



Minutes

Meeting: Performing Arts Centre – User Group Committee Meeting #6

Project: Performing Arts Centre Project

Place: City Hall, 3rd Floor, Committee Room 1

Date: March 24th, 2011

Time: 1:00 – 4:30 p.m.

Recorder: Kate Leathers

Meeting Attendees

Present	Mark Elliott (Chair)	City of St. Catharines	ME	melliott@stcatharines.ca
Absent	Janis Barlow	NAC Rep – (Primary) (Co-Chair)	JB	janis@barlowandassociates.com
Present	Jack Mills	Niagara Symphony Ass.	JM	jack.mills@niagarasympphony.org
Present	Jane Gardner	Carousel Players (Primary)	JG	jane@carouselplayers.com
Absent	Pablo Felices Luna	Carousel Players (Alternate)	PFL	pablo@carouselplayers.com
Present	Derek Knight	MIWSFPA (Primary)	DK	dknight@brocku.ca
Present	Brian Power	MIWSFPA (Alternate)	BP	bpower@brocku.ca
Present	David Vivian	MIWSFPA (Alternate)	DV	dvivian@brocku.ca
Present	Debbie Slade	Director, Brock CFA	DS	dslade@brocku.ca
Present	Alan Titley	CFA (Primary)	AT	atitley@brocku.ca
Present	Sara Palmieri	CFA (Alternate)	SP	spalmieri@brocku.ca
Absent	Mary Jo Mullins	Niagara Dance Co. (Primary)	MJM	info@niagaradancecompany.com
Present	Kim Fiocca	Niagara Dance Co. (Alternate)	KF	swandance232@gmail.com
Absent	Stephen Remus	NAC (Alternate)	SR	director@nac.org
Absent	Robert Cooper	Chorus Niagara (Primary)	RC	rmcooper@rogers.com
Absent	Josephine Henderson	Chorus Niagara (Alternate)	JH	bobjohenderson@sympatico.ca
Present	Hugh Gayler	Chorus Niagara (Alternate)	HG	hgayler@brocku.ca
Present	Diana McAdorey	Chorus Niagara (Alternate)	DM	cnadmin@becon.org
Absent	Annie Wilson	Suitcase in Point (Primary)	AW	annie@suitcaseinpoint.com
Absent	Deanna Jones	Suitcase in Point (Alternate)	DJ	deanna@suitcaseinpoint.com
Present	Kate Leathers	Barlow and Associates	KL	kate@barlowandassociates.com

Via Phone	Martin Vinik		MV	mv@martinvinik.com
Absent	Rick Lane	Director, RCS, City of St. Catharines	RL	rlane@stcatharines.ca
Present	Rebecca Cann	Cultural Planning Supervisor, City of St. Catharines	RC	rcann@stcatharines.ca
Present	Kelly Reichheld	Manager, Programs & Cultural Services, City of St. Catharines	KR	kreichheld@stcatharines.ca
Absent	Derek Beckley	PRISM	DB	dbeckley@prismpartners.com
Present	Jim Enright	PRISM	JE	jenright@prismpartners.com
Absent	Thevaki Ganesharajah	PRISM	TG	tganesharajah@prismpartners.com
Absent	Donald Schmitt	DSAI	DS	dschmitt@dsai.ca
Present	Gary McCluskie	DSAI	GM	gmcluskie@dsai.ca
Present	Michael Treacy	DSAI	MT	mtreacy@dsai.ca

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
6.1	Approval of Agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approval of agenda with no changes by AW and seconded by DV. 	
6.2	Approval of Minutes from Meeting of March 22, 2011. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approval of minutes with no changes by AT and seconded by DV. 	
6.3	Business Arising <p>1.5.5 Tours of Related Facilities DSAI has contacted Country Day School and Richmond Hill and both are both flexible in their timing on April 15th. The Mississauga Living Arts Centre has not been contacted – Rebecca will coordinate this and other possible venues. It will be a bus tour. The Young Centre was considered important enough to fit in on a separate day if need be.</p> <p>5.5.5.5 General Program Analysis KR reported that the verbiage in the funding agreement was very clear – the four venues are to be built at that location specifically and they are all to be built at the same time, in the same building. No phasing of these four venues is an option.</p>	MT, RC, TG
6.4	Correspondence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	
6.5	New Business <p>6.5.1 Conference Call with Martin Vinik 6.5.1.1 Building Program is a remarkably detailed response that is usually generated by a client working group at this point in the process. DSAI was deliberately fairly conservative in</p>	

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
	<p>the estimates, and that was wise. At this point in the project, small adjustments in the square footage, building efficiency, psf cost will all make a huge difference in the final project. Lots of the adjustments that the UGC have proposed fall into the margin of volatility in the planning of the project.</p> <p>6.5.1.2 Net vs Gross square foot always means something different to different people. Net SF is the actual floor area that you see – the space within the walls of the room. The wall thicknesses are not part of this figure, nor are corridors, stairs, elevators, mechanical spaces, telephone data rooms. These are the grossing figure – the combination is the gross square footage. What's counted in which depends on the designer/architect.</p> <p>6.5.1.3 Building efficiency ratios are hard to interpret without determining what is within their 'grossing' component. As a result there are going to be some differences between each of the three programs. In the end, what really matters is that the most efficient building design needs to maximize the net square footage. There is an enormous risk of frittering away a lot of space and cost on areas that don't count to the net – primarily interior circulation (corridors). Look to organize lobby spaces that are functional and programmable separately as useable space, and compress public circulation to force the audience to use the lobby spaces as they generate revenue.</p> <p>6.5.1.4 How can we find the most efficient way to move people through the building, how can spaces be compressed without compromising function? There are some spaces that will be discovered during the design process that will be easy to add as found space, or "discovered" in the design. One of the things that probably ought to be done is to identify those spaces that 'we would really like to have if we could find them' as opposed to those that are absolutely necessary. It really helps the architects to have a priority list based on this strategy. As efficiencies or opportunities are found, they will be creating spaces based on this priority list.</p> <p>6.5.1.5 As the ratio of gross to net changes, more dollars are being spent on net floor area so that more functional area is created for the same cost.</p> <p>6.5.1.6 In this kind of building, where there are a lot of relatively small venues, there are a lot of forces pushing towards inefficiency. If we're looking to take major chunks out of the program, start by removing big spaces – there isn't a lot of use nibbling around the edges. Start with the major public spaces – seating capacities and lobbies.</p> <p>6.5.1.7 Concert Hall changes. Removing the 50 seats from the Recital Hall and the Film Venue are proposed – it changes the program in major ways by affecting both venue and lobby. However, the capacities programmed initially were based on the MIWSFPA needs. They have now said that it is probably not a problem for the majority of their academic usage – although there is the probability of growth of student enrollment. There are some classes that would be too large. The Music Dept. does not see a problem with a</p>	

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
	<p>50 seat reduction in the Recital Hall – although they couldn't speak to other programming. Want to squeeze these down, but not to the point of hamstringing revenue opportunities. Fewer seats reduces the potential revenue of the facilities. In the Concert Hall rental revenue based on seating capacity is a significant consideration. It applies to a lesser extent to the other theatres.</p> <p>6.5.1.8 The capacity of the Theatre/Dance venue is more affected by centre programs that drive the seating capacity and the usage (particularly dance) and will dictate the dimensions</p> <p>6.5.2 Complete Review Summaries of Usage Per Venue</p> <p>6.5.2.1 Seating Capacity Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Concert Hall – 700 in the house and 130 in loft/sides of house (830). Absolute minimum per funding is 750. Assumes that the choir loft would be tiers of seating upstage of the rear of the concert enclosure. They may be blocked by a drop or cyc for events like dance and be unusable. (Would the seats be behind the speaker positions and therefore unusable for amplified concerts?) ii) HG (Chorus Niagara) spoke against the choir loft unless the orchestra was large enough to force them off the stage or if they were in a double or multiple choir situation and could not fit everyone on the stage. Likes the idea of the choir loft for a wrap around audience, not for choir use. iii) Someone suggested that occasionally artists have contractual requirements that there not be seating onstage (which means not being able to sell those seats). iv) There may be a little bit of room to tighten the stage as it was expanded to accommodate the possibility of Project Niagara – the festival planned by the TSO and NAC orchestras - using the space in the summer. iii) Recital Hall – It will be 300 for now. JM stated that the NYO would not have a major problem to reduce the seats to 250. (Note: at end of meeting this decision was changed.) iv) The MIWSFPA music appreciation classes are too large even for a 300 seat venue, so they do not see a problem with a reduction of seats. The MIWSFPA position is to privilege the acoustics over the tablet arms in this venue. Martin - <i>Tablet arms will force the back to back row spacing to expand the tablet arm (40-42") which will increase net floor – costs more than just the arms.</i> v) Users – 80 onstage not 70 (corrected) vi) Theatre/Dance Venue – user groups have no problems with reducing seating to 150. They want the intimacy and it increases the ability to reconfigure the seating – there are a variety of different seating layouts that get to that capacity. Flexibility is the highest priority for this set of user groups, needs a system that allows changeovers to be quick, easy and cheap. vii) Film/Lecture Venue – 180 seats would provide more usage by the MIWSFPA. Tablet arms are necessary. The question 	

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
	<p>of the recital hall and film venue seating counts has to go up the chain in the university.</p> <p>6.5.2.2 Lobbies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) KR noted that with the smaller venues the actual capacity use will rise (the amount of audience expected has not changed), which means that the common space shouldn't be reduced. ii) Film theatres have a different kind of need for lobby space – people don't arrive and hang around, they just go in, watch and leave. That's why there is no lobby for this space, instead it will feed off public lobby. iii) The main lobby for the Concert Hall needs to be a separately programmed space – people will hang around and it will handle meetings, cabarets, and other outside table and chair events. 10 s.f. per person – should be around 2800-3000 sf. It also has to handle the capacity of the Recital Hall users – has its own concession areas and toilets and offers 4-5sfpp. iv) Developing the café as part of the lobby space – it is supposed to be functional as a separate programmable space – it should be acoustically sufficient such that it is separated from the rest of the lobby so that it can be used while there are audiences in the main lobbies. v) Consider carving the lobby so that it can be cordoned off for spaces like the donor lounge (the café could cover this function). vi) Washrooms – MV feels that he is very liberal with washrooms. DSAI changed the toilets figure in the revision to the feasibility study – it should read 1,800 (corrected) vii) MV made the assumption that there will be staggered performance and interval times so that loads will not be combined. However, it was noted that this is not always within the control of facility management, particularly intermission timing. viii) JM noted that past experience tells him that the audience priorities (based on complaints) are 1) washrooms 2) bar/concessions access 3) lobby congestion. <p>6.5.2.3 Backstage Support Spaces</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) There will be a lot of give and take between the users' program and the architects. The UGC program points out the essential functional areas that may be 'found spaces' in the design. ii) DS commented that some of the backstage spaces could be merged or combined. iii) The security requirements of the centre and its relationship with MIWSFPA are more complex than the usual arrangement – which may require more spaces/considerations. iv) There have to be warm-up rooms for the spaces – there aren't any in the budget driven program 	

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
	<p>6.5.2.4 Rehearsal Hall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) SP questioned why it was needed in the centre, when there are other spaces in the area available. ii) JG the biggest question will be what the cost is, and they will find an alternative space that is cheaper. The big question is where is the holding pen for the dance recital, the dancer warm-up, the multi-use space. D+S left it in a slightly smaller form for those uses specifically. iii) The other issue is 'how can you develop an arts community if you don't have a rehearsal hall?' If you don't have that space, you will not have the possibility of having dance recitals (or competitions). The most serious complaints that make or break a space are that the children are not properly looked after. The CFTA feels that dance competition needs the spaces; Chorus Niagara has to be lined up for the riser configuration and the space is also used for receptions after shows. To lose this space would take away a key functional area for the facility's operation. iv) Rename it Multi-Purpose Room. <p>6.5.2.5 Administration</p> <p>Comments from MV:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The centre needs certain types of administrative space to do what it's got to do and in the long run. The city needs to offer certain admin services to its arts groups if it's going to thrive. Whether that has to be in the centre at the moment is up for debate. Some people do need to be onsite – box office manager, production manager, food and beverage manager. ii) There is no reason why the other admin can't be outside the building so long as they were sufficiently proximate, ie if there were existing space quite nearby that could be renovated for half the price. Has to be within a block or two, though, for connection. This relocation is also a possibility for rehearsal space – develop it offsite and allow the space within the facility to be a multipurpose room without the support and fittings that a rehearsal hall requires. iii) ME - as Councillor, the City is trying to put their workers in the sites where they do their work. It doesn't always happen, but the City's point of view is that admin should be in that building. The community groups might be housed in another City facility, an initiative that ME is working on. iv) While the community arts group offices aren't in the program, the feeling is that a cluster of arts groups working out of an administrative centre would be ideal. v) DS all of the CFTA people work in a very small space (under 900 sf for 11 staff). Don't want to have to work offsite for the immediacy of having all the administrative staff together in one area for ease of communication and team spirit. vi) Also have to consider that the staff will probably grow in 15-20 years to the point where they exceed what can be allotted to them. If there is no onsite space for the user groups, it would be good to have a temporary space that they can use for the duration of their rental (touring/stage managers' 	

Deleted: ¶

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
	<p>office).</p> <p>vii) The user group was very clear about the value of collaboration as a centre value – which is reflected in their commitment to combined office space.</p> <p>viii) There is definitely flexibility in how much space is needed for the administrative staff – staff would rather ‘squish in’ than not be on site.</p> <p>ix) JM - There is a psychological aspect to this – people who are far away don’t think of themselves as part of the activity. Putting too much focus on the physical and not considering the people who will work in the venue risks causing operational problems.</p> <p>6.5.3 Draft Programs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Optimum Program • Reconciled Program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group reviewed the Building Program with the goals of finding more to cut in the user program and identifying any grave concerns in the DSAI budget driven program. • Abbreviations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C/H – concert hall • R/H – recital hall • T/D – theatre dance studio space • F/L – film lecture venue • bp – building program • Page 37 User Seat Counts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C/H – 800 (budget driven is currently 850=720+130, it is recommended that it be reduced to 800) • R/H – 250 • T/D – 150 • F/L – 180 • total – 1,380 • Page 39 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • café is cut • merge all box office functions in BDP – in user group make all 400 sf • Page 40 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • toilets will be an ongoing negotiation • will reassess #s based on the new seating capacities and review on facility tour • cut the need for f/l lobby • note that concessions area in D&S bp is too small at 100 – CFTA concessions is 192 and it is too small • cut the personnel lockers/volunteer room and incorporate into house management offices • Catering kitchen – not a kitchen so much as a holding area and heating/refrigeration area for the caterers. Use DSAI numbers • Page 41 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • mark live mix position and follow spot as yes in DSAI • Need to transcribe 400sf into the artists lounge for DSAI • This is too small and cannot be the only green room in the facility. DSAI, please increase to 800. 	

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percussion Storage is necessary; please add 80 to DSAI • Please assume that the grand pianos are 9' concert grands • Warm-up room will become the multi-purpose room – cut 400 • Will leave the NSO storage at a reduced 300, but put lower on the priority list – there is dissension on this topic • Page 43 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce based on seat counts • Page 44 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • please note that there is very little support space in the recital hall DSAI bp • Page 45 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • need to understand the equipment before we can understand the complete storage requirements • cut the SM office 80sf • please note that equity standards need to comply to dressing rooms and they need to fit 10 performer • cut unisex toilets – use c/h • Page 46 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RH is multipurpose space. Need to consider adaptability for the future – make it retro-fit-able (make provision for a grid) • instead of support space – add unisex washroom access and they need to be proximate for the safety of the children. 240sf • Page 47 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • need for crew room in DSAI program. • Add 400 sf for trash storage, recycling - in DSAI this is counted within gross • There is concern about the loading dock size in the DSAI program as it is smaller than what CFTA has now – the user program is the same only – will have to see comparable venues – at least keep the user program and recommend that architects increase theirs • Page 48 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cut COE offices to 2,000 sf <p>6.5.4 Next steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Building Program to identify priority “return items” and begin discussion on FF&E. 	
6.6	Pending Items 2.5.2 Draft Space Program 2.5.4 Involvement of Infrastructure Staff 5.5.3 Conceptual Options 5.5.4 Room Data Sheets	
6.7	Closed Items	
6.8	Next Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 • Time: 1:00-4:00 p.m. 	

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Location: City Hall, 3rd Floor, Committee Room 1	
	Motion to Adjourn Meeting: SP	