



**Administrative Building Design Task Force Meeting
Wednesday, July 18, 2018 – 12:00 p.m.
Bud Clayton Memorial Room,
2069 Battersea Road, Glenburnie, ON**

AGENDA

Page

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Adoption of the Agenda**
 - a) **That** the agenda for the July 18, 2018 meeting of the Administrative Building Design Task Force be adopted.
3. **Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest and General Nature Thereof**
4. **Adoption of Minutes**
 - a) Minutes of Meeting held April 18, 2018
That the minutes of the Administrative Design Task Force meeting held April 18, 2018 be adopted.
 - b) Minutes of Meeting held June 27, 2018
That the minutes of the Administrative Design Task Force meeting held June 27, 2018 be adopted.
5. **Deputations and/or Presentations**
6. **Reports**
 - a) **Facilitated Session with Robert Wood – Follow-up to Previous Meeting**
7. **Communications**
8. **Other Business**
9. **Next Meeting**
10. **Adjournment**

2 - 4

5 - 6

7 - 12



**Minutes of the Administrative Building Design Task Force Meeting
April 18, 2018
Unconfirmed**

A meeting of the Administrative Building Design Task Force was held in the Frontenac Room, County Administrative Office, 2069 Battersea Road, Glenburnie on Wednesday, April 18, 2018 at 12:12 p.m.

Present:

Councillor Vandewal, Chair
Councillor Dewey, Vice Chair
Councillor Nossal
Councillor Inglis

County Staff Present:

Jannette Amini, Manager of Legislative Services/Clerk (Recording Secretary)
Kelly Pender, Chief Administrative Officer
Joe Gallivan, Director of Planning and Economic Development

CRCA Members Present:

Sandy Hay, City of Brockville Representative

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order immediately following the adjournment of the Council meeting at 12:12 p.m. in the Kingston Frontenac Rotary Auditorium and members proceeded to the Frontenac Room.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

Moved By: Councillor Dewey
Seconded By: Councillor Nossal

That the agenda for the April 18, 2018 meeting of the Administrative Building Design Task Force be adopted.

Carried

3. Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest and General Nature Thereof

There were none.

4. Adoption of Minutes

a) Minutes of Meeting held March 9, 2018

Moved By: Councillor Inglis
Seconded By: Councillor Nossal

That the minutes of the Administrative Design Task Force meeting held March 9, 2018 be adopted.

Carried

5. Deputations and/or Presentations

~~~~~

**6. Reports**

**a) 2018-058  
Administrative Building Design Task Force  
Site Selection Criteria and Priority Setting**

Mr. Pender provided an overview of the report, which includes the 3 steps that need to happen prior to any decisions being made.

Mr. Pender displayed an excel spreadsheet that listed suggested criteria, along with the ability to apply a rating to each, which was open to the committee for discussion and or amendments.

The committee discussed how far from its existing location it would be willing to go, noting that public comments seems to favour any new build being located within the County; however staff commute time also needs to be addressed. There is a property located in Harrowsmith that is owned by the Township of South Frontenac. Depending on the where and what the Committee places its priority on will determine what location will rise to the top of the list.

For visibility/profile, it would need to be located either on Battersea Road, Highway 38, Perth Road or Sydenham Road as those are the busiest roads. If decisions are being made regarding financial considerations, then availability of drinking water, existing septic and site ownership would rate high.

The Committee came up with some preliminary rankings regarding the site.

Mr. Hayes provided some insight into the discussions of the CRCA, noting specifically that during their meeting, it was concluded that it does not need to be located in the County.

Councillor Vandewal and the CAO will meet with their CRCA counterparts to look at a facilitated session.

**7. Communications**

~~~~~

8. Other Business

There was none.

9. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be at the call of the Chair.

10. Adjournment

Moved By: Councillor Inglis
Seconded By: Councillor Nossal

That the meeting hereby adjourn at 1:46 p.m.

Carried



FRONTENAC



**Minutes of the Administrative Building Design Task Force Meeting
June 27, 2018**

A meeting of the Administrative Building Design Task Force was held in the Frontenac Room, County Administrative Office, 2069 Battersea Road, Glenburnie on Wednesday, June 27, 2018 at 9:00 am.

Present:

Councillor Vandewal, Chair
Councillor Dewey, Vice Chair
Councillor Nossal

Absent:

Councillor Inglis

County Staff Present:

Kelly Pender, Chief Administrative Officer (Recording Secretary)

CRCA Members Present:

Alan Revill, CRCA Board Chair
Max Kaiser, Board Member
Donna Campbell, Assistant to, Chair & General Manager
Geoff Rae, General Manager
Tom Beaubiah, Manager, Conservation Lands
Rob McRae, Manager, Watershed Planning & Engineering

Also Present:

Robert Wood, 8020 Info Inc. (Facilitator)

1. Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

Moved By: Councillor Nossal
Seconded By: Councillor Dewey

That the agenda for the June 27, 2018 meeting of the Administrative Building Design Task Force be adopted.

Carried

3. Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest and General Nature Thereof

There were none.

4. Facilitated Session

After introductions, Mr. Wood reviewed the responses to the pre-meeting survey. Ten representatives of the two organizations provided input.

Discussion took place on the following subjects:

- Drivers for a joint approach
- Functioning of a partnership and ownership
- Physical location
- Financing and grant opportunities for shared facilities
- Potential partnership with the Township of South Frontenac
- Communications

Mr. Wood will provide a summary and an outline of questions and responses for the parties, plus a list of questions for each organization to work through at their individual meetings prior to re-grouping in late August, or early September.

5. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on July 18, 2018 at 12:00 pm in the Bud Clayton room.

6. Adjournment

Moved By: Councillor Dewey

Seconded By: Councillor Nossal

That the meeting hereby adjourn at 12:04 pm

Carried

Shared Admin Facilities Planning Session: July 18th, 2018

Discussion Guide:

The goal for this session will be to confirm the organization’s position, priorities and core requirements going into future discussions to explore the potential development of a shared administration facility.

Welcome & Overview of the Session

Clarifying Proposals for Shared Facilities/Options for Review

- Confirm acceptable site location parameters and search criteria.
- Review implications / interest in having a potential third-party co-locate.
- Confirm core functional, space and other site/building requirements.
- Confirm any on-site needs/opportunities for shared services.
- Develop general budget estimates / options for capital and lifecycle costs.
- Identify any operational, financial or governance concerns to be worked out before a shared model can be confirmed as a best option.
- Discuss scenarios and options that might be pursued with regard to site selection, construction, financial structure and nature of the partnership.
- Confirm timelines/milestones critical to development of a viable option.

First Cut: What might the best option look like?

Wrap-up/Next Steps & Takeaways

- Confirm availability for next joint meeting — week of August 6th or other?

Attachment: Facilitator Notes from joint planning workshop held June 27.

For Reference: Session Outcomes / Documentation
Shared Facilities Concept Planning Session: June 27th, 2018

9am, Wed. June 27 **Location:** CRCA Outdoor Centre **Facilitator:** Rob Wood

Participants: Tom Dewey Kelly Pender Ross Sutherland
Max Kaiser Geoff Rae (did not attend but
Natalie Nossal Tom Beaubiah gave input in advance)
Alan Revill Donna Campbell
Ron Vandewal Rob McRae

Facilitator: Rob Wood, 8020Info Inc.

Focus: The session's general aim was to confirm stakeholder priorities, requirements and timelines, potential synergies, alternative models, and key governance, relationship and process considerations.

Advance Input: Nine participants provided advance input (see agenda package) on a number of key questions to be discussed. General reactions in the session noted the broad range of perspectives and needs identified, plus the focus on achieving significant cost-benefits.

- Next Steps:**
- Confirm location parameters in terms of decision criteria, available options with services required for the site, and so on.
 - Confirm whether provision should be made for any future third-party interest in co-locating (e.g. Township of South Frontenac).
 - Map out detailed space requirements for both organizations.
 - Confirm any on-site needs/opportunities for shared services.
 - Identify and develop a deeper understanding of key operational implications involved in shared models.
 - Confirm components that will NOT be included as part of any shared facility (e.g. Paramedics, Fairmount, Outdoor Centre etc).
 - Develop a template outlining key factors/options to be discussed:
 - location options (within the County, with services, access etc)
 - functional models (owner/tenant, design/build etc.)
 - general design parameters (space needs, commercial grade)
 - approximate capital & lifecycle costs, and financial structure.

A General Framework for Exploring Options:

There was general agreement that the purpose of joint working group deliberations would be to investigate, consider options and make recommendations on **whether or not the CRCA and County of Frontenac should pursue a joint arrangement and co-location at a mutually agreed site**, or for each to pursue their own solutions to the problem of inadequate corporate office space.

The various options to be considered would be expected to reduce costs and open up opportunities for sharing space (board rooms, meeting rooms, staff areas, support space). There may also be some strategic and program synergies to be considered, including shared back office functions, community space and/or co-located services. At this stage potential options include new construction on greenfield or existing sites, renovation/ repurposing of current facilities, and leasing or design-build approaches.

Before any final recommendations proceed, more details would be required on proposed sites, designs and estimates of costs/feasibility vs. other possibilities that may exist for the stakeholders if they were to develop spaces independently.

Discussion: Points of Clarification and Initial Consensus

Focus on Cost Savings and Financial Efficiencies:

- The main “driver” for exploring a joint solution to administrative office needs is the desire for significant cost savings — not just a few percent savings on capital costs, ongoing maintenance or service efficiencies.
- Service sharing may bring the greater long-term benefit.
- It will be important to look ahead and make provision for any future changes or growth in service/space requirements that would evolve over the next decade or two.

Funder Expectations for Collaboration:

- FCM grants and funding support from other programs or levels of government usually have an expectation of collaboration among the parties wherever possible (rather than funding separate one-off solutions). They want to see creative partnering/approaches that make the best use of their resources.

Timelines:

- While the two stakeholders have slightly different timeline pressures, if the project were to proceed, the outline of milestone dates might look like this:
 - 2018: work through agreement in principle (“pre-nuptial”) by early fall
 - 2019: sort out the financing arrangements / budget issues
 - 2020: complete the design work
 - 2021: start the construction build, for completion perhaps in 2022.

Location:

- County participants expressed a political preference for locating any joint facility in Central or South Frontenac (provided suitable sites were to be available).
- The identity of the County and access to its services would be tied in part to the physical location of offices.
- Having an administration location in Frontenac County is not particularly a “plus” for other municipalities served by the Conservation Authority. CRCA is open to exploring this search area, but a future location should be fairly close to the 401 for ease of east-west connections across its region.
- Location near sewer or water services will be an important consideration (could be stand-alone).
- Digital access to high-speed broadband/fibre will be increasingly important.
- Impact on staff travel for both partners would likely be manageable provided a site is no further north than, say, Sydenham.
- Facility solutions for Frontenac Paramedic Services and Fairmount Home would be different/separate from/outside the scope of these considerations.
- The CRCA Outdoor Centre hosts about 7,500 students annually, many connected with education programs and/or the urban area of Kingston.

Third Parties:

- There may be some potential interest in a tri-party campus that includes South Frontenac at some future date. An early indication of interest would be needed. One option might be a design that permits expansion in a few years. Another would be to build and lease out space to an interim tenant, which could then be repurposed for Township use at some later date.

Potential Service Synergies:

- Corporate services would be the main area of interest to identify potential synergies — IT, financial services, HR and similar “back office” functions.
- The partners can learn from each other and the different types of approaches used (e.g. business structure, asset management, processes/best practices).
- The partners already have experience with similar models. For example, the County shares services under agreements with its constituent townships. The CRCA has deep experience working with multiple municipal jurisdictions.

Structural Aspects of Financing:

- Different models might be considered, including:
 - One takes lead as owner/builder/landlord; the other as committed tenant.
 - Each partner builds their own separate facilities on a single shared site.
 - Some facility is developed with both separate areas and also common/shared areas and services, similar to a condo corporation arrangement.
 - A design-build approach where a third party develops the facility (and assumes the risks) and both partners sign on as long-term tenants. The Guelph Agricultural Centre might be one example.
- The two organizations have different preferences, dynamics and restrictions/costs around debt structure, borrowing capacity and management.
- Level of indebtedness and risk management are also key factors to review.
- Delays in moving forward might lead to escalated costs later.
- It will be important to determine/clarify and confirm the level of quality and standards that would apply (e.g. general commercial grade; LEED-like vs. LEED-certified etc). Costs related to design will need to be acceptable/compatible for both partners in the building.
- The ownership role will be influenced by a number of factors — whoever takes the lead on financing, for example, might naturally assume the ownership role. Municipal partners might have a preference to own, especially if the facility were to be built on property it already owns. There are also political/taxpayer views to take into account.

Communications:

- A clear communications plan will be needed to explain the case for or against moving forward, and the alternatives.
- An open transparent process is needed to identify deep long-term savings and efficient provision of services. Cost controls will be important for both organizations, along with public perception that both organizations would maintain their integrity in any proposed development.
- Public opinion could be influential, and would be better informed if full information is made available. Political cohesion and support among the four townships in Frontenac County may also influence the decision-making process.
- It is important to demonstrate cost savings, but very difficult — how does one explain how a particular approach will “bend the curve” or demonstrate how much will be saved or not spent in the future, over time?
- Both parties might potentially feel some loss of identity if the chosen site were to be the other’s location — a weakening of their distinct “brands”.
- Good communications could also help ensure that the different mandates of the organizations are respected and not compromised.