

CITY OF ELLIOT LAKE



Ad hoc Community Hub Committee AGENDA

Tuesday, May 7, 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. April 17, 2019

5. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

6.1. Review of Functional Spaces and Footprint

6.2. Update Costing

6.3. Comparison of pre-engineered vs. conventional build

6.3.1. Discussion with representative from Sprung Inc

7. NEW BUSINESS

7.1. Report from CAO re: Interim Budget for Community Hub Planning Services – *to be distributed Monday May 6*

8. CLOSED SESSION BUSINESS

9. PUBLIC QUESTION PERIOD

10. NOTICE OF MOTION

11. OTHER BUSINESS

12. ADDENDUM

13. CLOSED SESSION BUSINESS

14. ADJOURNMENT

CITY OF ELLIOT LAKE



Ad hoc Community Hub Committee

Minutes of the Meeting held

Wednesday, April 17, 2019

1:00 pm

CITY HALL

Committee Room

Members Present

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

Staff Present

D. Gagnon, CAO
T. Dunlop, Director of Recreation and Culture
D. Brandow, Secretary Recreation and Culture Dept.
B. Lackie, Secretary

Present

Councillor L. Cyr

6 members of the Public: Chris Margetts, Bob Blewett, Fran Perkins,
Mary Caverley, Keith Moyer, Michael Thomas

1 member of the media: Brent Sleightholme

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by the Mayor at 1:00 PM.

2. ROLL CALL

All present.

3. DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None.

4. ADOPTION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

Moved by: Ed Pearce

Seconded by: Tom Turner

Resolution 03/19

"To approved the minutes of the March 6th Ad hoc Community Hub Committee."

Carried

5. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

None.

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

7. NEW BUSINESS

7.1. Review of Functional Spaces and Footprint

In light of the meeting with the Minister of Infrastructure on April 8, 2019, the costs of the facility must be paired down. Discussion in regards to what spaces are needed and how the footprint can be reduced to still accommodate the community's needs.

Moved by: Ed Pearce

Seconded by: Tom Turner

Resolution 04/19

"That the proposed Multi-Use facility / Community Hub contain recreation and social spaces only and that the theatre and arts component be under their own separate roof at a space yet to be determined. "

Carried

Moved by: Tom Turner

Seconded by: Ed Pearce

Resolution 05/19

"To defer square footage numbers of Functional Spaces and Footprint until the next meeting of the Ad hoc Community Hub Committee. "

Carried

7.2 Update Costing

Discussion in regards to the guidelines set out by the Ministry of Infrastructure at the meeting with the Mayor, Councillor Turner and the CAO of April 8, 2019. Costs will decrease if the footprint of the building is reduced. It will also decrease depending on the type of construction undertaken. The CAO will be meeting in the future with representatives of the Ministry of Infrastructure to review the timeframes and requirements for the City to submit a request for funding.

Ensure that the arena chillers and the newer new heat exchangers in the pool can be moved and used in the new facility.

7.3. Comparison of Pre-Engineered vs. Conventional Build

Discussion as to what type of construction should be used. The pros and cons were reviewed. The committee will invite a representative of Sprung to the next meeting to answer questions, including ongoing maintenance costs with a pre-engineered build.

7.4. Site Recommendation

Moved by: Tom Turner

Seconded by: Ed Pearce

Resolution 06/19

"That City Council rescind Resolution #524-17, re. Centennial Arena being the primary site for the proposed Community Hub and that Council now approve the primary location of 151 Ontario Avenue for the proposed Multi-Use facility / Community Hub."

Carried

8. PUBLIC QUESTION PERIOD

Comment: Chris Margetts advised the Swim Ontario will assist with the pool design and has ideas to help the community design the new complex.

Question: Mike Thomas asked if accessibility was considered before the footprint numbers were paired down.

Answer: Yes it is taken into account. Accessibility needs are standard for all new builds.

9. CLOSED SESSION

None

10. NOTICE OF MOTION

None

11. OTHER BUSINESS

Moved by: Tom Turner

Seconded by: Ed Pearce

Resolution 07/19

"To suspend the City of Elliot Lake Procedural By-Law."

Carried

Moved by: Tom Turner

Seconded by: Ed Pearce

Resolution 08/19

"To nominate Mayor Marchisella as the Chair of the Ad hoc Community Hub Committee."

Carried

12.ADDENDUM

13.ADJOURNMENT

Res#: 02/19

Moved By: E. Pearce

Seconded By: T. Turner

Resolution 09/19

That the meeting be adjourned at the hour of 2:14 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
total:	88,265		\$24,536,525
site prep			\$1,500,000
construction sub-total:			\$26,036,525
NET HST on construction (1.76%)			\$458,243
construction grand total:			\$26,494,768
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
subtotal softcosts:	9.5%		\$2,592,003
NET HST on softcosts (1.76%)			\$45,619
grand total softcosts:			\$29,132,390
Post Contract Contingencies	23%		\$6,700,450
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
GRAND TOTAL:			\$35,832,840

Functional Program Requirements	Area (ft2)	Area (m2)
Arena Function		
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
Arena Function - Total Program Area (Net Area)	28,705	9,999
Net to Gross Ratio	1.3	1.3
Arena Function - Total Building Area	37,317	12,999
Aquatic Centre		
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
Aquatic Centre - Total Program Area (Net Area)	16,650	6,187
Net to Gross Ratio	1.3	1.3

Functional Program Requirements		Area (ft2)	Area (m2)
Aquatic Centre			
Aquatic Centre - Total Building Area		21,645	8,044
Multipurpose / Fitness Function			
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
Multipurpose / Fitness Function - Total Program Area (Net Area)		6,855	2,089
Net to Gross Ratio		1.1	1.1
Multipurpose / Fitness Function - Total Building Area		7,541	2,298
Support Function			
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
Support Function - Total Program Area (Net Area)		3,640	1,109
Net to Gross Ratio		1.35	1.35
Support Function - Total Building Area		4,914	1,498
Gymnasium			
Gymnasium (*Double Gymnasium with Divider Curtain)		8,000	2,438
Gymnasium Equipment Storage		700	213
Bleachers		200	61
Change Rooms / Showers / Washrooms (*Change Rooms Shared with Aquatics)		0	0
Gymnasium Function - Total Program Area (Net Area)		8,900	2,713
Net to Gross Ratio		1.3	1.3
Gymnasium Function - Total Building Area		11,570	3,527
Curling Rink			
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	
Curling Rink - Total Program Area (Net Area)		15,800	4,816
Net to Gross Ratio		1.3	1.3
Curling Rink - Total Building Area		20,540	6,261

Functional Program Requirements		Area (ft2)	Area (m2)
Arts Centre			
	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
	Arts Centre - Total Building Area	23,075	7,033

Public Shared Functions			
	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
	Public Shared - Total Building Area	9,685	2,952

Functional Description Gross Floor Areas		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
	Total Program Area (Gross Floor Area)	136,287	41,540

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
total:	118,044		\$34,455,025

Civic Center

site prep		\$1,500,000
construction total:		\$35,955,025
NET HST on construction		\$632,808
construction grand total:		\$36,587,833

Prof - Engineered
= 25% cost
reduction

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
subtotal softcosts:	9.5%	\$3,550,844
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



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



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

Pre Engineered	Conventional
Pro(s)	Pro(s)
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	
Con(s)	Con(s)
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