Analysis and Recommendations: Preservation and Stabilization of Old Stoney Final Report - Executive Summary

prepared by

Old Stoney Study Committee

respectfully submitted for due consideration to

Frankfort City Council

Mayor Chris McBarnes

Frankfort Board of Works

Frankfort City Council Meeting January 26, 2015

Old Stoney Study Committee Charter

Dec. 6, 2014

Scope - What will we consider?

- Offices /occupants / users
- Space utilization current / future
- Financial sustainability support
- Reasonableness check of initial plan

Timing - When will we be done?

• January 2015

Key Deliverables

- Periodic Stakeholder Updates
- Study Committee Written Report
- Study Committee Presentation

Sponsoring Organization

• Frankfort City Council

Study Committee Members & Roles

- Eric Woods Frankfort City Council
- Tom Ransom Frankfort Board of Works
- John Reid Professional Building Preservation
- Curt Stevenson Preservation Advocate
- Tommy Kleckner Indiana Landmarks
- Rick Gunyon Study Committee Facilitator



Old Stoney Study Committee Frankfort, Indiana

Value Proposition

- Reasonableness check will help highlight any inconsistencies, errors, omissions in stabilization plan
- Provide justified recommendations that will further improve / optimize initial stabilization plan
- Provide justified recommendations that may increase potential funding opportunities
 - Grants, matching funds ...
- Represent 50-year perspective recognizing current uses will likely change over time
 - Consider financial constraints of stabilization project, current uses, the need for flexibility in the future
 - Provide structured evaluation of current space allocation utilization
 - · Identify potential improvements in space allocation utilization along with supporting rationale

Risks - Constraints - Assumptions

- Assumption 1: Having a 50-year perspective and limited total project \$\$ mandates careful tradeoffs based on community benefits and priority rankings
- Assumption 2: This stabilization effort is a "bare-bones" effort eliminating non-essential work can help reduce total cost or fund higher priority work
- Any added costs associated with recommended changes must be funded by justified reductions in project costs elsewhere (no cost increase allowed)
- Study may identify some beneficial changes that can not or will not be funded
- Some recommendations may differ from initial stabilization study, potentially causing some tension among some leaders

Notes

1. Mike Conley of Architura has offered additional study material and will avail himself for questions and further resource material at no added cost.

Rick Gunyon 6 Dec. 2014

Space Utilization

| # | Committee Recommendations | Rationale |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | Convert and update Room 106 to a more functional shared-use conference room Relocate adjacent file storage, remove partition walls to enlarge room, provide A/V capability | Optimize use of space; provide functional conference room for building occupants ¹ |
| 2 | Convert Tunnel into new common document storage area Relocates files stored by city administration into secured, space-conditioned "Tunnel Library" Exterior drainage, perimeter moisture barrier, HVAC air flow will provide good space conditions | Provide secured common storage room for occupants; free up space throughout building; eliminate today's unsafe file storage areas |
| 3 | Reorganize Building Services basement storage room to provide shared-use storage • Additional storage space as is needed by several building occupants today 1 | Organized storage will free up space in room other occupants need additional storage |
| 4 | Consolidate all materials stored by Museum on the 2nd floor Easier access to materials stored by Museum – eliminates moving materials floor-to-floor 2nd floor should provide adequate storage space for Museum needs | Museum occupies entire 2 nd floor and is largest user of space; all occupants should be treated similarly; others have need for increased storage |
| 5 | Convert large basement storage room at S.E corner of building into new leasable space Increases leasable space to improve space utilization of entire building Potentially increases lease income to help offset building operating costs Provides future opportunity to reinforce 'Old Stoney one-stop-shop' concept | Museum consolidation will free up storage space and will allow relocation of materials now stored in this room; much material in this room could be discarded; room is in tremendous disarray today |
| 6 | Continue to improve how building is organized, and how it is perceived by others Comprehensive walk-down can identify improvements in how building is perceived by others The intent Is to ensure visitors and representatives of new businesses and industries see a well-organized facility that demonstrates good government and shows pride in Old Stoney | Continuing to improve space utilization and general organization throughout the entire building is good stewardship |
| 7 | During discovery phase it was determined the Museum has not been open nearly as much as their advertised hours; it is not as accessible as is other occupants in building • As wonderful as the Museum is, many people cannot enjoy it due to limited operating hours | Currently, 2 nd floor is very underutilized because the Museum has often unavailable to the public during posted hours of operation |
| 8 | Clinton County Historical Society Inc. (who operates the Museum) appears to have a significant organizational issue relative to Indiana Department of State requirements – recommend city administration lend assistance to help them resolve this issue | Historical society is largest occupant of building but is no longer authorized to conduct business in Indiana; see http://www.in.gov/sos/business/index.htm |
| 9 | Continue to re-evaluate future "shared-use" of portions of the 2 nd floor of the building | Consistent with "having a 50-year view", future administrations and occupants may desire "shared use" |

¹ Area Plan, Building Services, Chamber of Commerce, Frankfort Main Street as well as many other organizations and volunteer groups

Analysis of Architura Report Dated August 11, 2014

| # | Architura Report | Committee Recommendations | Priority / Rationale |
|---|--|---|--|
| 1 | Jim Siegfried's original assessment indicated 5 areas need attention • roof and supporting structure • windows and exterior doors • building electrical system • HVAC system • repair interior water damage | a. Committee fully supports Jim Siegfried's list b. Recommend windows be repaired as needed, not replaced c. Exterior storm window of existing windows would lower utility costs. | Priority 1 Essential (window repairs) Priority 1 Essential, only if justified by ROI considering capital cost, maintenance cost, energy savings Rational: preservation and stabilization of Old Stoney |
| 2 | Pg. 3 "(this report) creates a preservation planidentifies repairs (and) prioritized needs to stabilize and preserve the building" | a. Preserving Old Stoney and meeting cost constraints are both essentialb. Prioritized needs to stabilize and preserve the building should be addressed before any other work is done | Priority 1 Essential Rationale: preservation and stabilization of Old Stoney |
| 3 | Pg. 4 "as well as critical elements inside the building - including emphasis in the Museum area." | a. All interior spaces are of equal importance - "emphasis in Museum area" is unjustified and should be avoided b. Museum-related expenses should not be paid by city taxpayers but by Clinton County Historical Society | Avoid Rationale: prudent use of taxpayer money; avoiding non-essential work helps reduce total costs |
| 4 | Pg. 7 Repairs to tunnel include dewatering and foundation drain to protect from leaks that occur today Estimated cost \$ 18,000. | a. Agree this work should be done, but cost estimate seems very low b. This work should be pursued if cost reasonable; if not, don't spend a ton of money on it c. RFQ should provide detailed scope and cost buildup | Priority 2 Recommended, but further cost estimates are needed Rationale: This space can provide good storage area and free up current storage space for better uses |
| 5 | Pg. 5 "Per Historical society, tunnel will be used for" (additional historical displays) | a. Recommend Tunnel be used to provide secure, common file storage for occupants of buildingb. Add lighting, air circulation and dehumidification; elevate file cabinets off floor | Avoid Rationale: Tunnel will provide functional space once it is dry, conditioned space. |

| # | Architura Report | Committee Recommendations | Priority / Rationale |
|----|---|--|--|
| 6 | (report is silent on this topic) | a. Evaluate if Tunnel can be extended in length, how much length can be added, and what the cost impact would be | Priority 3 Further Study Needed Rationale: Cost to increase Tunnel length should be established prior to letting contract for work |
| 7 | P.11 " more in-depth study of floor framing is recommended if (Museum Auditorium) is typically used for the assembly of a large number of people" | a. More in-depth structural analysis of floor framing should be conducted | Priority 2 Recommended Rationale: Auditorium is used for large group events so this analysis should be completed |
| 8 | Pg. 14 " at a minimum, fuel should be stored in fire-rated cabinet and new supplemental exhaust system installed to reduce fumes" | a. Per evaluation letter from Frankfort Fire Department, no remediation is necessary – current fuel storage meets requirements of State Fire Code | Avoid |
| 9 | Pg. 16, 17 "Pathways and entrances at the current entrances are too small to meet current building codes ADA accessibility is somewhat limited (from all exterior access points)space at the elevator is also very limited" | a. No action required | N/a Rationale: No substantiating info provided by Architura; recent ADA self-inspection by Sam Payne did not identify any issues |
| 10 | Pg. 8 "additional assistance such as wheelchair lift for (one flight of) stairs should be considered" | a. Do not pursue wheelchair lift b. Replace exterior door at elevator with 42 inch wide power operated door – this will cost substantially less than the proposed wheelchair lift and provide fully functional ADA compliant entrance/ exit c. Upgrade (1) existing North entrance door set by adding ADA motorized door operators and actuators and hand railing at steps | Avoid Rationale: Elevator can be made fully ADA compliant by installing wider exterior access door; wheelchair lift for stairs would cost estimated \$48,000 (\$38,000 for lift plus \$10,000 for new outside ramp) North Entrance will provide full ADA compliance and be near handicapped parking as required by codes |

| # | Architura Report | Committee Recommendations | Priority / Rationale |
|----|--|---|---|
| 11 | Pg. 4 "installation of old Jonson (Johnson?) Fountain located in TPA Park" | a. Locate a grant or seek donations – avoid use of taxpayer moniesb. Use city work force to the extend practical and safe | Avoid Rationale: Prudent use of taxpayer monies; avoiding non-essential work helps reduce total costs |
| 12 | Pg. 4 "The anticipated work will include the creation of a new retaining wall along (Prairie Creek)" | a. Recommend high priority on safety now (posts, guardrail, setback, pavement repairs) with future plans for wall to be integrated with open space planning b. City administration should pursue grant money to help pay for retaining wall engineering study and construction c. Plans for retaining wall and plans for open space should only be done in unison to avoid design changes and extra costs later | Priority 1 Safety Repairs Priority 3 Further Study Needed on retaining wall Rationale: Per M. Conly Dec. 23: a) "Any plan for creek walk or linear park need defined prior to further design work (on retaining wall) is started so you don't end up modifying the new wall after the fact." b) "The next step is a \$10,000 to \$20,000 engineering study - a stream bank core analysis - to determine retaining wall design details. These details will inform us as to actual design and we will then have a more accurate cost estimate." Retaining wall could be partly funded by grants, if timing allows. Plans need pre-approved by IDEM, U. S. Army Core of Engineers and County Drainage Board. Basis for \$208,000 cost estimate was cost of similar projects - the actual design has not been done so cost estimate is an approximate cost at this point. |

| # | Architura Report | Committee Recommendations | Priority / Rationale |
|----|--|--|--|
| 13 | Pg. 27 "Flat membrane roof to be repaired or replaced" Estimated cost \$ 8,000. | a. All membrane roofing should be replaced, not repaired b. This constitutes a cost increase for the project | Priority 1 Maximize life of roof |
| 14 | Pg. 27 "Sloped tile roof to be repaired / replaced" | a. Highest quality tiles from original manufacturer should be used even when they are more expensive b. Based on observation 30% of all roof tiles may need replaced, not 70% as stated in the report – this could potentially help contingency dollars available | Priority 1 Maximize life of roof |
| 15 | Pg. 10 Roof decking and supporting structure needs replaced in several locations | a. Recommend RFQ call for firm quotes based on Sq. Ft. | Priority 1 Maximize life of roof Rationale: Lock-in contractor price based on size of the job, so we don't hear "this is what it will cost ya" later |
| 16 | Pg. 10, 27 Metal flashing at all wall, roof and chimneys to be repaired or replaced; gutters and downspouts to be reconditioned, and replaced as necessary | a. Agree | Priority 1 Maximize life of roof |
| 17 | Pg. 27 "Overflow drains are to be added to supplement existing flat roof drains" | a. Based on observation, existing drains are fully adequate when properly kept clean and free of debrisb. Institute or add to written building maintenance plan and schedule | Avoid |
| 18 | Pg. 25 "Existing skylights to be repaired or replaced" | a. Remove existing skylights – no repairs would be adequate b. Install 1 new skylight of a similar design only if funding allows c. Current use of this space does not require natural light, and in fact natural light is detrimental to historic artifacts | Priority 1 Remove existing skylights Priority 3 Add 1 new only if funding allows Rationale: Maximize life of renovation; reduce future maintenance |

| # | Architura Report | Committee Recommendations | Priority / Rationale |
|----|--|---|--|
| 19 | Pg. 27flat roofs surrounding skylights should be replaced or reinforced due to water damage | a. Agree b. Recommend interior finish consist of contrasting tin ceiling to show respect to historical skylights | Priority 1 Rationale: Respect original architectural style |
| 20 | Pg. 9Sandstone masonry repairs to include very careful cleaning of all exterior masonry with repointing of mortar joints as needed | a. Tuck-pointing <u>entire</u> exterior is a high priority – important this includes integral waterproofing | Priority 1 Rationale: maximize life of renovation; provide uniform appearance |
| 21 | Pg. 12consider adding new water proofing membrane on exterior of basement walls and perimeter drain system as needed | a. Per meeting with Architura Dec. 23, perimeter drain system was not included in cost estimate | Priority 3 |
| 22 | Pg. 14 Mechanical Systems Summary List of items requiring mitigation: Replace Building Fresh Air System Replace Primary Heating Boiler Repair / upgrade flue and chimney Re-plumb water pumps Add new Building Automation System Improve ventilation in attic space Add exhaust vents to all rest rooms | a. \$392,000 cost estimate appears very low but insufficient details were provided within report to be certain b. Actual costs could potentially exceed estimates by a significant amount c. Recommend 2 smaller boilers with alternating lead/lag d. Recommend wholesale replacement or relocation of room heat exchangers should be avoided e. Avoid replumbing of water pumps to reduce vibration f. Much more details are needed in RFQ regarding scope of work and design options g. Care should be taken to select boiler manufacturer so risk of early failures is minimized (need reliability data) | Priority 1 Avoid replumbing water pumps Rationale: maximize life of renovation; minimize renovation cost Future replacement of in-room heat exchangers should be done on as-needed basis only Proposed relocation of some heat exchangers due to operating noise level does not pertain to preservation of building; if this is desired cost should be borne by occupant of that space |
| 23 | Pg. 25 Electrical Systems Summary List of items requiring mitigation: • Replace all branch panel boards, feeders, grounding, branch circuit wiring, devices, MC cable • Replace much of surface raceways • Add new GFCI in all rest rooms | a. Detailed comparison of items and estimated costs needs to be developed due to the extent of the work and associated costs, including details for each room/ space b. Additional electrical outlets need installed to serve occupants in each room | Priority 1 Renovation needs to fully comply with NEC Rationale: functionality, safety |

| # | Architura Report | Committee Recommendations | Priority / Rationale |
|----|--|---|--|
| 24 | Pg. Install new fire alarm system, including new sensors, alarms, panel, wiring | a. New integrated Life Safety Security system is recommended to provide smoke, fire and security alarming and building access | Priority 1 Rationale: functionality, safety, security |
| 25 | Pg. 17 Relocate building voice/ data panel board and wiring to climate controlled space; add cable management trays; add UPS backup system | a. Benefits do not justify added costs and complexity | Avoid |
| 26 | Replace Emergency Lighting fixtures with LED to reduce maintenance | a. Cost benefit analysis needed to justify LED fixtures b. Each emergency exit light needs to be battery backup | Priority 3 New LED Emergency Lighting - more evaluation needed Priority 1 battery backup exit lighting |
| 27 | Upgrade exterior lighting to high energy efficiency fixtures | a. Not essential to stabilization, preservation | Avoid |
| 28 | (no info provided) | a. Add CAT 6e cabling throughout building during electrical work | Priority 3 More information needs to be developed, e.g.(cost – benefit analysis Rationale: To future proof the building by providing state of the art wired connectivity; more reliable and secure than wireless |
| 29 | Pg. 18 Plumbing Systems Summaryreplace all internal domestic water pipes to fixtures (the document is silent as to renovation of restrooms) | a. The basis of the \$454K cost estimate is not clear - insufficient detail provided b. Avoid wholesale replacement of plumbing supply/ drain/ venting; replace only as needed c. Recommend upgrade of existing rest rooms in lower level so we have heated, functional his and hers public facilities; line of sight needs fixed; add ADA features to the extent practical | Avoid replacement of pipes, except on as- needed basis Priority 1 Renovate public restrooms Rationale: Public rest rooms are in need of updating; how the public experiences and views Old Stoney is a key consideration |

| # | Architura Report | Committee Recommendations | Priority / Rationale |
|----|---|--|---|
| 30 | Pg. 18 Convert hot water distribution system to recirculation design | a. Avoid recirculation designb. If delays to obtain hot water are excessive, install point- of use 'on-demand hot water heaters' | Avoid Rationale: Not cost justified; recirculation design increases utility costs |
| 31 | Renovations specific to Museum: Pg. 16 it would be an advantage to the museum curator to place 9 new receptacles in ceiling of main room Pg. 17 add LED cove lighting in museum auditorium, either monochrome or multicolor to allow curator to set automated themes switching Pg. 21 new interior UV shading for skylights (\$12,000) Pg. 21 new Museum window coverings (\$8,000) | a. Avoid – all space improvements within Museum should be paid by Clinton County Historical Society and Museum, not city taxpayers b. Note all interior water damage within nb public spaces on the 2nd floor should be repaired | Avoid Rationale: prudent use of taxpayer monies; control of overall budget |

The above information was compiled at the request of Frankfort City Council during a series of work sessions conducted between September 17, 2014 and Jan. 21, 2015 using processes described within the document <u>Guidelines for Effective Study Committees</u>, © 2013 by Rick Gunyon.

Respectfully Submitted,

Old Stoney Study Committee

- John Reid
- Curt Stevenson
- Rick Gunyon

- •Ken Estes / Tom Ransom Frankfort Board of Works
- •Eric Woods Frankfort City Council
- •Tommy Kleckner Director, Indiana Landmarks