

which has already been water-blasted and is on the ground. The GLE consultant said this particular lead-based paint is of low content and probably would not pose a problem, but still needs to be tested to confirm that. The solution is to till it several feet into the ground so it would not be injurious to anyone who happens to come in contact with or ingest some topsoil. Lang Environmental will address the rest of the removal from the bricks and the rest of the building. It will all have to be tested and removed according to OSHA standards. There is a report on this at City Hall.

Change Request No. 4 – Mr. Taylor said they need to remove 12 courses of brick in the center wall that impedes the reinforced concrete beam going across the building. They can save most of this brick and re-use it. This amounts to \$372.10.

Change Request No. 5 – Mr. Taylor said during demolition they discovered that door no. 1 was actually a double door that had been blocked up to make it a single door. They would like to install a double door as it originally existed, instead of a single door as called for. This amounts to \$2,627.00. Mr. Bush said this is one of the items that can be deleted and done when additional monies are collected through contributions. Mr. Taylor said they would like to go ahead and do this now. If they install a double door later, it will cost more money than it would to go ahead and do it now.

Change Request No. 6 – Mr. Taylor said this is to provide for electrical conduit to install security lighting, which will be secured through FP&L. This amounts to \$276.60.

Change Request No. 7 – Mr. Taylor said they originally estimated the roof pitch to be around 8.5/12. When the contractor started construction they realized it was 11/12. They want to increase the pitch to its original configuration. The tie beam needs to be raised 8 or 9 inches. This revision will increase the cost by \$5,716.03. It will be much more aesthetically pleasing, as well as historically and technically authentic.

Change Request No. 8 & 9 – Mr. Taylor said they found significant cracks in the concrete floor which has caused a 31” deep cavity under the floor. They removed a portion of the steel reinforced concrete slab and need to replace it. This comes to \$378.50 & 61.00 respectively. They have several options to fill the hole, but are considering putting a trap and grade over it to leave a natural channel.

Change Request No. 10 – Mr. Taylor said this adds back in the HVAC system, which was deleted from the original plans as the grant would not cover it. Due to Mr. Frizzel’s solicitation efforts, they can now add this back in. This will cost \$19,879.00

Change Request No. 11 – Mr. Taylor said this addresses the walls, which are quite flimsy. The mortar has almost turned to sand. They have devised a method of putting rods into the walls at 32” on center, and epoxying between the joints so they won’t be seen after the repointing. When the pins are in place, the walls will work together to create a stiffer “beam”. If they don’t do this, the building won’t have much stiffness. This will cost \$6,424.70.

Mr. Taylor said there is one other significant item that is not included on this list. When the old plaster is removed from inside the walls, there is no provision to put anything back on the walls. They have two proposals to further enhance the stiffness of the walls. One is a material that has been on the market for several years called “surewall”. You trowel it on and it bonds to the skin. It is a thin material and fiberglass reinforced. It has some plaster characteristics to it. The original plaster was added sometime during the 30’s or 40’s. They would like to see the plaster restored. Stability is a factor. If they use the pins going through the walls, they can use a washer and nut to pull the metal lathe through the masonry, and it will enhance the stability of the wall. That will cost around \$14,000. This is a parallel issue, and if the plastering is done in sequence with the construction, they will get the benefit of the stability, also. If they have to come back and do this later, they will not get the same benefit. Mr. Bush said they are going to put in a subsequent application to get more money for this project. Mr. Taylor said they could stick the bolts through now, and at a later time take them off and do the plastering. Mr. Bush said his memo shows deleting Change Order Nos. 2 & 5, which still leaves around

\$4,500 the City will have to pay from contingency. Even though that is not much, they had not anticipated it. They would be talking about adding this \$14,000 to that.

Mr. Taylor said the electrical was designed to reflect the way it was originally. The electrical conduit will be attached to the face of the wall. They will conceal it where they can. If this plastering is done out of sequence, there will need to be some repair work done. The walls are solid, so any wiring and lines will have to be run on the visible sides of the walls.

Mr. Bush said his intention was to ask the Commission to approve the change orders, less nos. 2 & 5, and approve \$4,500 in contingency funds to carry the project through. He will have to bring the \$14,000 for the plastering back at a later date. Mr. Frizzel has been very successful in raising funds for this project. They may be able to recover some of the contingency back from those funds, and they may not. Commissioner Brown moved to approve Old Water Works Restoration Project Change Order nos. 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 & 11. Commissioner Edwards seconded the motion. Mr. Bush said he will bring Change Order Nos. 2, 5 & the plastering back at a later date when there is more money available. Commissioner Norwood said he would like to have a memorandum on how much is being spent from contingency when he has those figures. There being no further discussion, the motion passed unopposed.

Mr. Taylor then took the Commission on a tour of the facility. He showed them the door referred to in Change Order No. 5. He said the door package has not come in yet, but it should have been here by now. Mr. Bush said if money comes available before the installation, they can take this item back up.

Mr. Taylor showed them the washout underneath the building caused by water running through the cracks in the slab. He showed them a retaining wall between the building and street, which they were going to remove, but discovered it is probably a necessary wall. They would like to remove a portion of it still if more money comes available. They looked at the plaque, which dedicated the building in 1886. Mr. Bush said the building was decommissioned in 1986; it was in use for 100 years. Mr. Taylor said the plaque is cast stone, not cast iron as they suspected. They are going to restore it so the patch will not be visible. They looked at the sidewalks that were to be removed and replaced with wheelchair accessible ramps as noted in Change Order No. 2.

Mr. Bush said the City has obtained a supplemental grant from SJRWMD, which will address the restoration of the ponds.

Mr. Taylor said the old windows will be restored. Fortunately, the old windowsills are still in place. Where the newer brick has been added, the mismatched brick will be removed and replaced with matching brick. The building has been altered somewhat and added on to. They looked at an artesian well, which they would like to preserve. Mr. Bush said they have a committee that is making recommendations on aquatic plants and the like. They will probably remove all the tanks, as they have no historic value. They discussed adding picnic tables and an overlook area.

Mayor Flagg asked if the area is secure. Mr. Davis said sometimes kids get into the area. They tear down the fence, he puts the fence back up, and they tear it back down. Commissioner Brown said the tanks are not safe.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned, moved by Commissioner Brown, seconded by Commissioner Norwood.

CITY CLERK

MAYOR