



**Central Branch Renovation Committee Minutes
Meeting 2016-24 held Friday, December 16, 2016 – 8:30 AM
Poolside Training Room – Artillery Park**

In attendance:

Library Board: Monica Stewart (Committee Chair), Ralph Gatfield, Barbara Aitken

KFPL Staff: Laura Carter (Director, Branch Experience), Patricia Enright (Chief Librarian / Chief Executive Officer; Mary Glenn (Administrative Support), Andrew Morton (Manager, Facilities – arrived at 8:55 AM), Chris Ridgley (Budget Analyst)

City of Kingston: Rob Crothers (City of Kingston – Project Manager)

Regrets: Steve Murphy (City of Kingston - Manager, Realty Construction Projects); Speros Kanellos (Director, Facility Management and Construction),

Agenda attachments:

- Financial update (including Relocation)
- Updated Schedule

1. Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved as distributed.

2. Minutes of December 2, 2016

The minutes were approved as distributed.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

3.1. Action Items (chart)

We are still waiting on the two items (4.2 Budget regarding clarification of signage and wayfinding, and confirmation of the IS& T budget estimate with Phoneworks).

3.2. Service Agreement with the City of Kingston FMCS

No action on this item.

3.3. Relocation of Operations

L. Carter reported that the move of the collection from Central to 18 St. Remy Place is about 2/3 done and she expects that the remainder of the collection and furniture will be moved

out by next week. The move is going well. She believes there will be space at St. Remy Place to store the collection for Kingscourt when it closes in the spring.

R. Crothers reported that he and A. Morton have discussed the telephones. We need to continue monitoring for security and the fire alarm, however once the contractor is on site he can make the decision to disconnect the telephones and notify the fire department provided there are no security concerns.

The elevator telephone is to stay if anyone will be using the lift. The elevator will continue to need to be maintained and inspected on a monthly basis which might not apply if the elevator is shut off. Once we have completed the move, the condition of the elevator will be inspected and photos will be taken to ensure the contractor takes responsibility for any damage or scratches.

The few remaining issues (heating in areas and lighting) at 209 Wellington Street are being resolved.

3.4. Parking

There is nothing new to report.

3.5. LEED

3.5.1. Commissioning

There is nothing new to report.

4. Updates

4.1. Communication Plan

L. Carter will be updating the website.

4.2. Project Design

With respect to the floor plans, R. Crothers reported that there has been a change in the plans in the Tech. Services area in the basement. It will be larger, insulated, and will look better with more natural light. It was discovered that there was a column in the centre of the proposed maintenance workshop so that space has been re-configured to make the maintenance space smaller, and the Tech Services that will be occupied on a daily basis, larger.

R. Crothers reported that Utilities Kingston (UK) has reported the piping outside the building is transite pipe in good condition. Pinchin has reported the downpipes are cast iron pipe. Pinchin also looked at the drywall on the third floor and because they can't unilaterally define what is in the walls, all the drywall on the third floor will be removed and replaced.

R. Crothers reported that the electrical vault that is off the parkade was also inspected by UK. It is all operable and well-ventilated but one of the linkages in the transformers can't be changed. This means we won't be able to increase the size of the service without replacing the transformer. However, because of LED lighting and the fact the building will be more energy efficient, he doesn't expect a capacity problem unless the library were to expand (i.e. add an additional floor).

Regarding the brick, at the last meeting the Committee felt that the best option for the long term would be to replace all the brick if we could obtain funding. A. Morton arrived at this time (8:55 AM).

R. Crothers reported that if we were to pursue one of the options presented at the last meeting, to replace all the brick in the section on the west side of the building, that entire section would be bumped out and would involve getting heritage approval. The brick would be different and would look different from the rest of the building.

If we replaced the brick on the entire building, everything would be bumped out; however it would require detailing changes. The stone surrounds would have to be removed and put back in and we would end up doing work that doesn't need to be done. The estimate for the consultant to provide that detailing for the entire building is \$57,000.

As reported at the last meeting, replacing the brick is necessary on the one side of the building but does not need to be replaced right away in the area near the parkade. We don't really know how long before that brick will need to be replaced, if ever. We have been getting different advice from different people. The question is – why is the deterioration different on the north wall? For one thing, there is no overhang over the main level on the end of the building where there is a lot of deterioration, which has likely contributed to the deterioration.

R. Crothers believes a better solution has come up. He suggested the Committee consider using spray foam insulation. It would increase the R value, give us more of an air vapour barrier and allow for ventilation in the walls. We would do this only where needed and patch spots around the building. We will be able to do this work in the future if it becomes necessary in other areas. If we go with this approach, we would not put stress on the budget or the contingency and we would not need to have the consultant provide detailing for the entire building.

There is also the question of the brick. It appears as though we can only save 4 of 7 bricks. One solution discussed last week was to get bricks with the same base and stain them to match. This process would come with a 25 year guarantee. We can also look at the section at the back and reclaim bricks from there. As well, the consultant is continuing to search for more types of brick and is getting closer to finding a match. This approach is reasonable depending on the price and we may not need to stain that many. R. Crothers recommended this approach.

R. Crothers confirmed that we will need to get heritage approval if we expanded the wall at the one end. He has spoken to the Heritage Planning department who might be able to approve this on a technical basis. The next deadline for a Heritage application is December 20.

Although there have been some health concerns reported with spray foam insulation R. Crothers reported that this would be outside the building and the building will be well sealed. It will likely make the building tighter than it is now. We need 3" for the foam to provide a proper air vapour so we will use blue skin in the areas where we don't have the necessary thickness. The result will be an R10 value which is an improvement over the R7 we have now. Although there is a recommendation to replace the brick on the entire building, there is no money in the budget for this. This is something the Library might want to discuss with the City in the future.

R. Crothers believes that the recommended work (use of spray foam insulation and the replacement of bricks where necessary) can be accomplished within the existing budget. The committee was in support of this option.

There was discussion on whether increasing the R value would create problems with moisture potentially coming from inside the building and whether that would cause more deterioration. R. Crothers said that it's hard to tell for certain, but by providing the required air / vapour barrier and fixing the overhang that has contributed to issues with snow and ice, that portion of the wall will be fixed.

4.3. Project Schedule

The consultant now has a date for the start of construction of March 10 which accounts for additional detailing (brick) and an additional site plan application. The Committee expressed concerns with the delay. With the decision today to eliminate the extra detailing it was hoped the date can be moved up somewhat. The schedule distributed indicates what the schedule would look like if we continue with a March 10 date for start of construction.

At this time the consultant has indicated that we will be provided with 90% drawings by next week that will also be sent off for a Class A estimate that we may expect to receive around January 9. According to the consultant's schedule, construction tenders will go out January 23. A. Morton reported that even if we receive 90% drawings next week, it would still be difficult for us to respond until after the holidays in January. It is at minimum a 10 day process to review the drawings.

Board members asked if there were any resources or outside help that could be brought in to get the review of the 90% drawings done. This is something that can be considered, however R. Crothers suggested we wait and see if the consultant can do this during that time period.

The building permit process will begin after we receive the 90% drawings next week, it should be a 2-3 week process.

4.4. Quality Control Plan

There is no change.

5. Closed meeting:

5.1. That the committee move In Camera to consider the following items involving the security of the property of the Board

It was moved by B. Aitken and seconded by R. Gatfield that:

The Committee move In Camera to consider items involving the security of the property of the Board (9:30 AM) Carried

It was moved by B. Aitken and seconded by R. Gatfield that:

The Committee rise from In Camera (9:50 AM) Carried

6. New Business / Other Business:

R. Gatfield will be away from early January to early April. Because there are only 3 board members on the Committee, a motion will go forward at the January 25 Board meeting to appoint another board member to sit on the Committee temporarily during R. Gatfield's absence. P. Enright will check the by-laws to see what is required in order to approve motions at the committee meetings until another board member is appointed.

7. Adjournment and next meeting date:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:51 AM. The next meeting will be held on Friday, January 6, 2017 at 8:30 AM – Artillery Park – Poolside Training Room.

The February 3 meeting will be rescheduled to February 10, 2017 due to a scheduling conflict.

Appendix A – Action / Follow up items

Action Items	Who	✓	Comments
4.2. Budget - will find out what is included in the signage and wayfinding budget line.	L. Carter		Waiting for response from consultant
4.2 A Morton will confirm the IS&T Budget estimate with Phoneworks.	A. Morton		Required for budget confirmation