



Minutes

Meeting:	Performing Arts Centre – User Group Committee Meeting #7			
Project:	Performing Arts Centre Project			
Place:	City Hall, 3 rd Floor, Committee Room 1			
Date:	April 1, 2011			
Time:	1:00 – 4:30 p.m.			
Recorder:	Kate Leathers, Thevaki Ganesharajah			
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@niagarasymphony.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
Absent	Diana McAdorey	Chorus Niagara (Alternate)	DM	cnadmin@becon.org
Present	Annie Wilson	Suitcase in Point (Primary)	AW	annie@suitcaseinpoint.com
Present	Deanna Jones	Suitcase in Point (Alternate)	DJ	deanna@suitcaseinpoint.com
Present	Kate Leathers	Barlow and Associates	KL	kate@barlowandassociates.com

Present	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
Present	Thevaki Ganesharajah	PRISM	TG	tganesharajah@prismpartners.com
Absent	Donald Schmitt	DSAI	DS	dschmitt@dsai.ca
Absent	Gary McCluskie	DSAI	GM	gmcccluskie@dsai.ca
Present	Michael Treacy	DSAI	MT	mtreacy@dsai.ca

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
7.1	Approval of Agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approval of agenda with no changes by DV and seconded by DK. 	
7.2	Approval of Minutes from Meeting #6 – March 24th <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approval of amended minutes by JM and seconded by JG. Please refer to revised Meeting #6 Minutes 	
7.3	Business Arising 1.5.5 Tours of Related Facilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rebecca is in the process of contacting the following venues for the facilities tour on Friday, April 15th: Young Centre for the Performing Arts, Mississauga Living Arts Centre, 3 Theatres at Harbourfront, Isabel Bader Theatre and RCM (to confirm that the Koerner Hall can be accessed). Also, a hard hat tour of the Burlington PAC is to be confirmed. Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.3.1 Tablets – DV noted that there are no issues with code as noted by MV. DV has forwarded the appropriate documentation to DSAI. 7.3.2 KF noted that the change to multipurpose room and rehearsal hall will not serve the use of the dance company; it should still be used for rehearsal, which requires specific furnishings i.e. sprung floor. This item is to be discussed later. 7.3.3 With regards to the reduction in seating in the Recital Hall, the MIWSFPA will not be able to run the Encore series in 250 seats and will have to move to the Concert Hall, changing the usage charts. 	RC/TG MT
7.4	Correspondence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.4.1 RC noted that the ED Job Posting and Cost Consulting 	

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
	Selection information had been forwarded to the group via email.	
7.5	<p>New Business</p> <p>7.5.0 Budget</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The Council approved budget sheet was distributed. ii) Noted that the retail space, office spaces for the COE and user groups and cost escalation are not funded by the Federal and Provincial government. iii) ME explained that the budget that was presented to Council was a Total Project Budget, not just a budget for construction. iv) One change from the Feasibility Study is that the Recital Hall is to be paid for by the City rather than Brock. v) One of the reasons that the project has been politically palatable is because none of the money for the project is coming from property taxes. Property taxes will be used to maintain and run the facility for the long term. vi) It was asked if this budgeting was a standard operating procedure. As this is the largest project that the City has taken on, there isn't a standard operating procedure. Projects of this size are not easy politically and Council took the project on in a way that would be most acceptable to the public because they believed it was important. vii) The costs have changed since the original budget was drafted. The budget is fluid as the process goes forward and money will be shifted around to make the project work. The project will need to be considerate of what users can do without vs. what has to be included to ensure that the facility is sustainable and will function properly. viii) Hopefully through the costing process the two programs will come closer together, but a gap between the two programs and the budget is expected. ix) Possibly need to look at increasing the fundraising component – it appears to be a small amount for a project of this nature (\$2.2m). There is a need for professional advice on how to undertake fundraising. x) Have to look at ways of justifying to Council the need to access tax revenue for the capital project. This should only be done if it is absolutely necessary. xi) The goal is to find out how to do the project within the budget we have and how to generate more funds if it is not possible to do it within the existing budget. xii) There may be ways of finding savings in parts of the budget that have not yet been discussed, such as FF&E. xiii) JM: would it be possible to learn what created the 2.5 million dollar increase in the Other City Costs category? ME: There may not be a specific answer provided as new costs are arising and it's possible that many smaller costs can have added up to the overall change in this cost line. xiv) DK put forward that it is very important to be thinking and strategizing about increased fund raising. This is something that will need to be done quickly to increase the available funds for construction and design. The strategy is to hire a fund raising consultant to assess the possible amount that could be raised and develop a campaign strategy. 	

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
	<p>xv) MOTION (JM): moved that the User Group Committee strongly recommend to the City that fundraising be initiated immediately given the design and budgetary constraints of the project, and that a professional consultant be engaged to provide a fund raising plan as soon as possible. Seconded: Annie Wilson</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o This item is something that an executive director should be taking the lead on. The order of action will be that a plan be created and the executive director will take the lead on the campaign. o The user groups will have to be brought in on the process as they will be fund raising both for themselves and the centre. o Motion was carried. <p>7.5.1 Building Program and Costing Exercise</p> <p>7.5.1.1 The purpose of the discussion is to review the text in the building program document and identify those areas that are of concern and areas that need to be returned into the program.</p> <p>7.5.1.2 Concert Hall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Q When is the decision going to be made with regard to the choir loft? A Architects need the decision on keeping or cutting the loft very soon – needs to be finalized next week. ii) SP: group should know the number of times the choir loft might be used versus when it is covered for presentation shows and what cost differences would result from moving the seats into the house. iii) It is unlikely for the COE series that those seats will ever be used. There always have to be 750 audience seats available, so if the loft is closed, there have to be 750 seats in the house. iv) Want to have comments from Bob, Janis and Martin before a decision is finalized v) The cost of an organ infrastructure and the necessary additional space is significant and the decision to include it must be made by next Thursday. Rebecca will bring together the various comments on the organ so that the group can deliberate next week. vi) <i>Addition to user document</i> – no orchestra pit will be provided for live musicians in the Concert Hall (dance) <p>7.5.1.3 Recital Hall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Tablet arms – the presence of tablet arms is a priority for the MIWSFPA, particularly if the hall goes back up to 300 seats. ii) Seating capacity would ideally be 300 seats – <i>revision to user document</i> <p>7.5.1.4 Theatre Dance Space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) PFL recommended not including Roselawn Theatre as a model because the reconfiguration involves an extensive crew call. <i>CUT reference in user document.</i> 	<p>RC/JB/MV</p> <p>RC</p> <p>MT</p>

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
	<p>ii) The goal of the centre is to have lights on every night, and Pablo is concerned about the efficiency of lighting systems in the space so that the changeover from show to show is as fast and cost effective as possible given the variety skill levels of the users in the space. He noted the value of a catwalk in the space. Further discussion is required regarding various systems.</p> <p>7.5.1.5 Shared Functional Areas</p> <p>i) Café: is not a priority, but notes on it will be left to explain its benefits.</p> <p>ii) Rehearsal Hall: has been shifted in concept to a multipurpose room but must remain as a functional rehearsal hall.</p> <p>iii) Green rooms: multiple are required.</p> <p>iv) Loading Bays: the incorporation of three would be ideal.</p> <p>v) Front of house curb drop-off point is needed.</p> <p>vi) It will be necessary to expand on the dialogue regarding the administrative areas.</p> <p>7.5.1.6 Program: continued areas of concern</p> <p>i) Loading area.</p> <p>ii) Washrooms, both public and backstage.</p> <p>iii) Offices for the COE and community user groups</p> <p>iv) Street animation and connectivity on St. Paul</p> <p>v) Connectivity with MIWSFPA</p> <p>vi) Percussion storage (as individual spaces per Hall rather than shared)</p> <p>vii) Separate greenroom and dressing rooms for recital and concert halls – for simultaneous performances or conflicting academic and COE usage</p> <p>vii) Sufficient Dressing rooms (in number and/or size) for concert hall</p> <p>viii) <i>Clarify donors lounge note</i> – cordoned off section of the lobby to be found for this purpose</p> <p>7.5.1.7 Café</p> <p>i) The removal of the café was discussed – felt that the uses of the room could be moved to other spaces. The issue is that the café is seen as animating the street and as a revenue generating area; repercussions should be examined.</p> <p>7.5.1.8 Animation of Street Front</p> <p>i) SP inquired how the centre is going to be animated at the street now with the café removed? What is the public access to the venue – will people come in other than when they are picking up tickets? Should they?</p> <p>ii) From a City perspective, the concern of constant usage as a ‘throughway’ to the Hair Cloth affects operational and capital costs.</p> <p>iii) PFL noted that if you’ve been to any theatre dept. in Canada, you will see students everywhere, waiting, lounging, rehearsing, or doing homework. Animation is people coming</p>	

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
	<p>to St Paul St who would normally not be there, they come downtown specifically to be at the PAC and generate activity for the whole street.</p> <p>iv) Should observe the options presented by other venues on the tour (e.g. Royal Conservatory, Young Centre). As well, just because there isn't an isolated space for the café, it doesn't mean that there couldn't be a 'café' space as part of the lobby (needs good coffee to work).</p> <p>v) It will be the responsibility of the ED to find ways to animate the street front, and running the café is a completely different business than performing arts.</p> <p>7.5.2 Room Data Sheets (5.5.4)</p> <p>7.5.2.1 Sample room data sheets were provided as examples of what will be used during the Schematic Design phase to review the rooms.</p> <p>7.5.2.2 The detailed information will need to be completed by the end of the Design Development Phase at the end of June. DSAI will be recording information in this fashion as discussions take place.</p> <p>7.5.2.3 Q & A: The raked vs stepped floor decision will be driven by code, accessibility, and sightlines – it will be reviewed and addressed during the schematic design phase.</p> <p>7.5.3 Furniture Fittings & Equipment (FF&E)</p> <p>7.5.3.1 The Martin Vinik Memo (2010) is the starting point for this discussion with regards to budget summary and allowances. There are some changes in the program (seat counts, cutting of the café etc.) since the memo was written, which will change the figures within it.</p> <p>7.5.3.2 MT: the figures in the memo will be escalated to current numbers, which will most likely result in an 8% increase.</p> <p>7.5.3.3 Discussions will continue during schematic design to ensure that the FF & E list reflects the precise requirements of the venues.</p> <p>7.5.3.4 It is critical for the architects to have information pertaining to the building envelope – this work must be done up front so that all of the items are included and the contractors are bidding on specific systems and equipment requirements.</p> <p>7.5.3.5 Key equipment affecting spaces should be determined in the next 4-6 weeks.</p> <p>7.5.3.6 The City Procurement Policy needs to be clarified. Will the policies accommodate necessary specialty equipment purchases? Will there be room to navigate the City's procurement policy to make certain the Technical Committee's recommended materials are in the spec's that are sent to bid. The concern is that sole source requirements may be necessary - is this feasible under current policy?</p> <p>7.5.3.7 The City will provide its procurement policy so that the creation of the spec's can be tailored to ensure the necessary specialized equipment is provided by the required supplier.</p> <p>7.5.3.8 UGC suggested it would be helpful to see the formal submission of equipment from Brock's Centre for the Arts to ensure that there is no unnecessary duplication.</p>	

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
	<p>7.5.3.9 Some items will be part of the contractor's bid, whereas others will be independently purchased to avoid the contractor's overhead.</p> <p>7.5.3.10 JG inquired about hearing assisted devices. This item would be categorized under audio/visual budget. A detailed list will be developed.</p> <p>7.5.3.11 SP inquired about box office equipment; what is the approximate cost and how that will affect first year operating costs. It should be noted that this is not a small cost (ie \$60,000 – 70,000). On the project budget, there is an IT figure, which may include Box Office software.</p> <p>7.5.3.12 PFL inquired about the marquee. The Marquee is one of the fixtures that is hard to keep when budget cuts occur, but it is important to note that this feature contributes to visibility and is essential to marketing on the street front.</p> <p>7.5.3.13 A Technical Sub-Committee should be involved in finalizing specifications for equipment. Suggested participants are AT, PFL, DV, KL, JE; also invite Brian Cumberland (Brock); Gavin Fearon (Shaw & Various); Doug Ledingham (Brock & Shaw)</p> <p>7.5.4 Design Schedule</p> <p>7.5.4.1 JE noted that at this time we are approximately two months behind schedule to make the hard opening date in September 2014. This delay will result in pushing the schedule up, such as reducing the schematic design phase by two weeks. Additionally, more timely decisions will need to be made.</p> <p>7.5.4.2 The Design and Construction Committee Meetings start in a week. This group reports to the Project Oversight Committee (POC), which will start in two weeks and reports directly to the Council.</p> <p>7.5.4.3 The Schematic Design is to be forwarded to Council for approval at the end of June.</p> <p>7.5.4.4 Design Development is to be completed by the end of August.</p> <p>7.5.4.5 Construction Tender is to occur in April 2012.</p> <p>7.5.4.6 Key milestones are to be documented and forwarded to the User Group.</p> <p>7.5.4.7 Public Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The architects will not have a show and tell for a public meeting on April 20th. Discussion took place about this consultation – should it be 'what do you think we should have' rather than 'what do you think of this.' Perhaps it would be better if there were something to have a conversation around, rather than throwing it out without a concrete starting point, when the design process has already begun. ii) JM: Public conversation should be driven by the need to connect the City and the public on the issue to create interest and engagement. iii) The project oversight committee should be setting up the public meetings and the user group committee will attend. iv) <i>[UPDATE: It has been determined that the Public Meeting will take place in early May 2011.]</i> 	<p>PRISM</p>

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
7.6	<p>Pending Items</p> <p>2.5.4 Involvement of Infrastructure Staff</p> <p>2.5.4.1 Is there a need to bring specialty City staff into the user group meetings to contribute to the discussion? General consensus was – not at this time.</p> <p>2.5.4.2 If the discussion of how the space will interact with the street (vis a vis animation) does arise, perhaps someone from economic development should be involved. The architects will be sitting down with the urban planning representatives and other city staff who will be addressing the issue.</p> <p>5.5.3 Conceptual Options</p>	
7.7	Closed Items	
7.8	<p>Next Meeting</p> <p>Date: Friday, April 15, 2011 (Facilities Tour)</p> <p>Time: 7:30 a.m. – 6:00 p.m.</p>	
	Motion to Adjourn Meeting: SP	