

# Anzac Community Hall

---

## *Public Information Session Q&As*

---

Inquiries made by the Anzac Community during the public information session:

**1) How much cost is associated with the roof replacement?**

The contractor, Corgan, estimates the cost of roof replacement to be \$251,000. This information is also identified in the Stantec report.

**2) Why was \$350 per square foot used for new builds?**

When providing cost estimates, the consultant uses standard budgetary prices based on previous experience with the type of facility. For the case of the Anzac Community Hall, Stantec estimates that to be \$350 per square foot. This per square footage estimate changes depending on the facility and features. For example, a facility like a Fire Hall may be \$750-850 per square foot, or an office building with a parking lot may be \$275-300 per square foot. These costs vary because of a variety of factors ranging from labour to specific build requirements.

**3) Are there other quotes from other builders? How many other quotes were done? Why would we not tender for all the hall? Separate issues would need separate tenders?**

There are no other quotes from builders. Corgan was secured as the contractor for the rehabilitation and remediation of this facility. As their work got underway, the hall's deficiencies were discovered. The RMWB and Corgan have a contract and it is still Corgan's construction site to manage. To have other contractors submit bids, there needs to be a decided change in scope of work and then have designed documents to tender against. Stantec have not created these design documents to go out to tender or an RFP.

**4) Why can't there be more responsible accurate numbers?**

The RMWB feels the numbers are accurate based on our benchmarking to the costs associated to other facilities that we have built.

**5) How do we see maintenance records?**

Maintenance records were supplied to the Anzac Recreation & Social Society and copies were available at the June 4 information session on the table set up before entering the Anzac Recreation Centre Field House.

**6) What maintenance and monitoring schedule maintenance were done on the hall?**

All maintenance records were provided. Our records for this facility date back to 2001.

**7) When was the building built?**

RMWB records indicate the Hall was built in 1990.

**8) How do we know if the facility was built correctly? Was it not built to Code in 1989 and what is the difference about the Codes in 2018?**

The Municipality does have the original drawings to reference to confirm if the building was built to the original plans. It can only be assumed that it would have been built to code in 1989. There have been numerous changes to the various Safety Codes, including the Alberta Building Codes from 1989 to today. As the building industry evolves and grows, the Codes change so there would have been many items which would not be in today's Code that were acceptable in 1989.

**9) RMWB took over ownership of this facility in 1995 at the time of amalgamation. Was a walk through conducted when they took this facility over? Did the RWMB get inspections done when they got the hall?**

Unfortunately, there is no record of a turnover walk through between Improvement District (ID) 18 and the RMWB. There is no record of an inspection at the time of transfer either.

**10) What was the amount the RMWB paid for the hall?**

As part of the Amalgamation agreement, by way of Government of Alberta approval, the Hall was transferred to the RWMB without cost. At the time it was turned over the RMWB, the net value of the facility was \$260,378.61.

**11) Who was/is responsible for maintenance in the facility?**

As was discussed at the public information session, both the RMWB and the ARSS have been responsible for maintenance for the facility.

**12) How much mold is in the building? Why are the mold levels high?**

It cannot be determined what the mold levels are in the building. However, as per the Stantec report there is mold throughout the facility. Traces of mold were found specifically in the janitorial room, bar area room, mechanical room and exterior wall cavity of the nurses' office. The environmental testing determined the levels of mold spores in the facility.

**13) There were three hazard assessments done in the past, why was the mold not noticed?**

No mold was visible when these assessments took place. Since there was no sign of mold in the assessments it was concluded that there was no mold present in the facility. At the time, the inspections/assessment did not involve invasive or destructive testing (such as removing walls) to see if there may be issues involving mold behind walls. Additionally, we are not aware of any air quality concerns being identified or reported to the Municipality.

**14) When previous floods happened at the facility, why were walls not looked at or baseboards removed and looked at?**

No mold was visibly present at those times, so it was determined that removing the base boards was not required.

**15) Regarding mold in the roof. In 2013 ARSS pointed out the roof leakage but nothing was done then. Multiple roof leaks have been reported. Was nothing done about those?**

Unfortunately, we do not have a record of the 2013 complaint and cannot speak to the circumstances surrounding it. We do not have any historical data or records that indicate if other roof leaks were repaired.

**16) Did flooding that happened in the hall contribute to the mold? If so, why was nothing done to remediate it?**

There were many possible reasons that there was mold growth in the hall and this outlined in the Stantec Report.

**17) If RMWB was monitoring, how did the mold get so bad? How long has mold been in the building? Why was it not fixed earlier when problems arose?**

There was never any visual presence of mold so it was unknown until this renovation started which exposed areas which had mold present behind walls and cavities. At this time, we cannot determine how long mold has been present in the facility. Unless disturbed, it is very difficult to trace the mold in the air as it is spread through water and disturbance.

**18) Why were there no subject matter experts at the meeting to explain and talk about the mold?**

Given tight timelines for scheduling, the subject matter experts were unavailable for the public information session.

**19) There was an issue noted with humidity. Is this the fault of the builder?**

There are many factors that can contribute to elevated levels of humidity in a building. Some issues could have been a result of the vapor barrier that was installed was either installed incorrectly or deteriorated over time and contributed to the high humidity in the ceiling cavities.

**20) Does RMWB have Title Insurance?**

The RMWB does not have title insurance. The RMWB insurance policy is for physical loss, fire, flood and liability only.

**21) Does RMWB have mold insurance?**

If the mold was created due to extenuating circumstances, like fighting a fire with water which in turn caused mold, then yes, the insurance policy would cover this. However, if the mold developed over time due to a prolonged exposure to water (or moisture) then insurance would not cover it – which is the case with this facility.

**22) Did the RMWB check on permits and requirements?**

Permits and approvals were obtained for the previous renovation work.

**23) If permits had been issued are they meeting today's requirements?**

Permits would have met the requirements of the day, but not necessarily today's Code requirements.

**24) Why are there no weeping tiles around the building?**

For this particular type of construction – grade beams and piles – weeping tiles would not have been Code requirements, so it would not have been installed.

**25) Where was the geo-technical testing done for ground water around the building?**

During the design process, Geo-technical testing was not identified as being required for the renovation work; therefore, the Geo-technical testing was not completed.

**26) What about community needs? Where are wakes and funerals going to be held? There is no appropriate place to hold it. It's too costly to hold at Rec Centre. Cost to use Rec Centre is \$125.00 per hour as opposed to using the hall at \$125.00 per day.**

Administration understands the communities' concerns and is committed to assisting with discussions between the ARSS and the Regional Recreation Corporation for the Anzac Recreation Centre to be an option for community activities. It is the RMWB's understanding that there were recently two wakes held at this facility and the feedback regarding this was very positive. Rental rates can be one of the things discussed. We feel that there are opportunities that can be explored to satisfy all involved, including discounted or waived fees.

**27) Why were the posters so misleading? It says "renovations" not demolition**

The community meeting was intended to discuss the project, which has always been the community hall renovation. The mold was discovered after the project started, which is when demolition became part of the consideration. The RMWB had also met with the ARSS on two previous occasions to provide an update on the renovations and share some of the challenges the contractor was having and the state of the building.

**28) Why was there no transparency? The community was just receiving documents now, with no time to review.**

The RMWB is committed to being open and transparent. When the RMWB received the reports and documents from the consultant, they were provided to the ARSS and made available at the public information session.

**29) How much damage is related to the fire?**

This facility was inspected by both the Insurance Adjustors and the Environmental consultant and the facility was cleared of any issues that would have stemmed from the 2016 Horse River wildfire.

**30) How much was the Canada 150 grant? Has anyone requested grants to pay for this project?**

This project was using the Canada 150 grant. The Canada 150 grant is \$126,019.33. The RMWB is always reviewing grants and acquiring grant funding where and when we can.

**31) What happened to memorial sign that was in the building?**

To ensure the memorial sign was not damaged during the renovation, all valuables were to be removed from the Hall. The memorial sign was taken down by ARSS and was placed in storage.

**32) How come Mayor and Council did not come out?**

Mayor and Council do not typically attend public engagements or information sessions. RMWB staff do their best to invite key project members to ensure an informative session is provided to our communities.

**33) What would the Municipality do with the land if the Hall is demolished?**

There are no plans for the land at this time. If this were to occur, then options for repurposing the land would need to be explored.

**34) Would RMWB consider giving the hall back to community?**

Given the extensive requirements to renovate and remediate the facility it would not be responsible for the RMWB to give the ARSS a building requiring such extensive work. There are also potential unforeseen cost and health and safety concerns associated with the repairs as well. We will continue to recommend that the building be demolished and an accommodation for the ARSS as well as other tenants be facilitated by the RMWB and RRC.

**35) Why can't the money be put up to build a new hall?**

Keeping in line with Council's Strategic Plan, the RMWB needs to act in a fiscally responsible manner. Unfortunately, in the past this hasn't always been a priority, but in today's economic reality it is something this Administration and Council are focused on. As well, with new infrastructure like the Anzac Recreation Centre, we believe it would be more prudent to explore the possibility of using that space to meet the needs of the community.

**36) Has the recommendation to Council changed since hearing the feedback and how community feels?**

As discussed and disclosed at the meeting, the cost to renovate and remediate the existing community hall is fiscally prohibitive. The recommendation would be to make every effort to ensure all tenants have been suitably relocated and their operational needs accommodated, while undertaking the demolition of the building due to health and safety concerns.

**37) Is this time sensitive? When does it need to go to Council?**

After listening to resident concerns, this issue was delayed from going before Council in June. Administration would still like to bring this forward to Council as soon as possible to address the mold issue as it is important from a health and safety perspective. Finding a suitable and agreeable resolution is important to us, as we want to ensure that the ARSS, and other hall tenants, are able to continue their operation in Anzac and the surrounding area.

**38) Could the ARSS obtain access to the community hall to obtain our own independent assessment of the condition and repair of our own community hall?**

The RMWB has completed a comprehensive assessment on the building including destructive testing. We hold the liability associated with the building and we will not allow another party to enter that building because of significant levels of mold within it and the potential health and safety risk to those that enter it. We empathize with the community and the sensitivity regarding the Community Hall and the historical significance that it has for the community. As indicated through previous discussions, we are committed to working with the ARSS regarding alternatives, including the potential relocation of the Society within the Anzac Recreation Centre.

It should also be noted that the assessment was completed by an independent third party, Environmental Monitoring Solutions, who utilized visual observations, destructive inspection techniques, the collection of analytical data and the use of specialized instrumentation to assist in determining the extent of fungal amplification and the specific locations where water damage and mold growth is present within the facility. The work of the report was conducted by trained and competent professional and technical personnel in accordance with generally accepted environmental health and industrial hygiene practices. Their reports provide professional opinions and observations of a technical and scientific nature. We are confident in the analysis undertaken and we stand by their conclusion and the associated cost estimates provided by Stantec for the remediation as benchmarked against similar facilities which have been built by the RMWB or our contractors.

**39) What if we have more questions about this?**

Please feel free to forward any additional questions regarding this to us and we will do our best to answer them.