

TOWN OF HARVARD

MUNICIPAL BUILDING COMMITTEE



Meeting Minutes – Meeting # 29 – 5 January 2012, 6:00 – 9:15 PM, Town Hall Meeting Room

Attendees

Wade Holtzman, Doug Coots, Peter Jackson, Marie Sobalvarro, Chris Cutler, Lou Russo, Ron Ricci

Lucy Wallace, John Sayre-Scibona, Drayton Fair, Jason Maurer, Chris Ladds, George McKenna, Amiee Lombardo

CPIC: George McKenna, Keith Cheveralls, Debbie Ricci, Cindy Russo, Peter Warren, Tim Bragan, Thomas Jefferson, Lorraine Leonard

1. Meeting Minutes
 - a. Will be addressed at next meeting
2. Invoice Approvals
 - a. No invoices to approve from DTI or LLB
3. LLB presentation of relative cost of Hildreth House Scheme
 - a. Broad brush numbers; western entrance, parking on west beyond the building; small lower level entry/lobby; open terrace area; original building separate from new addition, will be bridged together by elevator and stairs. Upstairs will be mostly administrative offices, a few classrooms. Will blend new addition using complimentary materials.

As the design is refined, more specific numbers will emerge. The total of \$3.7 mil is a reflection of construction costs only. (Excludes: contingencies, escalation (2-3% increase in construction costs per year), unforeseen conditions and soft costs.) At Doug's request Drayton defined "core services" as: handicapped accessibility (elevator), legal fire egress (stairs) and correct number of bathrooms assuming total occupancy. Right now the parking area is designed to include 24 spaces; can be expanded/reconfigured to accommodate more spaces.
 - b. Pete called for questions/comments: Ron wants to be sure we can walk the public through the process of how we get to the "real" bottom line number. John stressed that tonight's presentation includes a construction number with the understanding that there are exceptions right now. Skanska put soft costs at 48% - we need to vet these numbers; as the process progresses, we will have more specific information. Pete agrees that as we continue, we will define where the costs are, value engineer, and revisit numbers.
4. LLB presentation of relative cost of Town Hall Schemes
 - a. Scheme 1: demo existing addition and replace with new, restore historical TH; main entrance on NW corner; toilets solely on 1st floor; 2nd floor to include portable partitions ("dotted in"). Stage area is elevated with handicapped lift; "telescoped" addition; optional vault area on north side of building; net 800 sq/ft.
 - b. Scheme 2: entry between new addition and original building; toilets on both floors; future office space built into design; elevated stage; glass connector between original Town Hall and new addition. It is possible to lock off "retail area" and leave public spaces open for use (in all schemes. Drayton pointed out that it is admissible to travel one floor for a toilet (it is more expensive to build two restrooms). Lou pointed out that both schemes lack electrical and mechanical rooms. Drayton answered that they are looking at a mezzanine mechanical space, there is a lot of attic space in original building and the addition could be made to match. A vault could still be located to the north of the building. Drayton reiterates that both schemes are easily modified to fit what we want. "Core Costs" exist in each scheme being presented. Partitions have been priced out for second floor meeting space; moveable wall system is significant money due to the high ceilings (17ft); other portable concepts are available, but they are more like furniture (would be included in furnishings column); portable concepts also have specific aesthetic and acoustic limitations. Ron is concerned that larger room will not be conducive to good meeting space. Drayton is confident that there are

ways of outfitting larger spaces so that they feel welcoming. Pete suggests including an extra bathroom as a back-up in case one of the bathrooms needs service. George asked if it would be possible to outfit the basement level for storage and meeting space. Drayton is concerned about elevator, stair access as well as ledge – it might not be worth the money since the space would need to be handicapped accessible. Net 1600 sq/ft.

- c. Scheme 4 is an outfit of existing shell, no stage; smaller offices; toilets on both floors; big cost associated with reconstruction of current addition (foundations would need to be re-done); elevator pit would need to be hand excavated. Not much space for electrical and mechanical spaces (storage rooms will be reduced). Scheme 4 would eliminate large meeting space. Doug thinks we need to consider what an addition will afford the town in terms of value.
 - d. Cost breakdown: ****Attach construction only spreadsheet****; renovation costs are fairly close for 1 and 2; higher for 4 (1 and 2 include partitions, can be added to 4); Stage and stage lift costs will be taken out of scheme 4's calculations); Scheme 4's elevator (and stair) cost is twice what it is for 1 and 2 – due to difficulty of setting elevator within existing building.
Bottom line: 1=\$2.5mil; 2=\$2.7mil; 4=\$2.7mil
 - e. Pete called for questions from MBC or Liasons? John expects soft costs to be in the 1mil range and will thoroughly review Skanska's numbers. Risk is reduced every time we do more design. Cost estimates allow us to ask about what value are we getting.
 - f. Lou visited Town Hall's crawl space visited crawl space today – foundation on existing addition is not worth saving. Doug believes schemes 1 and 2 satisfy program needs and offers best value. Pete adds that a rebuilt addition could be made more energy efficient; sees more value with demo and rebuild; wants to be sure that the chosen design will carry us for 50 years. Chris (LLB) added that it would be easy to compress scheme 2 to bring cost closer to scheme 1. Scheme 2 is characterized by joint entry – possible to massage either scheme to be bigger or smaller.
5. Selection of preferred schemes
- a. Town Hall -- Pete called for a vote:
 - i. Chris: Scheme 2; likes entrance scheme, separator on public space, bathrooms, looks like it could be shrunk fairly easily, would like to change roofline to match scheme 1.
 - ii. Doug: Scheme 2; same reasons as Chris; cautions that we need to keep in mind corridor space – create “landing” spaces for when people are waiting for meetings to start.
 - iii. Lou: Likes symmetry of Scheme 2; troubled by additional 250K in cost estimate; would prefer a blend of 1 and 2 (aim closer to square footage of scheme 1).
 - iv. Wade: agrees with all Chris, Doug and Lou; would support a blend of schemes 1 and 2.
 - v. Pete: also in agreement, wants committee to commit to bringing down square footage
 - vi. A Jackson/Coots motion to recommend scheme 2 with pledge to bring down square footage is unanimously approved.
 - vii. Marie asked for Tim Bragan's input. He agrees with the MBC that we need to land somewhere between 1 and 2.
 - viii. Ron will support scheme 2 with a lower target cost.
6. Review of Schedule – next meeting
7. Discussion of need for new members – next meeting
8. Agenda for next meeting (prior to BOS meeting of 1/19/12)
- a. Next meeting posted for 1/10/12 at 6pm prior to meeting with BOS at 7PM. Present the selected plan for each building, and discuss new appointees. LLB and DTI will be present at BOS meeting (represented by Drayton and John respectively).
9. Public Comment
- a. Hildreth design will incorporate historical landscape report, concept of walking trails; work on TH will not affect drive to Hildreth.
 - b. Lucy wants to be sure that we are conscious of how much we shrink space for volunteer government; Town Hall is the seat of civic government; remain mindful of future needs.
 - c. Laurie: Option 2 is beautiful but thinks scheme 4 as presented is not a good comparison. Would like to see concept of scheme 4 better illustrated.
 - d. The hope is to have all volunteer government meetings held in Town Hall.
10. Joint meeting with Capital Planning and Investment Committee – 8:00PM
- a. George calls meeting to order: each CPIC member will have a chance to ask question/address concerns
 - i. Cindy: Likes scheme 2, but wants to move towards a scheme 1 price; would like to see a design that makes full use of 2nd floor (most productive program use of 2nd floor); would like

- to know cost associated with eliminating the large meeting space. LLB and MBC will continue discussion at next MBC meeting.
- ii. Keith: sees a lot of similarity in the approach of Skanska and LLB. The OPM (John) is developing total project cost; John clarified that soft costs will be examined as the design is developed and will apply real numbers to line numbers (percentages are too nebulous). By the time MBC is ready to go public, all those numbers will be vetted. Numbers will be ready for February BOS meeting.
 - iii. Debbie: Concerned about snow and Ice removal if parking is located on the west side of Hildreth (and associated DPW costs). Also supports open office space as it will lead to longevity of building use. Would like to see what the cost of saving the stage would be so that we are better equipped to answer questions from the public.
 - iv. Peter: Is there a plan for site work at the Town Hall? Drayton answered that minimal site work will be done to Town Hall, somewhat dependent of location of entry. Site work number is a place holder; the intention is not to add extensive landscaping.
 - v. Tom: Sees public support as the big issue; sees value add of 1 or 2; would like to see further development of 2nd floor. Illustrate core costs.
 - vi. George: Would like to know the compliance requirements for bathrooms (and corridors); Drayton answered that Massachusetts requirements are similar to ADA guidelines. Massachusetts requirements are law; written into building code and dictate corridor width, door width and bathroom compliance. Schemes 1 and 2 meet minimum requirements. At the end of schematic design we will have: full image of the building (so an itemized cost estimate can be created); estimators would add in contingencies as a part of the schematic design cost estimate (to account for all of the parts that aren't designed yet – like interiors). The intent of schematic design is to create a budget that will carry us through the whole project.
 - vii. Keith would like to account for the discrepancy between CPIC and MBC numbers. Pete answered that at the 2/15 meeting with the BOS we will present a defined number.
 - viii. Debbie was interested in our timeline. There is a public meeting scheduled for the end of January, by 2/9 we will have a cost estimate and by 2/15 a presentation ready for the BOS. We will pass cost information to CPIC via George. Wade shared an outline of our schedule with CPIC.
 - ix. MBC will explore the possibility of grant funding in the preservation of the historical elements of Town Hall. MBC will look for energy rebates but need volunteers to help. Peter Warren will discuss options at meeting with grant writer tomorrow. LLB also has experience gaining funding through grant money.
 - x. Tom asked of the contingency numbers will go down. Drayton answered that it is typical for a renovation project to carry a higher contingency number (you don't always know what you are going to find). John will break out escalation as a separate contingency.
- b. Questions directed to the MBC
 - i. There are no comparison numbers for Hildreth since there was only one preferred scheme. Construction schedule is still being decided; the plan is for Town Hall to go to construction first, Hildreth second. MBC will keep CPIC informed of construction schedule.
 - ii. George finds the number of parking spaces at Hildreth less than desirable. Add now, as opposed to later. Less foot traffic coming to the building for town business. MA records keeping is changing (they want electronic records) record retention policy will change. Important to look to the future.
 - c. MBC had no questions for CPIC
 - d. George and the CPIC commend MBC for their hard work.

Next Meeting dates

- e. January 10th (BOS meeting)
- f. January 19th

Rachel Holcomb