



509 North Main  
Maryville, MO  
64468-1610  
Phone: (660) 582.5281  
Fax: (660) 582.2411

## 2021 Request for Proposals for the Selective Cleaning and Repointing of the Library's Limestone Exterior

July 8, 2021

### Director's recommended action:

After reviewing proposals from all four bidders and speaking with available references regarding the quality of their work, and their ability to stay on deadline and within budget, the following recommendation is submitted for the board's consideration:

**Option A:** The offer of a contract to Mid-Continental Restoration Co., Inc. in the amount of 74,010 (Base bid \$42,044 with add-on options 2 (Replacement of t-cap on skyward facing joints for \$18,776 and 4 (recaulking of stair joints on west and south entryways for \$13,190), PLUS an allowance of up to \$14,000 for additional work approved by the MPL Board President (i.e. rebuilding of ground level south stair buttresses) for a total cost of up to \$88,010.

*Given the information provided, I have reservations about recommending the Option 3 addition of Prosoco water repellent. As stated in Section 1 of the Preservation Briefs published by the National Park Service, water repellent treatment on historic masonry carries its own irreversible risk, is usually unnecessary, and requires reapplication every 7-10 years. According to the Briefs, regular masonry repointing, and maintenance of adjacent roofing, drainage, and caulking are generally better investments toward long-term preservation.*

**Option B:** The offer of a contract to MTS Contracting, Inc. in the amount of \$85,700 (Base bid \$71,800 with add-on option of \$13,900 for the rebuilding of ground level south stair buttresses)

### Additional considerations:

**Observations during bidding process:** Dennis Buckles of Quality Restoration & Sealants and Clint Carpenter from Mid-Continental were especially helpful when answering my questions. MTS Contracting was also responsive. Staat Tuckpointing was much less responsive and after two tries, I failed to get an adequate description of the scope of work included in their bid price.

**Budget considerations:** If our goal is to maintain at least 30% in unrestricted reserves, and if our current budget estimates are correct (which include spending \$20,000 toward this project this year), we can spend up to \$53,000 in reserves in FY2022 toward additional building maintenance projects. However, we are still

facing large projects such as the replacement of all original windows and door frames, as well as the replacement of the roof on the 2000/01 addition.

**Feedback from references:** The most effusively positive references were from two who had worked with Mid-Continental Restoration on newer buildings. I didn't hear back from their third contact, nor the building supervisor at Union Station in KC, where Mid-Continental had done extensive work in 2017. Mid-Continental has also done work on the Nodaway County Courthouse in recent years. MTS had two very positive references. They were also just hired by City of Maryville to do work on City Hall. Staat Tuckpointing had positive references—two from owners of buildings more than 100 years old that could attest to their technical proficiency. However one respondent noted that he'd recommend a very specific contract to avoid "project drift". It's also notable that all references for Staat were from the St. Louis area. Regarding references for Quality Restoration & Sealants, Update: [I was able to confirm that they did complete work to satisfaction at B.D. Owens library on limestone constructed around 1981.](#)

**Technical considerations:** MTS and Mid-Continental differ in the type of mortar they recommend for tuckpointing. MTS proposes a softer "Type O" mortar to allow for flexibility and avoid future cracking, while Mid-Continental advises a stronger "Type N" mortar that can withstand more load (750 ppsi vs. 350 ppsi of Type O). Both types are frequently used. The two other bidders did not specify the type of mortar to be used. *Update: Scott Kuhlemeyer, AIA, Director of Capital Programs at NWMSU, advised that Type O mortar was likely used at the time of the library's construction. He added, "While Type O is softer, that does not mean lower quality. We want to avoid a mortar that is harder than the masonry/stone, as the wrong mortar could lead to issues with the masonry units. Frequently historic brick masonry will want to be pointed with Type O, but limestone has a higher compressive strength than brick. I have found many of today's masons tend to want to use Type N for everything, but not all can tell you when Type O should be used instead. Depending on your conditions, either one of them could be compatible."*

**Legal considerations:** Both MTS and Mid-Continental offered contract agreements to sign within their bid, neither of which offer adequate protection for the library. The MTS contract is especially unbalanced. I recommend offering the winning bidder a contract written up by the library that incorporates protections for both parties. (See attached example)

**Prevailing Wage:** I recently learned that tuckpointing is considered by the Missouri Department of Labor to be a "major repair" (as opposed to maintenance), and therefore subject to Prevailing Wage if the cost of work meets or exceeds \$75,000. Both MTS and Mid-Continental have verified their bids accommodate Prevailing Wage as defined in the applicable Wage Order published by MoDOL.

Presented by Stephanie Patterson, MPL Director