

Town of Harvard Capital Planning Investment Committee
Minutes of Meeting
January 27, 2010, 8:00 a.m.
Town Hall

Members Present: Cindy Russo, Keith Cheveralls, George McKenna, Debbie Ricci, Tim Bragan, Lorraine Leonard

The following members of the Municipal Buildings Committee attended our meeting to discuss their capital request: Ron Ostberg, Marie Salvavaro, Pete Jackson, Willie Wickman, Doug Coots. The members of the CPIC asked questions based upon the materials supplied.

1. Debbie asked about the amount of funding requested. The total recommendation for Town Hall is \$4,560,000 (including fit up of meeting room) with \$3,160,000 from levy, \$500K from CPC, \$900K from other sources.
2. Debbie asked about stretch energy code. Building additions would meet the stretch code. The costs of meeting Leeds standards are included in the construction estimates, except for paperwork costs which are not included.
3. The request for funding to this Town Meeting has changed. Current request is \$185K to prepare schematic designs for Town Hall and Hildreth (\$115K for Town Hall + \$70K for Hildreth). The MBC hopes to have a Special Town Meeting in the fall to approve funding for preparation of bid documents and to bring project funding to the 2012 ATM.
4. Keith noted that the project in total is \$9 million with \$3,425,000 from “other sources.” He asked what the MBC’s comfort level is with obtaining this other funding. MBC said that many other communities fund Town Hall renovations from CPC. The “other funding” includes 1.8 million in philanthropy which is the number raised for the library.
5. Keith asked about the property sale of \$275,000 which is shown as a part of the funding for the Hildreth project. The MBC has not identified which town property to sell, this could be the back lot of Hildreth which would require the road being put in to give this lot frontage. Ron noted that the Hildreth project is not as immediate and funding questions can still be addressed.
6. Keith asked about making Hildreth road a town road and opinions of engineers as to viability.
7. Cindy asked about cost of meeting room to the town. If you compare cost of Phase 1 of 3-Phase Scheme with cost of Phase 1 of the 2-Phase scheme, is that the cost of the meeting room? The answer is that some site work is not included in Phase 1 of 3-Phase Scheme.
8. George asked why it is necessary to bundle the three projects together. Not for reasons of saving construction costs (which George thinks will change) and costs of

borrowing (George believes they are carrying too low a number for borrowing costs). Why can't each project stand on its own? Ron answered – first the MBC was charged to do the whole thing. Second – the projects aren't bundled in terms of timing except for schematic designs. The Old Library proposal is being evaluated to see if the planned non-profit function will work, so that is not proceeding yet.

9. George asked what is driving the need for the addition to Town Hall. He noted that Fin Com survey showed that most people access Town Hall functions on line and that we could use technology for record storage. Pete said reasons include the need/desire to get the volunteer organizations in one space, the vault is inadequate, the law requires hard copies of documents, and better counter space is needed for dealing with public.

10. Debbie asked about code facilities for supporting the performance center. Example, the MBC agreed that Town Hall would require larger bathrooms to support the performance center.

11. Debbie asked how much additional space would be created by this plan for civic functions at Town Hall. She noted that we currently have an approximately 8,000 sq. feet building (about 4,000 per floor). The proposal is to build a 4,000 square foot addition, the second floor of the addition is supporting the stage. What is variation in space available for civic functions? No clear answer was given.

12. The MBC stated that Town Hall will need a second legal means of egress and an elevator.

13. Keith asked how the MBC expected to fund the first two stages – the \$200K and the design funds. No clear answer was given.

14. Keith noted his concern about “design creep”. He pointed out that the article creating the MBC said “reuse and renovation” of town buildings and the Selectmen changed the charge to include expansion. We are going past re-use to expansion.

15. Keith also noted that usually philanthropy would be in place before the Town approves a project. Cindy noted that the library trustees guaranteed the balance of the cost of the new library in the event fundraising goals could not be met.

16. Keith asked Willie about cultural center at the old library. He noted that 63% of revenue comes from one source and suggested that the current “budget for expenditures” should evolve into a business plan.

17. Cindy again asked about cost of meeting room to the town. If you compare cost of Phase 1 of 3-Phase Scheme, plus the cost of the site work in Phase 2 of the 3-phase scheme, with cost of Phase 1 of the 2-Phase scheme, is that the cost of the meeting room? The MBC agreed that it was, and that a rough estimate of the cost to the town (exclusive of fit up) of utilizing the second floor as a performance space is \$1.25 - \$1.5 million.

18. There was further discussion about old library program. The plan is for the Town to pay for “shell” construction, with philanthropy to pay for the fit up. It is unclear whether

the non-profit or the town is to pay for maintenance of the building. The MBC acknowledged at a business and strategic plan is needed.

19. Keith noted that we have to determine how this project impacts/fits into our long range capital planning budget.

20. Marie stated that her budget numbers assume that the town's share of the project would be funded by excluded debt.

21. George asked about the request for the ATM and the fall town meeting. The total request for FY2012 will be \$1,005,000. \$820,00 in the fall: (\$610,000 for "enabling work" (site work) and \$210,000 for final design work for Town Hall.) \$185,000 is the request for the ATM.

22. George addressed the enormity of this project from the capital point of view, and to a lesser extent operating. George also sees a competition with the upcoming need for an operating over-ride, and a competition of this override with a capital exclusion for this project. He advocated looking at a time line to evaluate the impact. He then proposed a continued discussion with the other boards – Fin Com, Selectmen and School Committee – which will be impacted by this project. Cindy moved, Keith seconded, that the Chairman schedule a meeting with these three boards and MBC, to discuss the project on Saturday February 5. The motion passed unanimously.

23. The CPIC will prepare for the meeting by showing the project's impact on capital, and ask Fin Com to be prepared to report on impact on operating budget including repayment of the debt.

24. The MBC's final report will be delivered to the Selectmen on Tuesday.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:55.

Next meeting – Thursday, February 3, 8:00 a.m.