

Joseph White House Rickman Equestrian Park



Long-Term Use Goal:

Public/Private Partnership

Heritage Area Theme:

Farming History Cluster

International Building Code Future Use/Occupancy:

Business (House)

Utility (Springhouse)

Responsible Party:

Inspection: Historic Preservation, Public/Private Partner

Funding: Historic Preservation

Work Already Completed or Underway

The Joseph White House (c. 1820) has undergone a major Phase 1 rehabilitation, including restoration of all doors and windows, total interior structural repair, the roughing-in of all mechanical systems, and the repointing of exterior brickwork. This work was completed in 2004 using CIP funds.

Work Planned for Future

Goal: Complete exterior rehabilitation of the Joseph White House using CIP funds totaling \$34,147.

Objective: Complete exterior rehabilitation, specifically restoring the historic front porch during 2005-06 using CIP funds.

Goal: Find a private partner willing to complete the rehabilitation of the Joseph White House and put it to an appropriate use.

Objective 1: Put out an RFP for a public-private partner to complete the rehabilitation, mainly the interior, and to and reuse the historic building during 2005-2006.

Objective 2: Select a private partner and execute a lease agreement during 2006.

H. Dunbar Darby House & Store

Beallsville

Long-Term Use Goal:

Public/Private Partnership

Heritage Area Theme:

Farming History Cluster

International Building Code Future Use/Occupancy:

Residential (House)

Mercantile (Store)

Responsible Party:

Inspection: Property Management

Funding: Historic Preservation



Work Already Completed or Underway

Acquired this early 20th-century pair of buildings in 2004 under the Legacy Open Space (LOS) program. The Department has secured the store against weather and vandals until a partner can be found.

Work Planned for Future

Goal: Stabilize the Darby House and Store and enter into a public-private partnership to achieve full rehabilitation and secure the best use for the property (preferably as a store, bed-and-breakfast, or antique store/ residence for storeowner).

Objective 1: Use \$100,000 to begin the stabilization of this pair of structures.

Objective 2: Put out an RFP in calendar year 2005-2006 to find the best partner to continue the rehabilitation and determine the best use of this building.

Objective 3: Select a private partner and execute a lease agreement during 2006.

James King Barn South Germantown Regional Park



Long-Term Use Goal:

Public/Private Partnership

Heritage Area Theme:

Farming History Cluster

International Building Code Future Use/Occupancy:

Assembly

Responsible Party:

Inspection: Public/Private Partner, Property Management

Funding: Public/Private Partner

Work Already Completed or Underway

The Commission purchased this 1930s dairy barn in the late 1960s. The Department restored the barn and added missing roofs to the existing, original silos in 2001-2002. Architectural and engineering plans have been completed for improvements to allow occupancy for use of the building as a museum.

Work Planned for Future

Goal: Work with the identified private partner to open the barn as the MOOSEUM.

Objective 1: Work with the Friends of the James King Barn to open the MOOSEUM to the public, first and foremost installing sprinkler and life safety systems.

Boyd-Maughlin House Black Hill Regional Park



Long-Term Use Goal:

Public/Private Partnership

Heritage Area Theme:

Farming History Cluster

International Building Code Future Use/Occupancy:

Residential

Responsible Party:

Inspection: Public/Private Partner, Property Management

Funding: Public/Private Partner

Work Already Completed or Underway

The Commission began acquiring land in this area in the 1970s. By 1994, it had entered into a public/private partnership with a caretaker family on this house.

The house, which was acquired in a very deteriorated state, has been the subject of an ongoing rehabilitation.

A new septic system was installed in 2005.

Work Planned for Future

Goal: Continue to monitor maintenance and rehabilitation of the house as undertaken by the private partner.

Objective 1: Maintain the public/private partnership so that the property receives preventive maintenance.

Objective 2: Find a mechanism for making the property accessible to the public once a year.

Rock Creek Stables (Meadowbrook Stables) Rock Creek Park



Long-Term Use Goal:

Public/Private Partnership

Heritage Area Theme:

Not Applicable

International Building Code Future Use/Occupancy:

Utility (Stables and Blacksmith Shed)

Responsible Party:

Inspection: Enterprise

Funding: Enterprise

Work Already Completed or Underway

The stables were built in the 1930s on park property and conveyed to the Commission. The conveyance was the subject of the Commission's first public/private partnership. The Department has rehabilitated the building and put a new roof on it. The Department has entered into a partnership with a concessionaire who is maintaining and operating the stables as an equestrian center. The concessionaire has commenced an extensive series of equestrian-related alterations on the site.

The farrier's shed, or blacksmith's shop, has been rehabilitated by Central Maintenance crews using CIP funds.

Work Planned for Future

Goal: Work with the private partner to maintain this property as an important historic site and as one of the County's best equestrian centers.

Objective: Work with the private partner to see that improvements to the property are in keeping with its historic character and park setting.

Seneca Store (Poole Store) and Upton Darby House Seneca Landing Special Park



Long-Term Use Goal:
Public/Private Partnership

Heritage Area Theme:
Farming History Cluster (store)
Technological Innovation Path (house)

International Building Code Future Use/Occupancy:
Mercantile (store)
Residential (house)

Responsible Party:
Store Inspection: Property Management
Store Funding: Property Management
House Inspection: Historic Preservation, Property Management (also includes outbuildings)
House Funding: Property Management (also includes outbuildings)

Work Already Completed or Underway

This pair of buildings started out as a general store and a mill owner's house, which explains why they are categorized as two different heritage themes. The Commission acquired the buildings to hold them for the state in the mid-to-late 1970s. The store and house are leased to a concessionaire, the Poole family, which has maintained the buildings (and other outbuildings) over a long period of time. The Department has undertaken major exterior rehabilitation work on both the house and store as well as performed some maintenance.

Work Planned for Future

Goal: Continue to have a responsible private partner in these important buildings.

Objective 1: Maintain the store as a community amenity by retaining it as a working store. Use \$30,000 in fiscal year 2010 to paint the store.

Objective 2: Continue offering the adjacent house to the store concessionaire.

Goal: For the long-term, consider the potential of this property as a major interpretive center to tell the story of the County's waterways. Its location near the C&O Canal, Potomac River, and Seneca Creek plus substantial, surrounding acreage owned by federal, state, and county make this an attractive option.

Objective: For the long-term, seek out a partner to support a waterways interpretive center.

Hyattstown Mill and House Little Bennett Regional Park



Long-Term Use Goal:

Public/Private Partnership

Heritage Area Theme:

Technological Innovation Cluster

International Building Code Future Use/Occupancy:

Assembly (mill)

Residential (house)

Responsible Party:

Inspection: Public/Private Partner, Property Management

Funding: Public/Private Partner

Work Already Completed or Underway

This pair of buildings was acquired in the 1970s. In 1998, the Commission entered into a public/private partnership with an arts group to maintain the buildings and open the mill. The Department rehabilitated the exterior of the mill and house. The private partner has done additional interior rehabilitation work and cleaned up the grounds. The organization runs public programs in the mill that focus on the arts, history, and the environment.

Work Planned for Future

Goal: Work with the existing private partner and maintain this mill and house as publicly programmed sites.

Objective 1: Continue to incorporate these buildings in the Little Bennett Master Plan to make sure they are highlighted for their heritage tourism potential.

Objective 2: Monitor the currently advertised RFP for private partners to best ensure that respondent with good idea for future interpretation/use is selected.

Robert B. Morse Filtration Plant Burnt Mills East and West Parks



Long-Term Use Goal:

*Public/Private Partnership
And Park-Related Use*

Heritage Area Theme:

Technological Innovation (but not along the “Technological Innovation Path”)

International Building Code Future Use/Occupancy:

*Assembly (West)
Residential (East)*

Responsible Party:

*Inspection: Park Manager
Funding: Central Maintenance*



Work Already Completed or Underway

The Commission acquired these 20th-century Colonial Revival buildings in the late 1990s from the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC).

Work Planned for Future

- Goal:** Find strong public/private partner(s) to rehabilitate and reuse the buildings. Maintain them in the meantime.
- Objective 1:** Work with Department task forces handling housing initiatives (such as the recent REOI on “Employer Assisted Housing Development and Management Opportunities on Park Property”) to look for partners for the east building.
- Objective 2:** Work with Trail Planning Staff to use the building on the west as a trailhead for the Rachel Carson Greenway.
- Objective 3:** Using SmartParks, generate work orders to better maintain these properties.

Kensington Cabin

Kensington Cabin Local Park



Long-Term Use Goal:

Public/Private Partnership

Heritage Area Theme:

Not Applicable

International Building Code Future Use/Occupancy:

Assembly

Responsible Party:

Inspection: Public/Private Partner, Property Management

Funding: Public/Private Partner to 5K/Central Maintenance over

Work Already Completed or Underway

This rustic cabin was built in the 1930s on parkland. The cabin has been vacant and suffering from deferred maintenance. In 2005, the Town of Kensington and the Commission entered into a partnership for local use of the cabin wherein the Commission will earmark funds for its rehabilitation and the Town will handle the rehabilitation and operate the building.

Work Planned for Future

Goal: Execute the partnership with the Town of Kensington so that rehabilitation of the cabin can commence.

Objective: Begin the rehabilitation of the cabin in calendar year 2006 via an \$88,000 grant to the Town.

Bureau of Animal Industry Norwood Local Park



Long-Term Use Goal:

Public/Private Partnership

Heritage Area Theme:

Not Applicable

International Building Code Future Use/Occupancy:

Business

Responsible Party:

Funding: Property Management

Inspection: Central Maintenance

Work Already Completed or Underway

The Commission purchased this building in 1936 after the Chevy Chase Terrace Community Association petitioned the Commission to do so. The community wished to rid itself of the particular government facility that had been operating there. In more recent times, the building has been operated as a community recreation center. It has never been rehabilitated and is not currently set to receive CIP funds between 2006-2010.

Work Planned for Future

Goal: Work with the private partner and other Commission divisions to rehabilitate the building either for continued use as a community center or for a new use that also serves community needs.

Objective 1: Install a new roof as an immediate maintenance need.

Objective 2: Coordinate with private partner and other divisions to evaluate best use for the building.

The Brainard Warner Property Kensington

Long-Term Use Goal:

Public/Private Partnership (with housing)

Heritage Area Theme:

Technological Innovation

International Building Code Future Use/Occupancy:

Assembly and Residential (House)

Residential (Carriage House)

Responsible Party:

Inspection: Historic Preservation

Funding: Historic Preservation



Work Already Completed or Underway

This property was purchased by the Department in December 2005 for its value as the 1890 home of Brainard Warner, considered to be the founder of Kensington for his development of the garden suburb of Kensington Park, the 1893 Noyes Library, and the Kensington Electric Railway line. Initial plans for studying adaptive reuse options are being developed by the Department in conjunction with the Town of Kensington.

Work Planned for Future

Goal: Develop viable adaptive reuse options that maintain the character of this Late Victorian home. Attract a public/private partner to implement them.

Objective 1: Develop an adaptive reuse plan by the end of FY06.

Objective 2: Implement a public/private partnership agreement by the end of FY 07.

4.3 Capital Improvement Program

The CIP is completed every two years and projected for a six-year cycle. Currently, it is completed through fiscal year 2012, four years short of the end target for this Strategic Plan. For purposes of this plan, some of the Top 20 priority projects are recommended to receive capital improvement funds in this Strategic Plan, but not all. This is due either to the fact that no projections have been calculated beyond 2012 or because some of the necessary bricks-and-mortar projects will be funded through public/private partnerships.

Below are tables spelling out the Capital Improvement Program as it currently stands relating to cultural resources. Following that is an outline of four steps that the Department should take to gain more specific capital improvement cost projections in the future.

Table 4-1: Projected CIP Expenditures for Top 20 Resources

	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12
Woodlawn Barn (design & construction)	\$340,000*	\$500,000	\$300,000				
Oliver Watkins House					\$60,000	\$210,000	
Bussard Farm	\$70,000*						
Fisher Barn (Seneca Stone Barn)					\$225,000		
Holland (Red Door) Store				\$285,000			
Joseph White House	\$34,000*						
*Some FY06 dollars include funds from previous fiscal years that must be disbursed in FY06.							

Table 4-2: Projected CIP Expenditures for Other Long-Term Use Goal Categories

	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12
Historic Markers	\$18,000*			\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000
Strategic Planning	\$10,000			\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000
Needwood Mansion						\$75,000	\$285,000
*Some FY06 dollars include funds from previous fiscal years that must be disbursed in FY06.							

Table 4-3: Total Projected CIP Expenditures

	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12
TOTAL (from both charts)	\$472,000	\$500,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000

CIP Goals are:

4.3.1 Use “Responsible Party” Structure

The spreadsheets that accompany this Plan assign division(s) within M-NCPPC as “Responsible Party - Inspection” and/or “Responsible Party – Funding.” These indicate *existing conditions* within the parks, with a recognition that these assignments may shift over time. For example, while Historic Preservation or Park Managers may be shown as inspecting projects now in some parks, more properties will be inspected by private partners when new users occupy currently vacant buildings. Regardless of the assignment, the “Responsible Party-Inspection” should regularly conduct a windshield inspection of the buildings, looking for any major changes.

The “Responsible Party – Funding” division should spearhead capital improvement projects and annual maintenance. **Note: Money for annual maintenance may be charged back to Historic Preservation’s annual maintenance for park resources budget using the “charge back” option. All work should be done in concert with the Historic Preservation Section to garner its expertise and to make sure the project conforms to the goals of this Plan. There should be semi-annual coordinating meetings between the various divisions with responsibilities for historic resources.**

4.3.2 Conduct Top 20 Analysis

Analyze each of the Top 20 Properties more intensively to assess short and long-term capital improvement needs. This could be done in either of two ways, both requiring outside contractors given present staffing capability: Replacement Cost Appraisals or Restoration/Rehabilitation Estimates.

4.3.2.1 Restoration/Rehabilitation Estimates

Historical architects could prepare individual building restoration/rehabilitation estimates.

- A batch of historic buildings would be analyzed by architects specializing in historic preservation. (Note: As mentioned, better in-house technical expertise is needed to prepare scopes of work for rehabilitation; currently independent contractors do this work.)
- The architects would prepare cost estimates for restoration/rehabilitation of key buildings. This was the approach taken by Prince George’s County in its Report to the Prince George’s County Council on the Historic Sites of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission in Prince George’s County (September 1997). Blackburn Architects, P.C., was hired to prepare cost estimates for architectural, structural, and MEP analyses on 10 of the county’s public sites. (See Appendix H: Sample Cost Estimate on Rehabilitation from Prince George’s County.)

4.3.2.2 *Replacement Cost Assessments*

As another approach, the Department could contract out Historic Replacement Cost Assessments by qualified historic building inspectors:

- Assessments would be used to back up capital improvement project requests with specific, hard data.
- A contract that would obtain assessments for a batch of buildings at one time would reduce the overall fee for these services.
- Historic Replacement Cost Assessments could be undertaken by a licensed home inspection company with experience in historic buildings, or by a specialty insurer, such as the National Trust Insurance Services, LLC (NTIS).⁷
- The most useful assessment would be more comprehensive than a Home Inspection Report, which typically contains a checklist of building features and services and a summary of condition, but not costs associated with upgrading condition.⁸ Instead, a “Combination Condition Report” would be more useful. This would include a “Home Inspection Report” and a “Reserve Study/Plan.” A Combination Condition Report would feature: 1) a thorough condition assessment of the building and 2) a breakdown of replacement costs for in-kind replacement (e.g., heart-pine floors rebuilt in heart pine, not Pergo).⁹ (See Appendices I and J: Sample Combination Condition Report and Sample Home Inspection Report and from Claxton-Walker.)

4.3.3 *Initiate On-Call Services Procurement*

Employ the tool of contracting pre-qualified vendors for “On-Call Architecture and Engineering Services.”

Such long-term retainers could be used for restoring historic buildings (capital improvement projects) and/or conducting certain types of routine maintenance (see below). “On Call Services” contracts—routinely used by the federal government—are an excellent means of eliminating Requests for Proposals and bid analysis for each and every step of historic building stabilization/restoration.

4.3.4 *Streamline Preservation Specialist Contracting*

Streamline the procurement process for contracting with preservation specialists for Historic Structures Reports or Cultural Landscape Reports. These in-depth reports would be extremely useful for those relatively few properties (historical or landscape) that hold significance

⁷ The NTIS might only provide such a report if historic insurance packages were being considered for historic structures separate from the County’s own self-insurance and additional blanket commercial policy, which only insures for reasonable replacement value, not the re-creation of historic materials.

⁸ A typical Home Inspection Report or Appraisal costs approximately \$350 - \$400 per building.

⁹ This latter step requires experience with costing out historic building materials, since Marshall & Swift and similar cost guides are “useless” for historic buildings.

deserving of intensive historical study. These reports typically include a detailed historic construction chronology and recommendations for specific restoration/rehabilitation steps and the costs associated with them.

4.4 ANNUAL MAINTENANCE

Whereas the Department now has a zero budget for preventive (or, repetitive) annual maintenance of the Department's cultural resources, this plan shows that \$375,258 is necessary for future annual maintenance of the Top 20 Priority Projects and \$146,314 is necessary to maintain important resources in other Long-Term Use Goal categories. This makes for a total annual maintenance need at present of \$521,572. As a conservative first step in creating this new annual maintenance program, this Plan requests that \$400,000 be devoted to an annual maintenance operating budget.

This money, if allocated, will be used for basic maintenance money, not capital improvement projects, which were described in the previous section. The total dollars cited above were developed according to formulas specifically prepared for this Strategic Plan in order to bring historic resources into SmartParks and move quickly forward with maintenance. This is necessary in order to partially make up for years of "deferred maintenance."

The following six goals, if implemented, would carry the Department forward in protecting and promoting its historic resources:

4.4.1 Allocate Dollars for Annual Maintenance

Operating budget money must be specifically earmarked for historic buildings to be maintained according to State/Federal law. Currently, the primary means of obtaining any funding for historic properties is through CIP funding in the Restoration of Historic Properties PDF, but these are limited funds that need to be directed to capital projects, not maintenance. **Operating funds should be allocated over the next ten years to Historic Preservation for the Cultural Resources in Parks Maintenance Program (CRPMP).**

4.4.2 Use the Responsible Party system for Annual Maintenance

The party identified in the spreadsheets as "Responsible Party-Inspection" is the party that should be checking on the property on a regular basis. The party identified as "Responsible Party-Funding" is the division of M-NCPPC that should be responsible for undertaking the preventive and routine maintenance on historic buildings/cultural resources in the park system's portfolio. There should no longer be any instances of buildings "falling through the cracks" because of miscommunication or 'lack of ownership' for maintenance problems occurring at historic buildings. **Using the "charge back" option, maintenance should be spearheaded by those divisions designated as "Responsible Party-Funding." There should be semi-annual coordinating meetings between divisions with responsibilities for historic resources.**

4.4.3 Use SmartParks as Maintenance Management System

The historic resources inventory must be coordinated with SmartParks, which cues a pre-programmed maintenance schedule for repetitive maintenance, internal and contractual work orders, and cost tracking.

A critical component of the merger of data on historic resources from this Plan and SmartParks is that historic park properties must be “flagged” with an identifying code so that Service Center personnel are informed that any repairs must be approved by the Historic Properties Manager. (Note: While most historic properties are already keyed with a “K” in the Park Code - the letter that signifies a historic property - the ‘flag’ described above should be an additional one placed into the system during work-order data entry.)

The Historic Preservation Section’s Historic Properties Manager should be assigned as the “Chief Liaison” with SmartParks in maintaining the data and making contact with those from other divisions spearheading work orders. In cases where Historic Preservation is the “Responsible Party – Funding” for a specific property, the Historic Properties Manager can become a “Shop” like other division liaisons.

4.4.4 Continue training Responsible Party divisions on inspection/rehabilitation methods

Historic Preservation should work in conjunction with Responsible Parties on inspection and rehabilitation. **Until a better inspection checklist is developed, inspection of historic buildings should require noticing major changes. Such changes would include damage due to trees, water infiltration, substantial wood deterioration, missing windows, roof damage, and the like. For buildings, such maintenance inspection should occur routinely when the Responsible Party is at the site or at a minimum of six-month intervals. For structures or objects associated with sites (gold mine entrances, trestle bridges, etc.) and archaeological sites, such maintenance inspections should occur at least once a year.**

Develop a straightforward maintenance checklist, either adding to Central Maintenance’s current “P.M., or Preventive Maintenance Form,” or simplifying the Maryland Historical Trust’s Easement Inspection Form. (See Appendix E for Maryland Historical Trust Easement Inspection annual maintenance checklist.) A curriculum, appropriate handouts on preservation techniques, and a regular training schedule for Central Maintenance should be developed, building on an earlier educational exercise that was considered successful.

4.4.5 Consider hiring a contract inspector to do an initial general inspection of priority historic sites.

As noted under the CIP section previously, consider contracting out an initial batch of priority maintenance inspections until M-NCPPC can bring all maintenance initiatives comfortably in house. Inspections of historic properties are best conducted by people with an expertise in historic architecture.

4.4.6 Develop a streamlined procurement process and use on-call service contracts

Institute long-term retainers/on-call service contracts for conducting certain types of routine maintenance, such as termite treatment, painting, roof repair, etc. These contracts are excellent means of eliminating the continual need for Requests for Proposals and bid analysis for every step of historic building stabilization/restoration.

4.4.7 Estimated Value and Annual Maintenance Formulas

In addition to setting the six goals, it is essential to assign values to properties to establish initial, ballpark annual maintenance costs in lieu of long-term and/or more costly evaluations. Property value and annual maintenance go hand in hand because one cannot perpetuate a decent value on a property if its buildings are not maintained. Currently, the Department has little data on the value of its historic buildings since real property assessments and acquisition data combine the values of land and improvements. Values from current insurance appraisals are not especially useful either, since the Commission has a blanket insurance policy that factors in reasonable replacement cost from typical building manuals that are not specific to historic structures.

Research was conducted for this Strategic Plan to determine how other agencies or organizations with large building portfolios arrived at annual maintenance budgets. While models for how to estimate the value of historic properties and establish budgets to conserve them can be found at other local agencies like Prince George's County, national agencies like the National Park Service, quasi-governmental organizations like the National Trust for Historic Preservation, private foundations, and private corporations, only one organization was found that used a formula, rather than a case-by-case cost analysis. That organization was Yale University. A brief synopsis of information gleaned from other organizations can be found in Appendix F.

4.4.8 Yale University

Yale commissioned a private architectural firm to undertake a three-year study. The purpose was to arrive at a formula that would estimate both the value of the school's properties and the cost of maintaining and rehabilitating/renovating them. Yale's resulting formula was complicated. It depended on dividing the building stock into categories; defining "useful life," "capital replacement," and "maintenance;" and developing a conceptual cost model to project capital replacement costs by assigning a useful life to individual components (structure, interiors, equipment, etc.) and their subcomponents (foundation concrete, exterior doors, lighting, grading, etc.). Appropriate useful life projections for individual components were determined from the R.S. Means Facilities Maintenance & Repair Cost Data,¹⁰ Yale's experience, and the Association of Physical Plant Administrators Standards. The Yale model determined figures that it termed

¹⁰ "There are several cost guides published by R.S. Means. One valuable resource is *Historic Preservation – Project Planning and Estimating*," by Swanke, Hayden Connell Architects (2000). It has a section entitled "Estimating Construction and Maintenance Costs" that details how to establish a maintenance budget for historic buildings. It describes the three main studies: 1) an Existing Building Analysis (EBA) that addresses replacement items; 2) a Replacement Reserve Study (RRS) that also addresses replacement items; and 3) A Preventive Maintenance System that consists of tasks that must be performed to prevent deterioration of architectural, mechanical, and electrical building elements. (See Appendix D.)

“Original Cost” and “80-Year Replacement Cost.” To simplify the results, Yale’s study found it would cost between 1.5 and 2.5% annually of what amounted to a major renovation cost to maintain its building stock.

Yale’s model is the one being used in this Strategic Plan in conjunction with “Estimated Value,” a dollar value placed on each resource, which was derived through in-house analysis. The Historic Preservation Section had to create this value because the Department does not have figures that amount to “major renovation costs.” (The Department lacks value for *improvements* separate from land, or has outdated values that don’t reflect the price of historic resources.) The Estimated Value used in this Plan, therefore, is derived from multiplying the square footage of the resource by a multiplier based on its current condition or its status as an outbuilding. (See Table 4-4 and Appendix C.)

The Historic Preservation Section tested the multipliers against established norms, such as:

- The GASB audit, which uses \$75 as a multiplier for a restroom (this Plan’s outbuilding multiplier).
- The National Trust for Insurance Services, which says that historic building multipliers can range from \$200 per square foot for a building with a new roof to \$1,000 per square foot for the most high-style buildings.
- New construction, which values office-building construction typically at \$100 per square foot.
- Actuals from a few CIP and Legacy projects, which showed that a few known buildings had values in the range of those ascribed to them.

Table 4-4: Strategic Plan Annual Maintenance Cost Model

ESTIMATED VALUE

The Historic Preservation Section has developed an “Estimated Value” for each of the buildings the Department owns. Estimated Value represents a value placed on a building in its current condition taking into account its square footage and whether or not it is a primary building or an outbuilding. The Estimated Value allows the Department to move forward in estimating annual maintenance requests by using a formula. Note: The formulas do not address interpretive programming and/or operating costs.

Formula 1: Estimated Value = Estimated Square Footage x Multiplier Based on Current Condition/Status

Multipliers:

- \$300 for a Currently Restored building;
- \$200 for a Currently Stabilized building;
- \$150 for an Currently Endangered building; and
- \$75 for an Outbuilding
- (Note: The Outbuilding multiplier overrides the current condition status multiplier.)

ANNUAL MAINTENANCE

The Historic Preservation Section has developed a formula for estimating Annual Maintenance for historic park resources. This money would include repetitive maintenance and minor repairs (gutter cleaning, roof patching), but not the cost of paying utility bills or major repairs. It would include the cost of both materials and labor for repetitive maintenance and minor repairs.

The Annual Maintenance costs for historic resources are based on a percentage of Estimated Value. The percentage multiplier in this formula is the low-end multiplier from the study developed for the Yale University Facilities Planning Department. (See description of Maintenance Models above.)

Formula 2: Annual Maintenance = Estimated Value x 1.5%

See Appendix D for explanation of formula.

Table 4-5: Projected Annual Maintenance Expenditures for Top 20 Resources

Resource Name	Annual Maintenance
Woodlawn (all structures)	\$29,851
Oakley Cabin	\$3,141
Oliver Watkins House and Barn (all structures)	\$15,605
Bussard Farm (all structures)	\$18,763
Seneca Stone Barn and House (Foundation)	\$3,094
Holland Store (Red Door Store)	\$7,875
Jesup Blair House	\$18,954
Waters House and Barn (all structures)	\$27,518
Joseph White House	\$9,450
Darby House and Store (all structures)	\$19,730
“Uncle Tom’s Cabin”	\$15,000
James King Barn	\$6,064
Boyd-Maughlin House	\$13,500
Brainard Warner Property	\$90,000
Meadowbrook Stables (Rock Creek Stables) (all structures)	\$11,835
Seneca Store (Poole Store)/Upton Darby House	\$32,907
Hyattstown Mill and House (all structures)	\$26,091
Robert B. Morse Filtration Plant	\$13,838
Kensington Cabin	\$2,250
Bureau of Animal Industry	\$9,792
TOTAL ANNUAL MAINTENANCE – TOP 20 RESOURCES	\$375,258

Table 4-6: Projected Annual Maintenance Expenditures for Additional Cultural Resources

Resource Name	Cost (all structures)
Brewer Farm	\$7,763
Cabin John Hotel Gas House	\$563
Ch. Browning Farm	\$11,813
Greenwood Miller's Cottage	\$4,875
Kingsley School	\$2,400
McCrillis House	\$15,750
Meadowbrook Recreation Center	\$9,000
Ned Watkins Farm	\$10,688
Needwood	\$20,271
Norbeck School	\$8,208
Perry Browning Farm	\$3,859
Pope Farm/Cooke's Range	\$5,117
Pumphrey's Stables	\$2,138
Spencer (Oursler) Farm	\$10,358
Stubbs House	\$9,271
Valley Mill House	\$3,078
Wheaton Farmhouses (Magruder/Nairn)	\$5,400
Z.N. Jones House	\$3,375
Zeigler Farm	\$12,387
Total (all major structures beyond the Top 20)	\$146,314

4.5 PROGRAMMING

Programming is a multi-layered process that involves determining a specific use for a resource, creating a detailed plan that would put that use into action, developing the architectural and engineering (A/E) program via plans and specifications so that the proposal can be implemented, and having the necessary dollars allocated to undertake all of these interrelated steps.

This plan has made a number of strides in the programming effort. It has: a) assigned every resource a Long-Term Use Goal, b) assigned every resource a Heritage Theme, and c) assigned every resource a future building code identifier as a starting point for planning. The Plan admittedly stops short of detailing the full extent of operational costs associated with a program and of assigning architectural/engineering costs associated with activating each and every building. These cost estimates require an extensive analysis and are not appropriate for a strategic plan. They will be done through individual feasibility studies/Historic Structure Reports.

The five programming goals outlined below will make it easier in the future, however, to activate historic properties and result in more efficient spending.

4.5.1 Convey the idea of the cultural and economic values associated with park resources.

Park Managers should be provided with historical research on their properties as well as the names of persons at Historic Preservation to contact when programming issues affecting historic resources arise.

4.5.2 Spearhead or coordinate activity/use programming for cultural resources.

The Historic Preservation Section should lead or work closely with other involved divisions to generate Feasibility Studies, Requests for Proposals, and selection of occupants.

4.5.3 Increase interpretive programming staffing.

Architectural historians, historians, archaeologists, museum managers, folklorists, and event planners are just some of the types of qualified personnel who should eventually have paid positions in the Department to facilitate activity programming, interpretation, and outreach at park cultural resources.

4.5.4 Pre-qualify or add architectural and engineering experts

Take steps to make it easier to generate Requests for Proposals and conceptual drawings for the actual architectural and engineering programming work necessary to restore/rehabilitate cultural resources. Either add in-house staff well versed in historical buildings (these would be historical architects) or pre-qualify a select group of architects to take this work on as consultants. Streamline the bidding process and re-evaluate the low-bid selection criteria.

4.5.5 Implement an expanded historic marker program throughout the parks.

Now that the bronze marker program for roadsides is almost complete, the Department should use the CIP funds allocated for markers to create laminated, fiberglass pictorial markers for trailheads and trails in the parks. In FY06, \$18,472 is available for this program and a strategy for these markers has already been developed.