

TOWN OF HARVARD

MUNICIPAL BUILDING COMMITTEE



Meeting Minutes – Minutes – Meeting # 27 – 15 December 2011, 9:00 – 11:15AM, Old Library

Attendees

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

1. Approve minutes
 - a. Read and approved December 1 meeting notes as amended.
 - b. Read and approved December 8 meeting notes as amended.
2. Review results of public presentation of schemes on Wed 12/14/11
 - a. Presentation will run on Harvard cable channel. Already one response on gmail account. Pete will email MBC members password for gmail account. Deadline for responses is 12/21/11.
 - b. Are we ready to recommend Hildreth scheme three? Lucy recommends reconfiguring space so that dining room is at the eastern end of the new addition.
 - c. Hildreth
 - i. Wade: Prefers scheme 3 with parking on west, likes open terrace, doors from existing hildreth and new space, and eastern exposure with green space on east side Suggests that we allow LLB to move forward with scheme three.
 - ii. Lou: Prefers scheme 3, views are important; parking on west clearly has the most support, concerned about the elevation challenges. We should be discussing (maybe with engineers) utility connections and availability to connections like the new town sewer.
 1. John will look into electricity, gas and sewer as well as civil and MEP engineer. Pete and wade will ask the sewer commissioner to act as a liaison for the MBC and also look for someone from the building committee from the sewer project. There is some concern over daily kitchen use. Lucy reminded the group that the kitchen will be outfitted as a catering kitchen – not a commercial kitchen, meals would mostly be brought in. John reminded that the new meal program is in LLBs hands – they have the info they need to consult with their engineers. LLB is basing their assumptions on what is included in the MBC report (which states that we should be able to handle forecasted capacity). Lou asserts that LLB should take their own look. Marie suggests a conversation with Tim Bragan since he's determining hook-up locations.
 - iii. Chris: Prefers scheme 3, decision driven by parking (parking shown on west side), personally finds 3 to be the most interesting.
 - iv. Doug: Prefers Scheme 3, likes natural light in the existing dining room that scheme 3 allows. Design makes it possible to go outdoors between the two buildings; landscaping ideas need to be further explored. Agrees with Lou that there is a cost associated with creating parking on the west. Easy line item to break out during cost estimating. Concerned about a shady area for "drop-off" (especially in the AM); Wade commented that since we are renovation an existing structure, the ideal southern entrance will no longer be used. Relation both with material and scale will help blend addition. Move both pieces away from each other to create opportunity for natural light. Public wanted to preserve "original" view of Hildreth so addition must go on back.
 - v. Pete: Prefers scheme 3, separation of buildings with dining room on eastern end preserves views and would like to give Drayton the opportunity to refine idea. Agrees with Lou that the grade difference needs to be explored. Doesn't like the idea of coming in at the basement level. Keep the scheme generalized so Drayton can incorporate feedback. Would like to see the terrace extend into the sun.
 - d. Town Hall
 - i. It was not explicitly stated in the Statement of Intent that the vault should be moved from its

current location. Wade reminded the group that initially there was a vault included in scheme 3; he sees the “code pod” as a reaction to Statement of Intent.

- ii. Wade: Prefers schemes 1 and 2. Thinks the elevator should be in main part of the building; liked the idea of re-doing back addition to reflect the original architecture, central axis entry makes a lot of sense. Prefers meeting space without raised stage – liked versatility of space. Harvard has a small population, hesitant to commit that much space to an event space that isn’t needed.
- iii. Lou: intuition is to go with scheme 1 or 2, likes west side entry of scheme 2, liked smaller size of 1, Also saw scheme 3 as a demonstration of complying with Statement of Intent. Is hesitant to disregard scheme 4 decision before we fully explore how poorly the original addition was constructed. Probably more expensive to salvage the old addition; better value in tear down and rebuild. Agrees with Wade on second floor (too much open space); Lou’s concern is that if we leave the second floor as an open space, we are going to lose usable space. Inclination is to go with either 1 or 2. Would prefer a squared off shape.
- iv. Chris: Agrees with Lou. Scheme 2 makes most sense if we are building a new addition. Scheme 2 plans for the future - cheap space compared to scheme 1. Pete agrees, we can create a greener space (more efficient) if we start from scratch. Second floor eliminate raised stage, look for solutions for diving space so it can be used for smaller meeting areas.
- v. Doug: Do we really understand what the majority of town wants in regards to the second floor? Didn’t hear that the town would want to lower the ceiling. Wade suggested a glass divider to assist moveable partitions. Marie asked if the Ventress building was a comparable second floor space. Doug suggested the Exchange Hall in Acton as a good comparison. Doug thinks schemes 1 and 2 would be an improvement, 3 more of an opportunity for the architect to self express – still an addition, just set apart from the building. Does the vault need to be handicapped accessible? It is part of the Town Hall function; is it necessary that we make it compliant? Vault will still need to be considered. Doug likes western entrance; likes size of scheme two (could accommodate vault). Lou believes the vault question should be easy to answer. Reach out for advice. Pete thinks Janet would be a good resource for vault questions. What triggers a change? Look for efficient filing systems. Structural engineers suggested that additional mass of the addition might up structural upgrade cost. Lou suggests an expansion joint (used in Westford and Bolton library).
- vi. Ron attended the capital meeting this morning and would caution against adding too much to the project. Currently, 2.4 million has been earmarked (the current draft budget is at twice that amount). Pete responded that information was solicited in order to create the program. Marie wants to clarify that Tim Bragan was tasked with signing off on Town Hall programming. Ron spoke with Tim 2 days ago – he hadn’t seen any of the schemes. Pete also wanted to clarify that a budget has not been created by this committee, The 2.4 mil came from the Skanska report and only accounts for phase one of a three phase project. Ron thinks the program needs are subjective, as you add to the program you raise cost. Pete suggests that we should revisit the issue with Tim if the program needs should change. Wade thinks that as long as we have a number the CPIC will support, we should let LLB know what that number is. Marie thinks it is unclear what the 2.4 number really means. We can fight that battle when we have a number; 2.4 is their number, we should define our own. Why is the number picked out (in error – it’s a program free number, baseline, code compliance number) the only number being considered, it is an academic number (not real). MBC is capable of defining a reasonable budget. Lou thinks we have stalled addressing this issue; we have FinCom operating in error. He would like to approach this project with fresh eyes, and not be held back by a number that was determined in error. Agrees with Ron that we should not be wasting space, but we should be designing for at least 20 years, 50 should be our goal. We should all be aware of value for town and what is most fiscally responsible. We should have a joint meeting with FinCom, and have this conversation. Pete agrees, we are looking for the most cost effective solution for the long term. It is possible that we might need to pay more now, to save more later. Lou agrees, we have a decent assumption on what different features cost; people need to know that what they want will cost \$
- vii. Pete: Prefers scheme 2; likes western entrance, thinks it would be a waste of money to restore existing addition. Likes that the scheme addresses traffic flow and parking issues and allows for adding the vault in at a later time. Sits best within town campus. Agrees that we should look for temporary partition solutions for the second floor. Like the suggestion of

creating a separate meeting space by using the stage as a room. Lucy believes there is some interest in private fundraising to preserve stage space. Pete has some concerns about acoustics in upper town hall depending on how the space is partitioned. Worried that in smaller meetings it will be harder to hear each other. Pete thinks we might be able to fundraise to outfit stage area.

- viii. Wade suggests that we point LLB to schemes 1 and 2, and ask for more feedback on how to make the second floor more versatile.
- ix. Given the short schedule, it would be difficult to solicit opinion through a survey or open on-line forum. Lou believes the email account to be sufficient, doesn't think we would get much more from an open blog. MBC will filter through emails and pass comments on to Drayton.
- x. Ron is concerned that we don't ignore the Statement of Intent; believes that scheme 2 far exceeds what is laid out in the Statement of Intent. Marie confirmed that clearly defining the Statement of Intent is on the BOS agenda for their next meeting.
- xi. Lou thinks that in the mean time, we should be able to get some numbers on the difference between the two (price per square foot). We need a consensus from this committee. John agrees that it is very important that we clearly define statement of intent to pass onto Drayton. Lou thinks our next step should be to attach costs to schemes (with deltas), makes analysis easier. We will have rough ideas of cost, refined numbers won't be available for 1/5 meeting.
- xii. Next public meeting scheduled for 1/19 – 1 scheme for each building with cost estimating.
- e. Pete (on the phone with Drayton):
 - i. Town Hall schemes 1 and 2 with temporary partitions available in upper town hall (break space into usable meeting spaces). Possibly convert AV space or 2nd floor bathroom into smaller conference rooms. Keep western entrance. Outline cost difference between schemes one and two. Drayton stated that the big costs are elevator and toilets (building systems); both one and two have those elements – a difference in square footage will be a relatively low. Negligible within the grand scheme of the project. The town vault discussion will continue with town clerk to clarify regulations. Pete suggests John or Drayton speak with Janet. Drayton already has looked at some regulations, would assume it needs to be accessible. Wade asked that if we don't touch it, would it be grandfathered in. Drayton answered, yes – unless you get a complaint. Drayton is looking at services, interested in sewer hook-ups. Pete will try to get drawings for LLB.
 - ii. Hildreth – scheme 3; reconfigure so dining room has South/East/North exposure. What are the costs associated with parking lot on the west (ramp/no ramp)? Line items that we can look at; choices to be made looking at site improvements. AV space needs to be handicapped accessible.
 - iii. Drayton clarifies that there is a consensus that we are focusing on scheme 3 for Hildreth (MBC agrees). TH schemes 1 and 2 are clear front-runners. Delta costs between 1 and 2, with cost option for 4 so we can understand cost difference between rehab and demo and new construction.

12/14 Presentation is available on town web-site.

Next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 22, 2011
Rachel Holcomb

Approved