

B.A. Parker Public School Replacement Project

Design Steering Committee Meeting

Convened at Geraldton Composite HS
Point to Point Videoconference with Marathon Board Office

Tuesday, January 13, 2009 - 5:00 p.m.

M I N U T E S

BAPS Steering Committee	<i>Attendance: On-site (OS); Teleconference (TC); Videoconference (VC); Absent (A); Regrets (R)</i>										
	OS	TC	VC	A	R		OS	TC	VC	A	R
Barrett, Chantal Community Rep	X					Luomala, Al Principal (GCHS)	X				
Chiupka, Wayne Plant Manager (SGDSB)			X			MacOdrum, Kaitie Student (BAPS)	X				
Czerwinski, Vance Community Rep	X					Mannisto, Mark Board Chair (SGDSB)				X	
Davis, Julie Parent Council (GCHS)	X					Pella, Patti Director (SGDSB)			X		
Davis, Kirsti Student (GCHS)	X					Penna, Linda Principal (BAPS)	X				
Davis, Patti Support Staff (GCHS)	X					Slomke, Lisa Parent Council (BAPS)					X
Kurish, Cathy Teacher (BAPS)	X					Sutherland, Nancy Support Staff (BAPS)	X				
Lindsay, Heidi Teacher (GCHS)	X					Turner, Jim Trustee (SGDSB)	X				

1. Welcome and Introduction

Patti Pella welcomed all to the meeting. She advised that the purpose of the meeting was to have the group review the schematic (1R, 2R and 3R) provided by project architect Ian Hill and provide feedback on the various proposals and/or arrive at a consensus on which of the drawings met favour and would be the most feasible to develop further with the architect. She turned the floor over the Manager of Plant Services, Wayne Chiupka.

W. Chiupka prefaced his review of the three schematics with information on cost of construction. He noted that cost included with each of the drawings did not include the architect fees (approx. \$0.4 million), the cost associated with building permits and no extra basic contingency costs.. These costs are not funded separately from \$4.5 allocated for project, hence construction cost proffered must have architect costs incorporated and charged out against the total \$4.5 million funding that the Ministry of Education has allocated for the BAPS Replacement Project. We have specific direction that funding for BAPS relocation as a Prohibitive to Repair (PTR) school is to be used in a fashion that would see excess space within GCHS absorbed and better utilized.

Generally, cost of construction in Northwestern Ontario is much higher than Southern Ontario; however, the allocation provided does not consider this difference. In our area, construction runs about \$250 per ²foot, while renovation is \$100 per ²foot.

2. Schematic 1R

W. Chiupka advised:

- Drawing captures committee wishes
- It has a dedicated front entrance off from the secondary space

- Gymnasium (50'X70') is included (considered a small-sized gym), hence regulation-sized volleyball/basketball courts cannot be housed. This size saves about \$0.4 million in costs
- Change rooms are required in any design that includes gymnasium
- Space is provided for administration, staff room, special education area, computer rooms, health service room, boys and girls washrooms, kitchen, library and resource corner, small janitorial space, small receiving area and small storage areas
- Two kindergarten rooms to accommodate the advent of full-day JK
- Five classrooms included

W. Chiupka concerns:

- This location would appear to require the relocation of a transformer (if hydro allows it). If yes, then this is an additional \$300,000 which must be taken total funds available
- The design as is has the potential for snow load problems, so there would need to be some structural work to alleviate the problem
- Congested in the front area of the design
- Access to playground is tight as we would need to close off from Beamish Avenue to the hospital side and create vehicle control with fencing which adds more cost
- Fencing would run all along Beamish to graveyard and terminate at the water tower, hence the thorough fare from Beamish would cease to be used as a roadway...we can do this as the property belongs to the school board
- Although design incorporates what the committee seeks, it is essentially an add onto the high school itself
- Very little excess space now contained in GCHS is being utilized
- It is akin to building a smaller version of BAPS onto the side of GCHS
- Cost is \$4.9 million with architect fees, plus cost of relocation of transformer \$0.3 million for a total of \$5.2 million to complete (over-budget)

Feedback from Committee

Al Luomala

- From his perspective with the fencing proposed, the community use of the school would be compromised as there would be restricted access to entranceways therefore the public parking area would mean walk-through school traffic which is not an ideal situation

Committee Consensus

- It was the consensus of the committee that Schematic 1R is not ideal given the fencing scenario...move onto to Schematic 2R

3. Schematic 2R

W. Chiupka advised:

- New all around but consists of an overlap onto the high school, formerly, the Outers Room of the high school
- As in Schematic 1R facilities new build composed of gym, two kindergarten classes, five classrooms, administration, staff room, special education area, computer rooms, health service room, boys and girls washrooms, kitchen, library and resource corner, small janitorial space, small receiving area and small storage areas

Feedback from Committee

Jim Turner

- Based on the drawings and need to reduce costs ...inquired as to whether the current very large library area of GCHS could be used to house some of the proposed 5 new classroom for BAPS
- Suggested that with the cost of new compared to lower cost for renovation and the very large area of the existing high school library would it be feasible to take some of the "new classrooms (1 to 5) and incorporate these into the high school library?

- Then relocate high school library to another area of the secondary school by renovating in existing space by taking two classroom spaces within
- Result is that two existing high school spaces would be used, one for BAPS classroom series in the existing huge GCHS library, another two-classroom sized space elsewhere in the library would be renovated to better service needs for students' high school
- By absorbing and renovating spaces cost could decrease
- Both BAPS and GCHS realize the benefit of new libraries

Al Luomala

- Concerned for location of the art room as the renovations suggested would leave the high school Art Room totally isolated
- W. Chiupka advised it may be feasible to move the art room to a more travelled area of the high school and the upper area which now houses art room has the potential to serve as a mechanical room

Feedback from Committee

- Could there be savings by flipping the kitchen wing and taking classrooms in drawing up the other way?
- Benefits that could result from such a revision could be realized by:
 - A more direct access to playground area is provided
 - Better accommodation for Confederation College parking needs
 - Closing of both the north and south side street access
 - Allowing funding to go further by using it to renovate instead of spending on new structures

4. Schematic 3R

W. Chiupka advised:

- The drawing represents a new school built and put up against the existing GCHS...similar to adding a new wing to school
- Contains all the same space as schematic 1R and 2R but more new floor space, more outside walls and very little excess GCHS space being used.

Committee Member Feedback

- Consensus Schematic 2R provides better opportunity for the school facility itself, better access to playground area, more potential to revisit configuration to reduce costs by using excess GCHS more efficiently and effectively
- 3R Schematic illustrates too much "new", hence costlier proposal with no opportunity to pare down

4. Next Steps

- W. Chiupka to:
 - forward spreadsheets with cost associated with schematics presented this day
 - forward survey document
 - forward entire site plan for school with layout of
 - whole area school
 - parking
 - bussing plan
 - student drop off areas
 - fencing
- Above information will be submitted to committee members under separate by W. Chiupka
- Monday, January 19th: Minutes will be forwarded to steering committee on Monday, January 19th
- Wednesday, January 21st : Feedback from individual Steering Committee members to be forwarded to W. Chiupka by e-mail at wchiupka@sgdsb.on.ca
- Once responses are submitted to W. Chiupka he will consult with the architect on developing drawings to incorporate suggestions as per discussion had in regard to Schematic 2R

- Drawings and revised costing on Schematic 2R will be provided at the next meeting.

5. Next Meeting

Thursday, February 12, 2009 at 5:00 p.m. (Video-conference GCHS and SGDSB Office)

6. Other

P. Pella to set up Kaitie MacOdrum (Student) e-mail address to facilitate communication