

Capital Planning Committee Minutes January 24, 2019

Attendees: Robyn Dunbar, Maria Hylton, Jim Henderson, Audrey Kalmus (chair), Peter Hussey, Jacqui Apsler, Jonathan Dwyer

Also attending: Barbara Myles (Lincoln Public Library); Peter Sugar, Martin Dermady (Lincoln Public Library Trustees)

Ms. Kalmus introduced the parapet repairs request. There are a number of issues that have been discovered in addition to the lollipops. The contractor's report indicates that the leak tests were done when the building was saturated making it difficult to locate leaks. The plan also indicates that the repairs may not completely resolve leaks. The scaffolding is expensive so we would like to be confident that the repair plan is adequate before we undertake it. Another issue is the stonework falling off the roof, but since netting has been installed, we can focus on the rest of the repairs and for the moment there is no safety hazard. We can focus on the bigger issue of fixing the leaking roof. The committee would like to discuss how we could develop a plan that would be guaranteed to resolve the leaking issue completely.

Mr. Sugar described that we don't know absolutely the source of the leaks causing dampness in the walls. From experience, step by step repairs are sometimes necessary to isolate the cause of the leak while reducing the problem. Any steps would improve the wall condition for the long term. Someone has suggested covering with a tarp and letting the wall dry out. The tarp couldn't be sealed effectively so this is impossible; the roof is uneven slate. A proposed alternative is to add waterproofing to wall in a stepwise process until we can resolve the leak.

We may be able to do the job from a bucket rather than scaffolding. Mr. Sugar recommends leaving that decision to contractor in the bid. The estimate that was provided was to get a global price before we gather bids.

The library can't guarantee that any waterproofing work we hire will completely resolve the issue.

Ms. Kalmus asked, if there is no through-wall flashing, is that going to be part of the repair? Mr. Dermady responded that it's not true that there is none.

The committee reviewed architectural drawings of the library building (wall sections). The wall flashing extends only 4 inches into the wall in the section over the roof; in other walls there is through-wall flashing. Water could leak around the flashing. We thought we could ask a contractor to extend the waterproofing through the wall; there are several ways to do it.

Big walls deteriorate over time. The pointing is pretty good. We could seal with silicone. That would stop any localized efflorescence and water penetration; then you would have to inspect.

In the past, The Waterproofing Company has come to inject waterproofing in some parapet cracks; it cost about \$30,000. We could remove some stones and recast them (they are manmade).

Ms. Kalmus stated that we need to come up with a plan that deals with leaking and other issues on the roof.

Mr. Henderson recommended flashing the back side of roof; Mr. Sugar agreed. The library has a roofer who inspects and repairs the roof twice per year. Snow freezes and causes problems; the design is challenged in New England weather.

Mr. Henderson asked if there is a solution that would prevent snow buildup along the parapet, such as a heating cable. Mr. Sugar responded that it wouldn't work because the water has nowhere to go. Mr. Henderson replied that he has found it to be very effective in many applications.

Mr. Henderson stated that if we don't take on all problems they will keep festering. There are architectural problems with this building.

Ms. Kalmus recapped, regarding the parapet, a new plan will need to be in place for all repairs. How much will a new plan cost? Mr. Henderson stated that we have a proposal for \$92,000. Given variabilities, once we open the roof, what is the right number for the quote? Mr. Sugar responded that we could get another consultant, and that costs even more money. Ms. Kalmus asked if we have confidence that the repair plan will largely solve the problem? Mr. Sugar guesses yes, and if not, we could see results and understand what's left.

Ms. Kalmus asked if we should consider removing the lollipops. Mr. Sugar recommended we would need to go to the historic district. We should include as an alternate in the bid to get a price for repairing the lollipops. Removing them would remove another possible point where water enters.

Ms. Kalmus asked what we need to approve to spec and bid the project? We can't approve the total amount without knowing what it is, but it's not possible to split this into pieces. There are a wide range of possible costs for the project and we need more information. Mr. Sugar responded that the report does give us a good sense, except there is an unknown amount of work that could be identified once we open the wall. We need to obligate enough money to support the repair and a contingency.

Ms. Kalmus asked about the maintenance report. The committee had a specific question: would the library prefer, instead of a single comprehensive report every 10 years, report on different systems in different years. Mr. Sugar responded that ideally one does a 10 year report so that you can prioritize. The list can be revisited periodically. A rolling report would likely cost more money in total. Mr. Henderson responded that it can be efficient to do 10-year review if we're able to work through most of the issues during the time period.

The committee discussed the \$10,000 annual contingency built into the maintenance budget request. Most contingency expenses have been for HVAC, which should be eliminated in the future when the HVAC is replaced. The Finance Committee asked the library to add the contingency funds. Another possibility is to create a separate contingency request so that we can track those funds in the event we don't need the funds for HVAC or other repairs. The library maintenance budget is detailed by line item so it will be possible to track these expenses. There are non-HVAC repairs that are unpredictable; the most recent example is need for telephone installation in the elevator.

Ms. Kalmus reported that the school maintenance budget request was reduced from \$75,000 to \$45,000.

The committee discussed the Hartwell roof. The committee believes that the roof needs to be replaced this year or next.

Mr. Henderson moved to vote. The vote was unanimous in favor of the school maintenance request, one opposed to the Hartwell roof funding.

The committee discussed the library repair. An alternative path would be to fund an inspection of the roof as part of the SGH 10-year facility review, with steps to stabilize the roof in the meantime. There were issues with the previous roof report, particularly that it was done on a wet wall.

Ms. Dunbar asked why we need to keep getting assessments and not get a contractor to start the work. Ms. Apsler responded that we want to be confident in what we do.

Ms. Apsler moved to vote on the facilities review. The committee voted unanimously in favor of \$30,000 for the review with a focus on the leak issue.

Ms. Dunbar moved to vote on library maintenance at \$50,000. The committee voted unanimously in favor.

Ms. Kalmus moved to vote on parapet repairs and first floor redesign at \$0. The committee voted unanimously in favor with one abstention.

Ms. Kalmus moved to adjourn at 8:39, unanimously approved.

Approved: August 6, 2019

