

TOWN OF HARVARD

MUNICIPAL BUILDING COMMITTEE



Meeting Minutes – Meeting # 22 – 4 November 2011, 7:00 – 9:10 AM, Town Hall Meeting Room

Attendees

Lou Russo, Wade Holtzman, Doug Coots, Peter Jackson, Marie Sobalvarro, Chris Cutler, John Sayre-Scibona, Ron Ricci, George McKenna

1. LLB Reference Checks

- a. Wade – Spoke with Mike McCormick at Brown University. He only had nice things to say, used LLB for multiple projects. Found LLB open to bringing in new resources, lack of experience with senior centers wouldn't be a problem.
- b. Lou – Maynard Library, Very good drawings and conceptual ideas (especially interiors), good cost control (1.5% change orders).
- c. Chris – Town of Acton, long history of working with Drayton Fair (12 years), very strong on public presentation and interaction. Has done schematic phase work for Acton's senior center.
- d. Pete – Bolton Library director on vacation, instead spoke with building committee chairperson, LLB did a great job, walked them through the process (great collaboration), public involvement (Drayton acted as support person to OPM), Confident that they could pull resources if needed. Large staff is a great resource.

2. Any remaining concerns?

- a. Preservation Architect and senior center consultant - Doug is confident that they will bring in correct specialists when appropriate.
- b. Commissioning – will be discussed with LLB (they are supportive), may need to "sell" the idea to the town.

A Coots/Holtzman motion to recommend LLB to the BoS without reservation is unanimously approved.

3. John will contact LLB to start working on fees and contract. There is a BoS meeting scheduled for Tuesday 11/8 at 7PM, if an approved contract isn't ready for Tuesday's BoS meeting, a letter of intent can bridge the gap.

Doug will begin work on a "packet" to give to LLB prior to kick-off meeting. The packet will include program information and new COA director's input.

4. CPIC Meeting

- a. Wade, Pete and Lou attended the CPIC meeting and there is some concern over the scope/budget of the combined projects. The hope is that we won't need to move beyond the existing envelope of the building (except for small addition for an elevator). Lou is especially concerned about the programming needs of the second floor of the Town Hall. With the understanding that the desire for a performance space grew out of public input, Lou still questions if a performing arts space on the second floor is really necessary and the best use of the space. Can we prove a financial need, especially when the town has other venues (Cronin Auditorium and Volunteers Hall) available? Pete and Doug believe that it is premature to present a budget for review at this point. The design process that we are about to undertake

with LLB will help define the scope of the project; the results of the design process will allow us to present an accurate budget. Lou contends that we can establish the scope of the project now, which will lead us into a general budget figure. Doug cautions that we shouldn't put too much emphasis on the content of the letter of intent; trust that the schematic design process will define scope. He also acknowledges the public's natural want to restore, but the highest priority of the Town Hall is to accommodate government functions.

Lou is not comfortable pushing an agenda that we were not charged with. Thinks MBC should step back to re-examine programming. Wade suggests that we give Statement of Intent to architect. Lou agrees that we need to discuss both the MBC report and Statement of Intent with LLB. Doug also adds that architects are good at boiling down lots of information and finding the best design. Program for Town Hall does not include performance space.

George added that changes in records management might change the program needs of the Town Hall. He stressed the importance of anticipating future needs.

- b. Doug addressed the concern that LLB showed additions to Town Hall as a part of their interview presentation. He read this as not having all the information and enthusiasm for the project – easy to correct the assumption that we are looking for an addition.
- c. Pete reiterated that as the process unfolds CPIC and the public will have input and be able to shape the process. Lou adds that it is our obligation to build consensus, and part of that is better communication with CPIC as to our expected scope and budget.
- d. Marie used the \$3.4 million in the CPIC application as a place holder and is happy to acknowledge that this number may be off.
- e. John suggests that we give all documents and program information to LLB – let LLB verify program, and then they will provide design options which will present budget options.

John will check in depending on what he hears from LLB. Everyone is in agreement the backup is HKT.

Rachel Holcomb

Approved