

Community Center Meeting March 6, 2013 At Pivot Architecture

Purpose: To review the draft report from Pivot for presentation to the Board and Members.

Attending: OCF: Charlie Ruff, Andy Strickland, Chewie Burgess, Thom Lanfear, Indigo Ronlov, Hilary Anthony, Tony Clementi, norma sax, Steve Wisnovsky, Jon Silvermoon, Anna Scott

Pivot: Eric Gunderson, Scott Bishop, and John Stapleton

Pivot and Solarc presented the first part of the meeting, so “We” refers to that team. “You” refers to the OCF.

Eric presented the report Pivot and Solarc prepared to present to the Board. With Eric and John’s guidance, we went through and touched on key points. We started on an adventure of what a community center would look like.

Eric explained the goals for this meeting are: 1. Be sure the Community Center committee wants to move forward 2. If so, how do we bring this to the Board

Pages 7, 8, 9 Eric - Pivot/Solarc looked at buildings we thought did a nice job of reflecting the Fair environment and that looked doable, built by regular folks on a regular scale but put together in interesting ways.

Page 10 - 16 – Mind Maps This was used to develop a list of what activities the Fair wanted. We did

this in a large group of Fair folks. We used the mind maps to develop a list of space and activities for the Community Center. Second, we looked at how big and where they would be located in regard to each other. It was a highly useful event; a lot of people gave their 2 cents worth.

Page 18 – Site Planning Workshop - Second workshop had to do with site. We looked at three different locations. We had options A (The Hub), B (Zenn), C (Alice’s). We settled on a hybrid between A and B. A lot of things were looked at.

Page 26 – Sustainability Next workshop had to do with sustainability. We brainstormed tools to

talk about sustainability. We brainstormed features of the building that we thought would be cool to include. We categorized them as health, site, energy, water and materials. At the end of the evening everyone put dots on those things that most highly reflected things we’d like to see in the project. Top vote getter was net zero energy.

A few others that got high scores were sanitation and hand washing stations,

minimal disturbance of the site, groundwater heat exchanges, minimal ground disturbance, net zero energy, treat water on site, obtain water on site, durable materials.

Out of the work we did on locating sites we were able to land on a site that is a hybrid between a and b, between hub and Zenn Acres area. That let us connect the existing hub with the new facility and make good use of the roadways that are there. We showed dispersed parking, which is one of the goals that we set so parking spaces are scattered. We added driveway loops to accommodate added circulation. This exact spot that misses trees and disturbs site less. We looked at buildings getting solar access all year. We looked at wind direction and connection from Community Center itself to other parts of the fair.

We tried to include bigger facilities. E.g., we know there will be some sort of water storage for fire sprinklers. We don't know exactly how big it will need to be, but we tried to represent it. Make sure these elements are what you were thinking they would be and where.

Look this over carefully. We tried to include everything we think you'll need. We're looking for feedback on location of elements. We purposely used these shapes because they're not building shapes, but are roughly sized to scale.

The whole area south of Community center, we'd need to remove vegetation to have solar access. One of the big criteria for where we located this is we wanted to be sure we're doing it in a way it wasn't impacting true native species on the site. We don't want to touch the oak savannah. We can reuse that lumber we have to remove for the building. The idea is to optimize the incoming winter sun to get the gain and cut off the summer sun to get shade.

Eric – One of the things that will help us locate everything accurately is to get a survey .

Anna – I suggest that in some of these diagrams we need language about what some of these physical things really mean.

Eric – How about if we say the diagrams are conceptual, not a design?

Anna – Absolutely.

Eric – There's really great congruency between the areas south of the Community Center. the site we've opened up now becomes a great meadow for you and it's a great parallel with the open space we wanted for the Community Center.

Anna – The report has the same sort of feel of the kinds of drawings LUMP and Path Planning have presented before. It has that Country Fair feel.

Page 39 Diagrams show a conceptual look at the sizes and relationships of the various parts of the Community Center. Blue is gathering space as well. A multiuse room is a part of that. There are offices, support, and storage spaces. While these are diagrammatic, the area is the right square footage. Red part is kitchen, which is the core of the mission of this facility. There are indoor kitchen fully enclosed and heated and outdoor kitchens. Lastly is the covered outdoor facility that works together with the Community Center so in summer the enclosed Community Center opens up to combine the gathering space indoors with the space outdoors and you're able to handle a crowd. We think we have the inside sized for 250 people and the outside sized for 200. 250 people seated at tables.

Jon Sil – What would be the maximum number of people?

Jon Stap – We aren't asking in terms of a packed assembly to the county because of parking issues.

Jon Sil – If the space is used for concerts, that is not table sitting. So that would require more parking than what is specified now.

John Sta – We're doing code minimum to do the developing. Right now that # is 100. If we propose more people in the assembly, we would have to have another conversation.

Hilary – What defines parking? Can we say the property we just bought will handle parking?

Tony – I feel like we set that goal from the beginning, saying the idea of big parking lots everywhere vs. using the parking we do have.

Chewie – I'm hearing you say 450 people seated and I don't see how that helps our goal of moving the main camp kitchen.

Hilary – We don't feed 450 people at a time, people cycle through.

Eric – On page 40, 41, 42, 43 you'll see diagrams showing multiple uses for that space. Performance mode, meeting mode, dining mode.

Jon – 3300 sq ft, 5 sf per person, 642, add 25% that would be 155 more parking spaces potentially the County would require us to have if during the permitting process it comes out we have the capacity to have a concert.

John Sta – You would have to work with the county to see how they would feel about that,

Charlie – In reality, we have ample parking on the site for any use we would have with the possible exception of during the 3-day event. To a certain extent the

use of this facility would probably be at their minimum. It's an odd inverse bell curve. Most people will be out enjoying the Fair. Even the main camp

kitchen is still fairly active, but it's a whole different thing. To me, it seems like the number of parking spaces we have to accommodate officially connected to this has to be a fairly specific subset. It's a limited # of those 4A's that have to be hard-packed and an identifiable # of impervious spaces, but not in the staggering hundreds that close by. We have ample parking on the rest of the site that actually accommodates as big a crowd as we're ever going to put in this place

Steve – Looking at page 39 – Looking at early criteria in design, we forgot altered access. Will we be able to have full 4A access?

Tony - It's the law that anything we build has to be compliant with ADA laws. Both public and staff spaces have to have 4A access.

Jon Sil. – Parking – a lot of our parking is seasonal use. County will require we have year-round parking. How much parking is the county going to require us to provide? Is it feasible to use parking that's not impervious in winter? Are we going to be faced 3 or 4 years down the line, with we have to pave this now because we're not getting the use of the building we want because some of the people are complaining about muddy parking spaces? I'd rather if we're going to need 150 impervious spaces, we be upfront about that. Gravel parking is a paradigm shift, different than we usually think of parking at the Fair. Let's be upfront about parking.

Tony – Upland parking is different. More gravel parking. The Hub and some parts of Alice's' are all gravel.

Chewie – Concentrating too much on parking until we see what we end up is a moot point.

Hilary – Parking – 300 square feet per vehicle? We need 3000 sf for 100 cars. Henderson's is high and flat; perhaps we can use that.

Steve – We have an aerial picture of the Henderson property in 2011. There were 200 cars in the middle of that field, with space for another 100.

Indigo – It's important the Board gets the report ahead of the meeting so they have time to read through it.

John – Page 47 – We went through a big exercise on sustainability. Page 47 -48 is an attempt to encapsulate that. We heard the Living Building Challenge would be the guideline we would use for moving forward with the intent to get as many petals as we could and at the end of it you want to be able to use the Energy

Star Building Portfolio Manager tools to be able to manage the building. Take a look at it and make sure it agrees with what you want. If it doesn't we'll fix it.

Hilary – On a couple of these things, e.g. net zero energy, we might have some minority opinions. I agree that's what got voted on, but I want to reserve the right to say I had an objection. We're not in consensus about the Living Building Challenge.

John – You're a long way from adopting net zero, We have a design process and budget vetting to do. But if you think it might be something you're interested in, look.

Hilary – That feels like backpedaling, we have here a sustainability goal is what it says, and that's the way people adopted it. The idea that's it's not really a goal but we're throwing it out as a goal and we can decide later doesn't seem to me what this process is doing.

Indigo – It says here the “Living Building Standard will help guide the design effort in pursuit of a highly sustainable building.”

Hilary – It also says things like we'll have to build in enough infrastructures to bring in enough solar panels to bring it to net zero.

Anna – Is there a way to register a minority opinion?

John – What I was trying to do, and I understand you're not in consensus – is the LBC is something we will continue to look at.

Page 50 John - What we have here is the result of our budget vetting and mind mapping kind of summarized in a spreadsheet where in all the spaces that are in each building element – we have enclosed building, with kitchen, community center common room and support spaces. The sizes of those spaces are listed along with the supported activities. These are the sizes of the areas and what's in the areas. I just want to point out that this is meant to say there are different spaces within the building. There are the things we think are the primary components based on all the work we've done with you. The important thing is to look at that and say “You're totally missing XYZ. What is that in there? This is too big, or whatever.” The areas that you see here are the results of our amalgamating our work over the past 3 or 4 months. It started out a lot bigger in the mind mapping exercise. It's been getting a lot smaller as we go through. The final account was that budget document you went through. This is in agreement with that.

Square footage is in agreement with the last budget.

Hilary – This is the first time we'll have gender specific bathrooms. It would take

more space to try to do co-ed bathrooms.

Anna – Space descriptions are by code.

John – Page 51 is the other two types of building – the covered with outdoor kitchen and the outdoor spaces with site improvements. Parking, utilities

John – All these pieces from pages 50 and 51 are multiplied by unit cost and that's how we arrived at our budget. We're trying to show how we got to where we are. We took what we wanted to do at the very beginning with the mind map, we brought forward the spaces in the diagrams, we summarized those spaces, and we took the summary and turned it into the site map.

Jon – How much area will be paved? What will be required? Is the loading dock area gravel? Does it need to be concrete? What is gravel and what is concrete?

Eric - in the cost estimate there is 4,000 sf that is hard scape and that is handicap parking and delivery areas.

Chewie – We don't want impervious surfaces. There are some places that have to be tar paved but a majority of those we can do as flow-through.

PROPOSED BUDGET

John St – This is the budget as you gave it back to us after we first presented it to you. I noticed the cost per square foot went down for the Community Center building. We initially started with \$175 and it went to \$150. If you feel that's a good # that's what we'll leave it at.

Hilary – I don't think we meant to do that.

Andy and Charlie – I remember we did it.

Hilary – We had started at \$200 and we took it down to \$175.

Tony – when the committee said we're going to lower that, what was it based on?

Andy – Trying to make it cheaper.

Charlie – What were the SF costs that we started with at the beginning of the process?

Hilary - \$275 and \$200. This is the page that's going to have the most discussion.

Tony – When we're making these adjustments, this is the difference between

putting up a lifetime roof and ten-year prefab. This is the difference between using hardy plank term board instead of cedar.

Hilary – Jack says to expect for commercial construction \$200. This is all the building parts, not the kitchen parts.

Tony – We're talking about grades of materials. When we arbitrarily say that needs to be cheaper, I want to make sure we understand what that actually means.

John – I can tell you that \$150 per SF, based on my experience, is fairly low for a high quality building.

Andy – Ask for the money and let them reject it. I wish the biggest number got out there first.

Eric – Should we put \$175? Andy et al – Yes, that's the realistic number. Hilary – There's a lot of contingency, cost overrun, markup. Eric – 7% markup is fairly normal in the industry for a commercial contractor. Chewie – New site natural scape seems exorbitant.

Eric – This budget should look relatively near what you expected it to look like. It's a little over \$4M overall. If you could get this back to us as quickly as you can, lots of cascading numbers come off this primary document, start at this end of it work your way through the table.

Anna – There are two different budgeting documents. This one gives the construction costs. This is the real market value. The reason why we're doing this is we have to have this kind of basis for fundraising and grant writing. There's another type of spreadsheet that shows the in-kind contributions and things we can provide ourselves with volunteer labor. This needs to be described to the Board more clearly.

Jon S. – this is what the cost would be if it we 100% contracted out. This is the budget we present for fundraising and grant writing. Donations of materials and labor by Fair family and others will offset some of these costs. Who knows what the in-kind will amount to – could be more, could be less. We talked about 20% in-kind, but who knows what the figure will really be.

Hilary – We should identify specific line items we're going to target for in-kind donations and communicate that to the Board. A breakout of what are labor costs and what are materials costs would be very helpful. We can't apply 20% to everything.

John – I think that will be a process we'll need to get into as we get a little bit further. It's going to be hard to arbitrarily say what's labor and what's materials.

Hilary – I think the Board will want more information on materials and labor.

Eric – In Phase 2 you'll have much more complete design. It's a little too soon in this phase to say we're going to draw a line to say, "ok, this amount for labor, this materials." In phase 2, you'll much more details to see the elements of what you'll need to purchase, what you'll need to put in. Phase 2 will have more

detailed cost estimate and then you'll be able to get your developmental piece into it.

Pages54-57

Eric - We wrote a summary of everything we thought we might need to do for the next 2 phases. This is what PIVOT thinks will be required in the next phases. We took a much more careful look at what we thought your design fees are going to be. Please read through it; if there's anything you want to change, anything missing, let us know and we will adjust the fees accordingly.

Our job is to help you with this project. I've watched people go through this. Take a shot at defining...Encourage you think of this is as a basis for moving forward.

Anna – Thanks to the design team. I feel comfortable taking this to the Board. The Committee's job is to take these materials to the Board to get to Phase 2.

Indigo –We're asking the Board for \$89,000 to go to phase 2. The tricky part is convincing the Board this is a preliminary figure.

Chewie – It's Important to make this clear. This is an estimate. Make sure we have this \$4 million figure as our top.

Hilary – The meeting on March 18 is a work session, no vote will be taken. There is controversy swirling, a lot about the price. There will be issues about placement, costs. I don't think the Board will quickly decide on phase II. As treasurer, I need to investigate how we'll pay for it. Scenario looks shocking. Two million dollars looks challenging, but doable.

Andy – This is not the bottom line. Let's not whittle it down. We now know the magnitude of it. Could cost somewhere between \$3 and 5 million.

Thom – Hopefully, the Board will have the report before the work session, They'll need more than one work session. The Board has to affirm key assumptions we used before we can move forward. They have to agree. They need a presentation on fundraising. Maybe a fundraising person to help them see what's possible.

Eric – The YMCA found local professional fundraisers to help them. Shaw, Snow

Associates.

Tony – All this is a compilation of our dreams and requirements. This is a price tag attached to that. We'll need to whittle down our requirements.

Indigo – On page 33 – Questions about square footage.

Tony – I don't want to sell ourselves short, but let's look at reality v. dream.

Charlie – We can make simple point at the March 18 meeting that this will not be paid for by the event, but by grants and donations. We are acknowledging operational costs. Look at the (?) costs now. Not a sudden influx of drivers. We have to tell the story of filling a need. If something goes wrong in the screen house kitchen, it could be lots more expensive to fix it. We need this to maintain event at current size and sustain growth. This is necessary if we keep growing. Other option is to decrease our size.

What's our other option if this doesn't fly? We've taken what's an abstract concept and given it structure. What would a minimal, temporary kitchen cost us? We all this a community center because it give us options on locations. Fundraising needs to be a separate work session with consultants.

Jon – I won't be at the March 18 meeting. I don't support his report. I don't see the need for a year-round facility. Even if we raised \$4 million, I don't think` this is the best use of the money and instead of spending it on ourselves we could increase our philanthropy. The scale is too much. I would rather adjust square footage and present that to the Board. I will prepare a minority report.

Thom – Pivot would like comments from us by next Monday. Send remarks to Thom; he'll get them to John by Monday morning the latest.

Next meeting: March 12 – 5:30 – Meet to create presentation for March 18 work session with Board.