



P.O. Box 3110, 963 Airport Road
North Bay, ON P1B 8H1
705.472.8170, Fax: 705.472.9927

Jay Aspin, Chair

Craig Myles, Director of Education

North Bay Facilities Study Committee

Tuesday, February 9, 2021

Head Office of the Near North District School Board
963 Airport Road, North Bay, ON

Committee Members Present

Craig Myles, Director of Education
Gay Smylie, Acting Superintendent
Liana Blaskievich, Officer Corporate Affairs
Liz Therrien, Superintendent of Business
Marianne Speirs, Capital Projects Manager
Wally Easton, Interim Executive Officer

Absent

Jay Aspin, Board Chair

Minutes:

Krista Messenger, Executive Assistant

1.0 Call to Order

1.1 Adoption of the Agenda

Director Myles called the meeting to order at 1:10 PM. Attendance was called to confirm all invitees are present, apart from Board Chair Aspin.

1.2 Adoption of the Agenda

Moved by Superintendent Smylie that the agenda for the February 9, 2021 agenda for the North Bay Facilities Study Committee be approved as presented.

CARRIED

2.0 New Business

2.1 Establishment of Committee Chair

Director Myles reiterated the value in establishing this role as an critical piece of the board's commitment to good governance and establishing formal processes. The floor was opened for nominations. Director Myles nominated Superintendent Smylie as Committee Chair, given her extensive experience via the consolidation process and her leadership over the capital planning portfolio. Superintendent Smylie accepted the nomination. Consensus from all committee members to support this recommendation.

Committee Chair Smylie assumed leadership over the meeting.

2.2 Terms of Reference discussion

It is noted that Chair Aspin directed the Board's committees to draft a Terms of Reference for approval by the Board of Trustees following the annual committee membership reorganization meeting. Brief discussion regarding the scope and time-limited nature of this committee. Committee Chair Smylie Update to note the committee can table this. Note this was not a standing committee and is time limited. Therefore it is felt that there is value in moving forward due to the time-limited nature of this. Recommendation to continue with other formal structures to support the committee as it relates to meeting. Consensus to defer this formal process and continue to operate within the frame of reference outlined in the Board Report that brought this committee into inception.

2.2 Review of North Bay Facilities Study Memo

- Committee members referred to the memo shared as part of the agenda package. Update from Gay to note capital plan tie in. Review of relevant data sources: capital plan, revised capital plan, Watson report.
- Costing and operating data could be procured.
- School needs information
- Need to review all the data sources we have to determine way forward.
- Finding a single consultant is unlikely, a better approach may be to appoint a lead to
- Can we discuss consultant roles versus in house roles?
 -
- Wally noted that one of the benefits of the consultant is the public person of more objectivity, despite the acknowledgement that much of this work can be supported internally.
- Craig noted the value in bringing on someone with an objective lens. It is a very left lots of work to be completed.
- One's concept is to hire an initial consultant to oversee the full project to facilities the initiation of the work. This will allow us to capitalize on the information and expertise we have.
- Floor opened for discussion regarding this suggestion
 - Liz- we cannot forget we are bound by procurement law. It is noted that you can procure consultant services under 100K... so be mindful of this scope. Committee needs to review the internal guidelines on this matter. 0-50K informal process, 50-100K is a more formal process.
 - Wally to note below 100K is an invitation with 3 written quotes on firm letterhead? Liz, yes, but with varying levels of formality.
- Team discussed this point of clarification- noting it would likely be in the informal, lower range. Discussion on if one firm would have the expertise to
- Review of the Watson Report- is there opportunity to go back to them as a refresh? Look to build on the previous one to bring forward this forward with the new capital plan approved by the Board.
- Liz noted that she was here during the Watson Report- and shared staff were extremely involved in the work and data gathering (very labour intensive for staff).
- Point raised that no matter the firm, there will need access to the
- Line of best fit between ensuring the work is complete, while being informed appropriately and supported by staff.
- Wally- we do not need Watson to do the capital plan leading to an accommodation review- it would be scoped to an enrollment projections. No sense looking at school closures at this point. LOE is not going to comment on this any time soon.

- Need to get a handle on what data we have... Marianne invited to speak to the inventory and resources the Board has in-scope for this project.
 - Marianne noted a document was prepared to collate much of this information including operating costs. The pieces were easy to pull together.
 - We need external support for more recent engineering study for these buildings.
 - Appraiser should be accredited and given an unbiased building.
 - We have 75-80% to feed this study... the rest needs to be updated and coordinated.
 - Need a firm who can understand the missing pieces, and filter down a report to be shared with the Board of Trustees.
 - Request to review the material collected... Marianne to share this resource with Wally ahead of the next meeting.
- Gay noted that following the capital plan, we had partnership meetings across the board to identify potential partnerships. Review of the ARC process, noting that a lot of information was collected on these schools already.
- Craig noted that once this is distilled down into a recommendation, this would be brought forward to the external consultant to present options for the Board of Trustees for final decision.
- What kind of expertise do we need on this project?
 - Wally noted we likely don't need Watson, as they are more focused on the demographics side
 - If enrollment projects are our need- we can narrow the scope of our work.
 - They will be pricey!
 - Wally feels we need a good project manager... this could be done internally, but the transparency aspect is well noted.
 - Will need someone familiar with schools, the sale of schools,
- Question on how the consultant will be informed about scenarios?
 - Wally- we aren't talking about closing schools that is totally out of scope.
 - We have gone through an accommodation review already- if there was a closure recommendation, would we not have received this already? Gay noted no additional closures were noted in the capital plan for the north bay.
- Question for Liz- do we need ACR reviews to close buildings not being used as "schools" (ie: board office/ adult learning centre and the maintenance shop)?
 - Liz- when you have alternative facilities, you can't apply for your own MIDENT number- you have to tie to the closest secondary number. It does have a specific facility number, so we would have to carefully look to see about the need for an ACR. Recall that adult center is an "instructional facility"... so the disposition of property process (and ensuing legislation) must be followed.
 - Years ago we got permission to use surplus to do 800K in renovations on adult learning centre... sharing from a public perception piece. How would this affect write offs?
 - Board office and maintenance are non-instructional; spaces- so how would these be closed? Liz noted the regulation would need to be re-read to ensure we are following the process
 - Wally noted LLC would have to be reviewed carefully, as the board will need to provide adult instruction. This serves adults, ESL students (credits not instruction).
- Should be very complicated- board offices/maintenance shop non instructional. WSS closed. Thoughts on what to do about the Annex? (attached to Vincent Massey).
 - Originally owned by the Mattawa Conservation authority... Liz called upon for this history of the partnership.

- Liz recalled it was formally the property of the NNDSB with a solid shared space agreement in place to share costs. MCA ran in to financial issues that lead to the dissolution of this agreement.
- Board owns the parking lot and a triangular piece of property nearby. NNDSB owns the property the school sits on, and around it.
- To sum this up: VM and the Annex are considered one property? So we cannot do anything to the Annex without severing the property.
- Liz recalls the upstairs was built in a modular fashion to be configured into instructional spaces.
 - Craig- we could move the staff out of the annex

Next meeting: MS/LB to bring forward data. Share for review.

Review of the second attachments

- Note an updated copy was shared.
- Value noted in capturing all the possibilities- review of all possibilities.
- Suggestion to recommend an engineering study of WSS... clarification from Marianne to confirm we need to continue to explore options before moving ahead with our preferred outcome.
 - Note that engineering studies take a lot of time though.....
 - Marianne- we just need this to be identified as a "potential outcome" so we can move to the next step to procure the engineering study
 - What is the benefit of an engineering study- this will give us a true evaluation of usability. It speaks to the usability of the building- will consider the value, age, renewal, etc to inform next steps.
 - Wally invited to comment on engineering study- noting MOE will focus on lifecycle costing.
 - Question for Liz- can we just take over a school and use it for an office? Liz... there must be some kind of hoop to move from instructional to administrative purposes... Liz/Wally not sure on exact process... not that current board office used to be a school.
- Agreed upon first step: procure a consultant.
- Wally- if we reviewed a floor plan of WSS- are we sure this is going to work for us?
 - Gay- we have reviewed this...
 - Craig- the value of the consultant is to evaluate all this evidence and develop all the most viable sustainable, logical options.
- Gay- value noted in getting data upfront to inform the next steps.
- There are many angles for decision-making...

Recommendation to move forward with procuring a consultant.

- What does this look like?
- RFP/RFQ?
- Qualifications of consultant to execute this project?
- What is the scope of work? (ie- what are they being tasked to do?)

Are we going to task someone to bring this forward?

- Liana and Marianne have begun this work and will fine tune to bring forward at the next meeting.
- Craig- there is a diverse range of qualifications.... Do we go with a project manager that will coordinate this work?

- Not looking for an expert, but someone who can procure leadership in areas of need.
- THIS WILL BE THE FOCUS OF THE NEXT MEETING
 - Ideas around scope of work
 - Qualifications of consultant
 - Avail binder data to wally

Next meeting: looking at a monthly cycle.... Liana and Marinne need time to digest and delveop next steps.

Could we gather together next week to review these pices and from there, this is likely the scope fo he RFP. Form here, would need to find 3 candidates to invtd to participate. Wally noted the timeline for RFP can be flexible... Liz- it's a "RFQ" not "RFP"

- Liana requested a template to draw from.... Liana to reach out to Paul on this item. Wally noted RFQs are very simplified.
- KM to do a doodle poll.... Wed/Thurs.

2:36 PM- adjourned.

3.0 New Business

-

4.0 Adjournment

There being no further business to discuss, on February 11, 2021 the Multi-Year Strategic Plan Committee stands adjourned at 10:37 AM.

Minutes: BS/km.