



City of Arts & Innovation

Museum of Riverside Board Memorandum

TO: MUSEUM OF RIVERSIDE BOARD **DATE: MARCH 25, 2020**
FROM: MUSEUM DEPARTMENT
SUBJECT: REPORT ON HARADA HOUSE ARCHITECTURAL ASSESSMENTS

ISSUE:

Receive and file a report on Harada House architectural assessments.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Museum of Riverside Board receive and file a report on Harada House architectural assessments.

BACKGROUND:

Harada House was donated by Harada family heirs to the City of Riverside / Museum of Riverside in 2003 and formally accepted by the City in the following year. It was placed on the National Historic Register in 1977 and earned its National Historic Landmark designation in 1990.

Since its donation to the City of Riverside, Harada House has been progressively assessed and interpreted. Interventions have occurred to prevent further deterioration prior to the Museum being able to proceed with a full-scale rehabilitation to a high standard of historic preservation. It is estimated that over \$1.2 million in hard costs and a further \$500,000 in soft costs have gone toward these efforts as of late 2019. A notable share of these costs has been underwritten by grants and private donations. These totals include allocations for the impending rehabilitation of Robinson House to serve as Harada House's interpretive center. The City of Riverside has not been in a position to fund the substantial cost of full rehabilitation of Harada House since its acquisition.

In 2018 the Harada House Foundation, an independent private nonprofit, received a private grant in the amount of \$15,000 from Metabolic Studio, an affiliate of the Annenberg Foundation, to fund two (2) historic preservation architects' rehabilitation plans with cost estimates. The Foundation issued a Request for Proposal (RFP), and selected two (2) responding firms, Architectural Resources Group (ARG) and IS Architecture (IS). ARG and IS presented their reports to the Foundation in August 2019, and the Foundation shared these plans with Museum staff for analysis.

DISCUSSION:

Content of Architects' Proposals

Both firms were provided with broad instruction to provide plans that would be phased, anticipating that funding would be secured incrementally. Further guidelines included a rehabilitation plan that would maximize preservation of the historic fabric, permit safe public entry, and include building systems that would facilitate maintenance of an interior environment meeting museum industry preservation standards. Both firms were asked to obtain estimates for options that might not be pursued, so that the Museum would have the data it needed to make informed decisions. The Museum has determined, for example, not to proceed with installation of an elevator in the interests of preserving the historic integrity of the structure; the reports, however, provide information about the costs for installing an elevator as an additional alternative.

ARG and IS's reports differ significantly in their cost estimates. Staff continue to analyze these extensive plans to identify the specific differences in approach that account for the cost differences. Each plan establishes multiple phases:

Architectural Resources Group (ARG)

Phase	Description	Costs
Phase I	Stabilization and foundation repair	\$618,310
Phase II	Partial rehabilitation / public access	\$2,458,943
Phase III	Complete rehabilitation	\$1,102,173
	Totals	\$4,179,426

IS Architecture (IS)

Phase	Description	Costs (all phases in quick succession)	Costs (phases over ten years)
Phase I	Preparatory work	\$301,063	\$337,325
Phase II	Bring house level and reconstruct foundation	\$444,271	\$522,672
Phase III	Middle phase	\$432,334	\$605,510
Phase IV	Final phase	\$296,253	\$497,904
	Totals	\$1,473,920	\$1,963,410

Costs in the charts above **do not** include additional alternates such as the elevator. They do not include historic landscaping restoration, interpretive features, or reinstallation of the contents of the house. Costs are calculated on the assumption that the project would begin within a year of the presentation of the reports. A factor for cost escalation will be necessary if further delay in commencing occurs.

The notable differences in costs between these two (2) plans remain under analysis by Museum staff, and additional information will be sought from the architects when all questions that staff have for them have been collated.

Fundraising Goal

The Harada House Foundation opted to use the costlier of the two (2) plans as the basis for establishing a realistic campaign goal in order to commence fundraising. On October 28, 2019, the Foundation adopted a three (3) phased \$6.5 million fundraising goal, seeking to support

rehabilitation, endowment, and interpretation. As of the end of 2019, the Foundation had raised \$62,247 in grants, gifts, and in-kind support.

In addition to the Harada House Foundation's efforts, the City of Riverside and the Riverside Museum Associates continue to maintain restricted funds in support of Harada House to receive donor contributions and / or grant funds. Additional gifts were received to both of these funds in 2019.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no fiscal impact associated with this report. Costs will be associated with each stage of the future rehabilitation project and will be presented for required approvals as funding is secured.

Prepared by:	Robyn G. Peterson, Ph.D., Museum Director
Certified as to availability of funds:	Edward Enriquez, Chief Financial Officer/Treasurer
Approved by:	Lea Deesing, Assistant City Manager
Approved as to form:	Gary G. Geuss, City Attorney