

Subject: Report on Restoration and Repair of  
St. Spyridon Cathedral Domes

Date: 3 April 1994

From: Dome Restoration/Repair Committee

To: St. Spyridon Cathedral General Assembly

The committee is comprised of:

George Fotiades

Charles Fotos

Anthony Matulaitis

Donald Theoharides

The objectives of this committee which is a sub-committee of the House Committee are as follows:

- A. Insure the best quality restoration possible in order to alleviate any further expenditures
- B. Select the best material as to warranties (minimum of 10 year manufacturers warranty) and contracting to approved applicator for enforcement of warranties.
- C. Maintain full accountability throughout all construction phases.

Since the Cathedral was built in 1953 the Dome(s) have been repaired/recoated in

• October 1965	\$ 2,635
• September 1976	\$ 9,016.
• August 1980	\$ 8,087.
• August 1984	\$ 13,400.
• August 1990	\$ 22,000

The existing paints on the Domes were never removed. Before recoating was applied, areas of flaking were sanded and then primer and finish coat were applied to the Domes

During late summer of 1993 an inspection of the large dome by two consultants ~~indicated~~ found that the <sup>paint was</sup> peeling off the surface <sup>off the dome</sup> in 1/2 inch thick layers. Fungus and tiny bugs were noticed ~~below the pieces~~ <sup>flaked</sup> below certain areas of ~~stained areas~~ indicating the presence of dampness between the dome's surface and the paint layers. Both consultants stated that the dome appeared to be structurally sound.

One of the consultants drew up a proposal and submitted it to the committee. Additional Requests for Proposals were sent out <sup>in October seven</sup> to ~~six~~ Structural Architectural companies in October. Three proposals were received. ~~and~~

The committee decided that each company would be invited to ~~talk to the committee~~ and to the Cathedral wherein a review of their respective proposals would be discussed. ~~Identical questions were asked of all companies.~~ Each company was asked the same questions. ~~Requests for additional information was requested~~ ~~and~~ In no case was one company treated any differently ~~from~~ from the others. On 27 January 1994 after our

3

~~Upon completion of our~~  
reviews, the Committee ~~was~~ decided to  
accept the proposal from SEA Consultants, Inc.  
of Cambridge, MA. for a cost of \$8500.00.