

# ***CITY OF ELLIOT LAKE***



## **Ad hoc Community Hub Committee AGENDA**

Wednesday March 17, 2019  
1:00 PM  
Committee Room

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. ROLL CALL**
- 3. DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST**
- 4. ADOPTION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES**
  - 4.1. March 6, 2019
- 5. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS**
- 6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**
- 7. NEW BUSINESS**
  - 7.1. Review of Functional Spaces and Footprint
  - 7.2. Update Costing
  - 7.3. Comparison of pre-engineered vs. conventional build
  - 7.4. Site recommendation
- 8. CLOSED SESSION BUSINESS**
- 9. NOTICE OF MOTION**
- 10. OTHER BUSINESS**
- 11. ADDENDUM**
- 12. CLOSED SESSION BUSINESS**
- 13. ADJOURNMENT**

# ***CITY OF ELLIOT LAKE***



## **Ad hoc Community Hub Committee**

### **Minutes of the Meeting held**

Wednesday, March 6, 2019

1:00 pm

CITY HALL

Committee Room

#### **Members Present**

Mayor D. Marchisella  
Councillor T. Turner  
Councillor E. Pearce

#### **Staff Present**

D. Gagnon, CAO  
D. Halloch, Director of Public Works  
T. Dunlop, Director of Recreation and Culture  
B. Lackie, Secretary

#### **Present**

Councillor S. Finamore

#### **1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by the Mayor at 1:05 PM.

#### **2. ROLL CALL**

All present.

#### **3. DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

None.

#### **4. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS**

None.

#### **5. NEW BUSINESS**

##### **a. Updating Functional Program / Design**

**Moved by: Ed Pearce**  
**Seconded by: Tom Turner**

**Resolution 01/19**

"That the addition of the arts and culture spaces that were in the Lester B. Pearson Civic Centre be added to the footprint of the Elliot Lake Community Hub plans."

**Carried**

Tom Turner will make the recommendation to Council.

**b. Water / Waste Water implications at Centennial Site**

Reviewing the drawings at the Centennial site, the Hub would run over the sewer mains. Daryl Halloch was directed to cost out moving the mains and to cost out obtaining core samples around the boundaries of the Petro Canada property.

**c. Next Steps / Time Frames**

- i. Resolution to council
- ii. Update functional program design with Colliers International and Nicholas Yallowega Belanger
- iii. Status of the Civic Centre and the arena
- iv. Updated binder
- v. Meet with the Province
- vi. CAO to notify user groups of the status of the project and time frame for consultation with the groups

Next meeting a committee chair will need to be chosen.

**6. PUBLIC QUESTION PERIOD**

Mike Thomas recommended to call the fitness space a Wellness Centre. Suggest to put in a physio facility which will bring in revenue.

**7. CLOSED SESSION**

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

**Res#: 02/19**

Moved By: E. Pearce

Seconded By: T. Turner

That the meeting be adjourned at the hour of 2:25 PM

**Carried**

## Class D Capital Cost Estimates

Apr-19

function	sq ft	cost / ft	amount
arena	31,641	\$275	\$8,701,275
pool	12,000	\$385	\$4,620,000
curling	12,400	\$250	\$3,100,000
multi-purpose / fitness	5,000	\$250	\$1,250,000
gymnasium	10,625	\$210	\$2,231,250
public / shared / washrooms	9,685	\$300	\$2,905,500
office / support	6,914	\$250	\$1,728,500
theatre	0	\$400	\$0
museum	0	\$300	\$0
art studio space	0	\$300	\$0
<b>total:</b>	<b>88,265</b>		<b>\$24,536,525</b>
site prep			\$1,500,000
<b>construction sub-total:</b>			<b>\$26,036,525</b>
NET HST on construction (1.76%)			\$458,243
<b>construction grand total:</b>			<b>\$26,494,768</b>
professional / design fees	4.0%		\$1,059,791
disbursements	0.5%		\$132,474
other consultants	1.5%		\$397,422
project mgmt	2.0%		\$529,895
permits / dev charges	n/a		\$75,000
misc, commissioning, move-in etc	1.5%		\$397,422
<b>subtotal softcosts:</b>	<b>9.5%</b>		<b>\$2,592,003</b>
NET HST on softcosts (1.76%)			\$45,619
<b>grand total softcosts:</b>			<b>\$29,132,390</b>
<b>Post Contract Contingencies</b>	<b>23%</b>		<b>\$6,700,450</b>
change orders	3.0%		\$873,972
escalation to tender (1 year)	5.0%		\$1,456,620
location factor	7.0%		\$2,039,267
project scope contingency	8.0%		\$2,330,591
<b>GRAND TOTAL:</b>			<b>\$35,832,840</b>

Functional Program Requirements	Area (ft2)	Area (m2)
<b>Arena Function</b>		
NHL Ice Pad (85 x 200)	17,000	5,182
Players bench, penalty box, timer booth	500	152
Junior A Home Team Change Room / Quiet Room / Coach Room / Laundry / Storage / Team Entrance Vestibule	900	1,524
Junior A Visiting Team Change Room	600	183
Adjoining Change Room / Washrooms / Shower Facilities (4)	2,000	610
Family Washroom	120	37
Housekeeping	110	34
Equipment Storage	650	198
Music Room / Broadcasting Booth	200	61
Seating (*500 - Seating on 1 Side)	4,000	1,219
Referee Rooms / Change Area (*3 People)	150	46
First Aid / Storage	125	38
Ice Resurfacer / Refrigeration / Maintenance	1,500	457
Mechanical / Electrical	500	152
Storage	350	107
<b>Arena Function - Total Program Area (Net Area)</b>	<b>28,705</b>	<b>9,999</b>
Net to Gross Ratio	1.3	1.3
<b>Arena Function - Total Building Area</b>	<b>37,317</b>	<b>12,999</b>
<b>Aquatic Centre</b>		
Training / Lap Pool (6) 25M Lanes (*Barrier Free - Adjoined to Leisure Pool)	4,100	1524
Beach Entry Leisure Pool / Children Wading Pool	1,500	457
Therapeutic Pool (*Approx. 20'x8')	350	107
Pool Deck and Seating (*Bleacher Style Seating)	4,000	1,219
Men's / Women's Change Room / Public Lockers / Staff Lockers (*Change Rooms Shared with Fitness)	2,250	1524
Family Change Room	2,000	610
Filter Room	750	229
Pool Equipment Storage	1,250	381
Shared Functions Staff Room / Kitchenette / Supervisor Office / First Aid	450	137
Licensed Viewing Area / Food Services / Seating (*Space Shared with Arena & Curling)	0	0
<b>Aquatic Centre - Total Program Area (Net Area)</b>	<b>16,650</b>	<b>6,187</b>
Net to Gross Ratio	1.3	1.3

Functional Program Requirements	Area (ft2)	Area (m2)
---------------------------------	------------	-----------

<b>Aquatic Centre</b>		
-----------------------	--	--

<b>Aquatic Centre - Total Building Area</b>	<b>21,645</b>	<b>8,044</b>
---	---------------	--------------

<b>Multipurpose / Fitness Function</b>		
--	--	--

Indoor Walking Track	2,770	844
Small Multipurpose Fitness Space	925	282
Small Multipurpose Storage Room	270	82
Multipurpose Room, Cardio & Selectorizer Equipment Room	2565	782
Consultation Office	325	99
<b>Multipurpose / Fitness Function - Total Program Area (Net Area)</b>	<b>6,855</b>	<b>2,089</b>
<b>Net to Gross Ration</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>
<b>Multipurpose / Fitness Function - Total Building Area</b>	<b>7,541</b>	<b>2,298</b>

<b>Support Function</b>		
-------------------------	--	--

Customer Service Reception / General Office	300	91
Manager's Office	120	37
Staff Washrooms (2)	120	37
Workroom / Storage	100	30
Building Services Room(s)	3000	914
<b>Support Function - Total Program Area (Net Area)</b>	<b>3,640</b>	<b>1,109</b>
<b>Net to Gross Ratio</b>	<b>1.35</b>	<b>1.35</b>
<b>Support Function - Total Building Area</b>	<b>4,914</b>	<b>1,498</b>

<b>Gymnasium</b>		
------------------	--	--

Gymnasium (*Double Gymnasium with Divider Curtain)	8,000	2,438
Gymnasium Equipment Storage	700	213
Bleachers	200	61
	0	0
<b>Change Rooms / Showers / Washrooms (*Change Rooms Shared with Aquatics)</b>		
<b>Gymnasium Function - Total Program Area (Net Area)</b>	<b>8,900</b>	<b>2,713</b>
<b>Net to Gross Ratio</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>
<b>Gymnasium Function - Total Building Area</b>	<b>11,570</b>	<b>3,527</b>

<b>Curling Rink</b>		
---------------------	--	--

Six Sheet	14,800	4,511
Allowance for Support Space and Viewing	1,000	305
Licensed Viewing Area / Food Services / Seating (*Space Shared with Arena & Aquatics)	0	
<b>Curling Rink - Total Program Area (Net Area)</b>	<b>15,800</b>	<b>4,816</b>
<b>Net to Gross Ratio</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>
<b>Curling Rink - Total Building Area</b>	<b>20,540</b>	<b>6,261</b>

Functional Program Requirements		Area (ft2)	Area (m2)
<b>Arts Centre</b>			
	360 Seat Theatre	6,000	1,829
	Back of House (Equipment, Storage & Dressing Rooms)	2,000	610
	Community Artist Studio Space	2,500	762
	Museum and Archival Working Space	5,000	1,524
	Lobby	1,500	457
	Washrooms	750	229
	Arts Centre - Total Program Area (Net Area)	17,750	5,410
	Net to Gross Ratio	1.3	1.3
	<b>Arts Centre - Total Building Area</b>	<b>23,075</b>	<b>7,033</b>
<b>Public Shared Functions</b>			
	Licensed Viewing Area / Food Services / Seating (*Level 2)	2100	640
	Housekeeping	100	30
	Lobby Public Washrooms	400	122
	Customer Service Reception	300	91
	Lobby / Café / Concession Area / Seating / Storage (*Level 1)	4,550	1,387
	Public Shared - Total Program Area (Net Area)	7,450	2,271
	Net to Gross Ratio	1.3	1.3
	<b>Public Shared - Total Building Area</b>	<b>9,685</b>	<b>2,952</b>
<b>Functional Description Gross Floor Areas</b>			
		Area (ft2)	Area (m2)
	Arena Function	37,317	11,374
	Aquatic Centre	21,645	6,597
	Multipurpose / Fitness Function	7,541	2,298
	Support Function	4,914	1,498
	Gymnasium Function	11,570	3,527
	Curling Rink	20,540	6,261
	Arts Centre	23,075	7,033
	Public Shared Functions	9,685	2,952
	<b>Total Program Area (Gross Floor Area)</b>	<b>136,287</b>	<b>41,540</b>

## Class D Capital Cost Estimates

function	sq ft	cost / ft	amount
arena	31,641	\$275	\$8,701,275
pool	16,000	\$385	\$6,160,000
curling	14,563	\$250	\$3,640,750
multi-purpose / fitness	7,541	\$250	\$1,885,250
gymnasium	10,625	\$210	\$2,231,250
public / shared	9,685	\$300	\$2,905,500
office / support	4,914	\$250	\$1,228,500
theatre	7,800	\$400	\$3,120,000
museum	7,500	\$300	\$2,250,000
art studio space	7,775	\$300	\$2,332,500
<b>total:</b>	<b>118,044</b>		<b>\$34,455,025</b>

site prep \$1,500,000

**construction total:** \$35,955,025

NET HST on construction \$632,808

**construction grand total:** \$36,587,833

professional / design fees	4.0%	\$1,463,513
disbursements	0.5%	\$182,939
other consultants	1.5%	\$548,818
project mgmt	2.0%	\$731,757
permits / dev charges	n/a	\$75,000
misc, commissioning etc	1.5%	\$548,818
<b>subtotal softcosts:</b>	<b>9.5%</b>	<b>\$3,550,844</b>
NET HST on softcosts		\$62,495

**sub-total:** \$40,201,172

**Post Contract Contingencies 23% \$9,246,270**

change orders	3.0%
escalation to tender	5.0%
location factor	7.0%
project scope contingency	8.0%

**GRAND TOTAL:** \$49,447,442

*Civic Center*

*Pre-Engineered  
= 25% cost  
reduction*





## MEMORANDUM

To: Dan Marchisella, Mayor  
From: Michael Paul, P.Eng., PMP, LEED AP, PMI-RMP  
Project: City of Elliot Lake - Multi-Use Complex  
Subject: Memo – Operational Costs

Doc Ref: Doc. 820612-0074(1.0)  
Date: November 27, 2017

Dear Mr. Marchisella,

Please see the below opinion based on our experience in terms of operational cost savings for a new facility vs old for the new Multi Use Complex in Elliott Lake.

Ice and aquatic facilities are the most expensive recreation facilities to operate and maintain. In general, for every dollar spent towards the operation of these facilities, about 55 cents is collected as revenue and 45 cents is carried as a deficit. Studies related to comparison between operating expenses of existing facilities to new, are never straightforward and can be complicated, and for the same reason there are very few published studies available that we can refer to make a direct informed assessment. This is probably because in most cases old facilities are standalone buildings housing just an arena or a pool, where as their replacements are often consolidated facilities housing hockey rinks, curling rinks, pools, fitness centres etc. under one roof. It is a generally acknowledged fact (for the lack of any comprehensive study) that consolidated facilities are much more efficient to operate as they benefit from economies of scale, be it labour, energy or repair and maintenance costs. The biggest cost component in any recreation facility is the wages paid to staff who operate the facility. Staff costs will average about 50% of the total yearly expenses for a recreation facility. It has also been observed that this component does not often change significantly. Many facilities have worked around this by not hiring replacements for staff that retire and by using more volunteers from the community.

It is logical to argue that new facilities can achieve significant savings in heating and cooling costs as a direct benefit of using new building exterior envelop systems that have a 10% to 15% higher efficiency in comparison to older systems, and new efficient HVAC systems available these days. The other advantage of a consolidated new facility is in the potential savings from fewer capital upgrade requirements. A simple comparison would be the periodic upgrades to the exterior envelopes and MEP systems of multiple standalone (old) recreational facilities versus the potential upgrades required for a single facility towards the end of a 25 year period from now. These two cost components and the fact that repair and maintenance costs would be very minimal in the first ten years when compared with the existing facilities' current costs, would translate to savings to the order of \$65K to \$70K per annum in a new facility. That said, it is also true that the recovery ratio (ratio of revenue to operating expense) of a new consolidated facility would be very similar to that of an existing standalone facility. This can be attributed to the subsidized operating business model that most facilities follow. In any real estate investment there is a limit to how much the operating costs can be contained through efficient management of operations. The only means of covering/balancing operating expenses is generating additional revenue. Even though it may not be feasible for a public facility to increase the fee they charge their patrons, they can certainly explore ways to increase the average annual utilization of spaces. These facilities should try to generate annuity revenues through long term rental agreements with (local or out of

City of Elliot Lake - Multi-Use Complex  
Memo – Operational Costs  
Doc. 820612-0074(1.0)



Colliers  
Project Leaders

town) sports clubs or educational institutions for hosting sporting events or year round training engagements.

Please note that we are in the process of conducting a comparative study of operating costs of a couple of similar recreational facilities that we built for our clients in the past. Closest one that can be used as a reference for this project would be the Edwardsburgh/Cardinal Arena. We hope to provide you with some valuable insights on operating cost savings and efficiencies achieved by the new facility in comparison to its older counterpart.

In summary, the operational savings of a new recreation complex vs your existing facility is anticipated to be about \$70,000 per year. The other factor is you are increasing the level of service and as such are providing more value and more options for the community at the same or slightly lower costs.

Regards,

Michael Paul, P.Eng., PMP, LEED AP, PMI-RMP

Principal

[michael.paul@colliersprojectleaders.com](mailto:michael.paul@colliersprojectleaders.com)



## MEMORANDUM

To:	Dan Marchisella, Mayor	Doc Ref:	Doc. 820612-0073(1.0)
From:	Michael Paul, P.Eng., PMP, LEED AP, PMI-RMP	Date:	November 23, 2017
Project:	City of Elliot Lake - Multi-Use Complex		
Subject:	Memo – Pre Engineered vs. Conventional Steel Frame Construction		

---

Dear Mr. Marchisella,

Please see the below opinion based on our experience in terms of proceeding with pre-engineered or conventional construction for the new Multi Use Complex in Elliott Lake.

Conventional construction involves on site construction/coordination for all aspects of the build, involving more design, coordination and in turn more room for errors. Pre Engineered build involve pre-fabricated steel elements made off site in a controlled environment and delivered to site ready to be placed and connected with minimal coordination and adjustments. Both options essentially require the same building materials however they have different processes as well as their own pros and cons. See below for a more in depth review of the two options.

### **Pre Engineered Construction (Steel Frame Construction)**

Pre Engineered builds can minimize or eliminate the involvement of an Architect and/or Engineer, as they can easy and quickly select a pre-engineered structure which has already been designed by the fabricators. These buildings drive the design by setting the building shape and size right away. This would help set the foundation, interiors and exterior materials to suit the selected pre-engineered building due to the standardized steel sections and connections, simplifying erection and accelerating construction completion. With this streamlined approach, the build would be more efficient and deliver a more controlled building, as well as reducing errors and related costs. Overall this option would speed up project timelines and creates less waste (material and labour costs), although the designer would not have as much flexibility as conventional construction. Pre-engineered builds are ideal for commercial and industrial construction projects such as gas stations, box stores, offices and recreational facilities.

### **Conventional Construction (Steel Frame Construction)**

Convention construction approaches construction in a step by step method, which includes multiple trades and coordination requirements. For example, the excavation and foundation are construction before the framing from the design documents, and then the steel fabrication would involve site measurements, shop drawing reviews and fabrication of the steel components to meet the design intent. The Architect/Engineer design done from scratch will standardize sections as much as possible however the building size and shape is less set and can inadvertently create "one off" connections and structural members that will lead to more time and costs required to complete the work. The timelines to design, measure, approve and fabricate alone will create a significant delay for other trades to coordinate their work, and in turn slow down the ordering of materials and construction of their respective tasks. This type of construction is ideal for complex designs. Complex designs come with higher costs, more coordination (i.e. more potential for errors) and longer completion timelines.



### Summary of Pre Engineered vs. Conventional Steel Frame Construction

<b>Pre Engineered</b>	<b>Conventional</b>
<b>Pro(s)</b>	<b>Pro(s)</b>
Less Quality Control required	Complex/Creative Designs, more flexibility
Less Cost (Labour)	
Shorter Construction Timelines (easier to fabricate and deliver/construct)	
Pre Engineered Selection drives the other design elements	
<b>Con(s)</b>	<b>Con(s)</b>
Simple Designs, not as flexible.	Coordination Mistakes (More QC required)
	More Costs (Labour)
	Longer Construction Timeline (longer deliveries and construction)
	Complex/Creative Designs come with more complex detailing and construction methods

In summary, a pre-engineered building would be ideal for the multi-use complex, and a more conventional approach could be used for the lobby or other areas of the facility to add its own aesthetic appeal for the City of Elliott Lake and its future multi use complex users.

Regards,

Michael Paul, P.Eng., PMP, LEED AP, PMI-RMP

Principal

[michael.paul@colliersprojectleaders.com](mailto:michael.paul@colliersprojectleaders.com)