

TOWN OF HARVARD

MUNICIPAL BUILDINGS COMMITTEE



Meeting Minutes – 18 November 2010, 9:30-11:00, Town Hall Meeting Room

Attendees

Present - Peter Warren, Marie Sobalvarro, Pete Jackson, Doug Coots, Lucy Wallace, Willie Wickman, Maggie Green, Ron Ostberg (chair, secretary);

1. The minutes of the November 4th meeting were read and approved.
2. The attached documents were circulated and discussed.
 - a. There was agreement that the committee's work, while not complete, is at the point of tendering a recommendation for discussion.
 - b. Peter W. noted that the committee can make a recommendation to ATM with or without the BOS endorsement.
 - c. Pete J. noted that models and drawings are very helpful in educating residents and fundraising.
 - d. A history of philanthropy in Harvard would be helpful in promoting the idea of a Public/Private Partnership.
 - e. There was consensus that the attached documents contained the basic ingredients of committee recommendation.
 - i. All three buildings should be used for civic purposes.
 - ii. Hildreth should be modified and expanded to serve as the Senior Center.
 - iii. The use of the old library as a Cultural Center should be endorsed.
Because the preliminary findings of the Pilot project indicate that there is a market demand and a corresponding supply of providers, the Pilot should continue for a year and the formation of a non-profit actively pursued.
 - iv. Town Hall should be renovated and expanded to serve all aspects of volunteer town government and provide a meeting/performance space on the second floor.
 - v. Funding should include private philanthropy, as well as public sector grants.
3. The next scheduled meeting is December 2nd. It was agreed that we should plan on another one on December 9th to prepare for the Workshop on the 18th.
4. The 3rd Workshop will focus on costs and funding mechanisms.

Alternatives Schemes – Phasing and Packaging

November 18, 2010

Town Hall

Scheme One – Three phases (elevator on exterior; egress stair remains within the envelope in phase 1)

- **Phase 1 - Package A - Architecture**
Upgrade to meet all codes; corresponding changes in layout; building is vacated
Package B – Civil
Build covered walk to old fire station/vault; upgrade utility connections
- **Phase 2 –Package A – Architectural**
Addition of new wing and shelling of upper town hall
Package B – Civil
Reroute Elm Street; add hardscape and landscape
- **Phase 3 –Package A – Fit up**
Fit up Upper Town Hall
Package B – Civil
Add parking lot north of Town Hall

Scheme Two – One phase (elevator and egress stair outside of existing envelope; addition of new wing)

- Package A – Architecture**
Renovate entire building, restore upper town hall and add new wing
- Package B – Civil**
Reroute Elm Street; upgrade utility connections; add hardscape and landscape
- Package C – Civil**
Add parking lot north of Town Hall

Hildreth

Scheme One – One phase

- Package A – Architecture**
Add new wing with elevator, egress stair, kitchen, toilets and dining/multipurpose; in existing building, upgrade insulation, remove thresholds, add toilets on second floor
Alternate – Provide for later addition of a second floor on new wing
- Package B – Civil**
Reroute road, add new parking and drop off; upgrade utility connections
- Package C – Civil**
Developed landscape/hardscape - allowance
- Later Additions** – allowance at cost/sf

Old Library

Scheme One – Core and Shell and Fit up to accommodate selected use

- Package A – Architecture**
Create new vestibule with elevator; revise existing egress stair; upgrade systems to meet all codes ('cold, dark shell')
- Package B – Civil**
New curb alignments, crosswalks, parking spaces, utility connections
- Package C1 alternative– Architecture fit up**
To accommodate Cultural Center
- Package C2 alternative – Architecture fit up and civil upgrade (drop off)**
To accommodate COA

Evaluation Criteria Municipal Buildings Committee	Town Hall					Hildreth House				Old Library			
	1/A	1/B	2			1				1			
A. Code <i>Relative cost of meeting code</i>													
1. Access													
2. Egress and Fire Protection													
3. Triggers significant upgrades													
4. Energy Code													
5. Codes governing other systems													
B. Program <i>Relative responsiveness to program</i>													
1. Accommodates program spaces													
2. Effectively support operations													
3. Efficiently organized													
4. Enhances current activity													
C. Appropriateness <i>Relative 'fit' w/architecture & location</i>													
1. Compatible identity of arch & program													
2. Compatible identity of site & program													
D. Site <i>Relative accommodation by the site</i>													
1. Centrality to town residents													
2. Opportunity for exterior program													
3. Safety and accessibility of parking													
4. Adequate number of parking spaces													
5. Vehicular drop off													
6. Service and Emergency access													
E. Implementation <i>Relative feasibility</i>													
1. Phasing Opportunities													
2. Relocation requirements													
3. Funding Opportunities													
F. Long-Term Viability <i>Relative adaptability</i>													
1. Expandability													
2. Convertibility													
TOTALS													

Factors influencing our recommendation:

(Looking beyond first cost and functional performance)

- I. **FINANCIAL** (Cost as a function of *time*)
 - A. External - Market and economic considerations
 1. Real estate prices
 2. Construction costs
 3. Private fund raising – grants and personal philanthropy
 4. Government grants and incentive programs
 5. Energy industry rebates
 - B. Internal – Town and State finances
 1. Debt limit
 2. CPC funding – availability and inclination
 3. Yearly budget challenges and move to sell assets
 4. Increase in tax base – EDAT and Devens
 5. Predictability of State revenues

- II. **QUALITY OF LIFE** (Benefit as a function of citizen *values* and *priorities*)
 - A. Town Services – values prioritized
 1. Education
 2. Fire and police
 3. Library
 4. Park and recreation
 5. Senior services
 6. Town Government
 - B. Amenities – values prioritized
 1. Open land
 - i. Conservation land
 - ii. Pond
 - iii. Constraints on dense development
 2. Character
 - i. Traditional landscapes (vernacular landscapes/development)
 1. Common – civic and religious life
 2. Oak Hill - orchards
 3. Prospect Hill and Still River
 - ii. Historic districts
 1. Town Center
 2. Shaker Village
 - iii. Private institutions (Historical Society; Fruitlands)
 3. Organizations
 - i. Collage of small scale groups
 - ii. Vast array of community events

- III. **OTHER FACTORS** (that are *time* dependent)
 - A. Land
 1. Potential sale of Catholic Church
 2. Zoning changes to promote high density housing
 - B. Political restructuring
 1. Regionalization
 2. Devens

Arguments critical to convincing voters of the merit and viability of optimizing the beneficial use of three historic buildings on the Common:

1. Wisdom of retaining Town assets
 - a. Maintaining future options
 - b. "Can't shrink to success"
2. Importance of preserving our Patrimony
 - a. Character of town is a stake
 - b. Common is as important as conservation land
3. Viability of Public/Private Partnership
 - a. Precedents exist
 - b. Again becoming a necessity
4. Merit of enhanced Programs
 - a. Critical to town life
 - b. Building Social Capital

Patrimony/Programs/Partnership

Possible Approach:

1. **Old Library – "Continue the Experiment"**
 - a. Continue the experiment; Initial results are positive
 - b. Need to measure demand
 - c. Need to gauge financial support for Non-Profit
 - d. Not the market to optimize return for leasing office space
2. **Hildreth – "Develop plans and funding mechanisms; proceed accordingly"**
 - a. Property is ideal ambience for Seniors; both exterior and interior
 - b. Site supports vehicular access
 - c. Site supports future expansion of program
 - d. Site provides possibility for adjacent senior housing
 - e. Program expansion would be attractive for philanthropy
 - f. Site provides real estate funding opportunity
3. **Town Hall "Develop plans and funding mechanisms; proceed accordingly"**
 - a. Good construction market to obtain lowest cost
 - b. Upper Town Hall would be attractive for philanthropy
 - c. CPC, State grants, energy company rebates, Green Communities funding possibilities
 - d. Single phase less expensive than two phased approach