



Minutes

Meeting: Performing Arts Centre – User Group Committee Meeting (UGC) #8
Project: Performing Arts Centre Project
Place: Bus
Date: April 15, 2011
Time: During travel time to facilities.
Recorder: David Vivian

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
Absent	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
Absent	Sara Palmieri	CFA (Alternate)	SP	spalmieri@brocku.ca
Absent	Mary Jo Mullins	Niagara Dance Co. (Primary)	MJM	info@niagaradancecompany.com
Absent	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
Absent	Hugh Gayler	Chorus Niagara (Alternate)	HG	hgayler@brocku.ca
Absent	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
Absent	Kate Leathers	Barlow and Associates	KL	kate@barlowandassociates.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
Absent	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
Absent	Gary McCluskie	DSAI	GM	gmcccluskie@dsai.ca
Absent	Michael Treacy	DSAI	MT	mtreacy@dsai.ca

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
8.1	Approval of Agenda Approval of agenda with no changes by DK and seconded by DV.	
8.2	Approval of Minutes from Meeting #7 – April 1st, 2011 Approval of minutes with no changes by DK and seconded by DV.	
8.3	Business Arising 8.3.1 Review of Minutes with reference to revised Building Program. 8.3.1.1 Dressing rooms for the Concert Hall need to clearly state they are for 18 women as well as 18 men, as per NSA needs. (JM) Discussion took place about s.f. as it relates to the actual CFTA dressing rooms (approx. 1000 sf) with proposed (1600 s.f. in user building program). 8.3.1.2 It was clarified that details of each space size will be addressed during schematic design process. 8.3.1.3 Discussion about FADS requirements and consistencies, consultations (with specific reference to assisted hearing devices). JE confirmed that the City and University policies are comparable. 8.3.1.4 Confirmed that the 800 seat capacity of Concert Hall includes the choir loft. 8.3.1.5 The group asked Prism to review the Wednesday/Thursday/Friday meeting schedules for the User Group and Construction Design Committees in order	PRISM

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
	to make them adjacent and with UGC first in schedule order (as is logical for useful and expedient information flow.	
8.4	Correspondence None.	
8.5	New Business 8.5.1 Key Schedule Milestones (see attached) <p>8.5.1.1 April 15 – Schematic Design process has begun after verbal approval by Project Oversight Committee (POC); formally it begins after April 21st following UGC approval of Proposed Building Plan.</p> <p>8.5.1.2 Delivery of schematics expected in middle of May for the first public meeting presentation.</p> <p>8.5.1.3 Discussion took place about future participation of UGC at first public meeting: deemed crucial that UGC members participate at this event.</p> <p>8.5.1.4 Future key dates to be communicated by JE.</p> <p>8.5.1.5 Need to manage distribution of accurate information to the public, soon. The group noted that ideally this would be coordinated with other arts and culture programming.</p> <p>8.5.1.6 Discussion about possibility of keeping members of UGC involved in the consultative process across the key summer dates and during planned absences. Possibility of web-based secure posting of drawings, etc. to be discussed.</p> 8.5.2 Benchmarking Budget (see attached) <p>8.5.2.1 Introduction of bench-marking budget and comparators, as provided previously by architects. It was noted that the St. Catharines project is more expensive per s.f. due to the four venues. All other comparatives have one or two performance venues only.</p> 8.5.3 Cost Savings Options (see attached) <p>8.5.3.1 JE circulated Executive Summary of the Building program costing and cost savings options as developed by the Cost Consultants, with the latter revised by the POC. It was noted that the difference between the cost of Options 1 (user driven) and 2 (budget driven) is a factor of reduced square footage (~20, 000 s.f. difference). PAC Option 2 (Budget Test at \$510/s.f.) has lower total cost vs PAC Option 1 (User Required, \$485/sf).</p>	JE

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
	<p>8.5.3.2 Discussion took place about each of the cost saving options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) LEED certification and proposed reduction in LEED status - political desire is to a sustainable practice. A difficult process for theatres (for e.g. extended duty cycles that are outside of the norm) and few comparators (Burlington PAC, GCTC in Ottawa). City is aiming for all facilities to be LEED silver-rated. (Kiwaniis Aquatics Centre is silver). Government funding documents for arts centre project require proof of “attempt to achieve” LEED Silver status. ii) Development Fees normally collected by the Region are to be waived; tbd on the City fees, but some if not all will likely also be waived. iii) Mechanical systems reduction is a change of the quality of system, although the system would still be good – some discussion took place about variations in heating and cooling plant specifications. Proposed benchmark is Richmond Hill PAC as it has the system being proposed with cost reduction. Group to verify satisfaction during site tour. iv) Variations to electrical system include replacing back-up generator with a battery-powered system and the elimination of lightning protection. A generator increases regular operating costs. Discussion took place about effective back-up for an elevator in emergency situations and reconciliation with need to evacuate mobility-challenged patrons over a protracted amount of time OR adequate designed space for fast evacuation by Fire Department. Issue will require consultation with the City’s Accessibility Coordinator. v) Proposed electrical and mechanical cuts are not going to impinge upon the presenting functional program of the venues. Any such electrical and mechanical system reductions that change capacity of facility to present a full range of programming should be reviewed. Requested that UGC be notified if this is likely. vi) Lighting reductions will affect the nature of lighting fixtures in public spaces, but still allows for reasonable quality fixtures (definitely no chandeliers with 	

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
	reduction).	
	vii) Discussion took place about the Recital Hall costing being higher than what was in agreement between City and Brock – i.e. anticipated budget is lower than costing by more than \$1M. Regarding a pending change in capacity for the Recital Hall: the group suggested that it should be maintained to support community programming needs and be of suitable and appropriate quality to serve all users.	
	viii) Discussion took place about cost-consultant response regarding proposed Choir-Loft and process for future discussion. Detailed information per cost-saving determination is necessary and desirable before Thursday. Group is unclear if Choir Loft is more or less expensive.	
	ix) The UGC is concerned that each space is 'equitably' and appropriately considered during the cost review process, noting that each venue will require different priorities for investment, for example finishing, equipment will be different for a venue's programming requirements.	
	x) The Building Program must be reconciled on Thursday, April 21, 2011 with any more necessary additions and acceptable reductions.	
	MEETING PAUSE upon arrival at Country Day School, Vaughan	
	CALL TO ORDER to continue meeting 16h47 en route for St. Catharines from Living Arts Centre, Mississauga.	
	xi) Cost savings identified are yet-to-be determined as REAL Cost savings. This is a second generation list, having already been reviewed and edited by the Design and Construction Group (DCG) and the POC.	
	xii) The group asked "Is there anything on the cut list that is a concern?": 1. Potential cut to equipment is identified as a concern. We have reservations that in the absence of detailed information an informed position on proposed cost savings cannot be taken.	
	xiii) MOTION: The PAC UGC identifies the proposed cut to equipment as a potential concern. In the absence	

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
	<p>of detailed information we APPROVE WITH RESERVATIONS proposed COST SAVINGS OPTIONS. Potential cuts to the FF&E must be reviewed with detailed information in hand BEFORE PAC UGC approval.</p> <p>Moved by JG, seconded by JM. Carried.</p> <p>xiv) The UGC requests an update on the Recital Hall capacity discussion ASAP, planned as an agenda item at the Project Oversight Committee (POC) next Wednesday.</p>	
8.6	<p>Pending Items</p> <p>5.5.3 Conceptual Options</p> <p>5.5.3.1 JE outlined the process after April 21, 2011. He indicated three schematic options should be ready for public consideration in mid-May.</p> <p>7.5.2 Room Data Sheets (5.5.4)</p> <p>7.5.2.1 JE will confirm whether and how we need to proceed with Room Data Sheets completion.</p> <p>7.5.2.2 Will the PAC UGC need to contribute to Data Sheets completion before Schematic Design process? Should defined per-venue committees be formed to contribute specifications to Room Data Sheets, and when?</p>	<p>JE</p> <p>MT/JE</p>
8.7	Closed Items	
8.8	<p>Next Meeting</p> <p>Date: Thursday, April 21, 2011</p> <p>Time: 12:00-1:30 p.m. ***Please note the change in time***</p> <p>Location: City Hall, 3rd Floor, Committee Room 1</p>	
	<p>Motion to Adjourn Meeting: End of Meeting</p> <p>Moved to adjourn at 5:30 PM (near Jordan on the QEW Niagara)</p> <p>Moved by DS, seconded by DV. Carried.</p>	