



**CCI GROUP**

**SCIENCE • ENGINEERING • SOLUTIONS**

7900 KEELE STREET SUITE 200 CONCORD ON L4K 2A3

# **BUILDING                      CONDITION ASSESSMENTS EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

for

**Town of Canmore**

at

**Town of Canmore Civic Centre**

**902 7 Avenue**

**Canmore, Alberta**

Prepared for

**Dave Hubman**

**Supervisor of Facilities**

**CCIG Project No: T146434CA**

**CCIG Contacts: Deirdre Roe, John Kirkpatrick**

January, 2015

**CONTENTS**

- 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ..... 2
- 2.0 INTRODUCTION ..... 3
- 3.0 PURPOSE..... 3
- 4.0 SCOPE OF WORK..... 4
  - Data Collection & Preliminary Analysis ..... 4
  - Data Input & Report..... 5
- 5.0 METHODOLOGY ..... 6
  - Setup..... 6
  - Review of Existing Information and Drawings ..... 6
  - Site Inspections ..... 6
  - Data Entry ..... 7
  - Costing ..... 7
- 6.0 SUMMARY of DATA..... 7
- 7.0 ANALYSIS..... 8
- 8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 9
- 9.0 LIMITATIONS and ASSUMPTIONS .....11

### 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CCI Group Inc. (CCIG) was retained by the Town of Canmore, (Canmore) in 2014 to prepare Building Condition Assessments (BCA) for all identified municipal buildings/facilities within the Town of Canmore in response to the Request for Proposal #1413, dated August 1, 2014.

The basis of the assessments was to review any current or historical information on the facilities, arrange for inspections, conduct inspections, prepare expenditure plans and submit the reports with associated, representative digital images. Further, the basis of the inspections was one of condition as opposed to full compliance to any applicable regulatory standard. A total of seventeen (17) facilities were inspected in October 2014.

CCIG found that the facilities and associated components are in an overall fair-to-good state of repair with varying degrees of condition.

Notable findings include:

- General lack of record drawings and detailed documentation on past repairs or replacements.
- Repairs are required at most facilities to bring them into a state-of-good repair.

It is recommended that the high priority repairs/replacements be executed immediately to reduce potential liability from the deficiencies that are present, to minimize further deterioration of the assets and to bring the buildings into a state-of-good repair. It is also recommended that Canmore adopt standardized specifications for the design, construction, and maintenance of the facilities and associated components. This approach will allow for uniformity throughout the facility portfolio as a whole.

The reports serve as the basis for documenting the physical assets of Canmore. They are considered the starting point in the asset management program. Further analysis and the streamlining of repair/replacement execution events are required and expected.

## **2.0 INTRODUCTION**

CCI Group Inc. (CCIG) was retained by the Town of Canmore to conduct Building Condition Assessments of municipal buildings. The visual assessments of the facilities were conducted from October 20-24, 2014. Reports were compiled and submitted between October 31, 2014 and January 14, 2015.

## **3.0 PURPOSE**

The specific initiatives of this condition audit are:

- To determine the present physical condition of the listed facilities with respect to structural and architectural components, building envelope, mechanical/electrical systems, fire/life safety systems, and predictive 10 year renewal costs;
- To determine the scope, timing and current cost of all building component repairs or replacement likely to be required;
- To determine the finances required for both normal maintenance and capital repair/replacement of these components for budgetary purposes.
- To establish a consistent condition rating format for all key components for each facility and the subsequent life cycle expectancy of same.
- To provide a means by which Canmore can anticipate and forecast expenditures required for these components, rather than responding to emergency repairs/equipment failures as they occur.

## **4.0 SCOPE OF WORK**

The investigation process included the following:

- Correspondence with Canmore to discuss parameters of the assessment, obtain any relevant information, and determine the format of the final submission.
- Review previous documentation including drawings and reports, where available.
- Prepare a questionnaire for Supervisors/building maintenance staff.
- Conduct informal interviews with facility staff.
- Site inspection: Provide a visual, non-intrusive inspection of the facility, record information including digital photographs. Record quantities by visual means.

The purpose of on-site visual inspections was to provide a general indication of the present physical condition of all building components with respect to wear, performance and aesthetics. Performance is limited to actual conditions during the site inspection, e.g. testing and measurement was not executed on any properties.

### **Data Collection & Preliminary Analysis**

The process was essentially a walk-through of the facilities to provide us with basic information on the existing conditions.

We identified all applicable deficiencies/surface failures or conditions during visual inspections. These items are expected to require capital repair/replacement expenditures within the next 10 years. Cost estimates for the repair or replacement of key components are to be prepared based on current industry cost guidelines for the Canmore area. These estimates are intended for general budgeting purposes only, since the nature of the work required is defined only conceptually during this audit process.

Phasing of work is not shown in the expenditure plan; work is presumed to occur in the event year as follows:

Immediate repairs are considered Year 0 (2015) and Year 1 (2016).

Short term repairs are considered Year 2 (2017) to Year 4 (2019).

Mid/long term repairs are considered Year 5 (2020) and beyond.

### Data Input & Report

On completion of the visual surveys, all data were entered into Excel spreadsheets. The physical condition of each facility is described, along with observed critical faults, potential surface defects and areas of accelerated deterioration. Digital photographs of notable defects and normal conditions are also provided.

Each component was classified as:

**Good:** Newer installations or older installations that are wearing better than their in-service age. Minor imperfections can occur.

**Fair:** Newer or older installations that are wearing as expected based on in-service age versus useful service life. Imperfections and defects are common.

**Poor:** Installations that are nearing the end of their useful service life. Significant deterioration or imperfections are expected.

**Urgent:** Installations that have exceeded their useful service life, are obsolete or are in a state of disrepair due to neglect or unexpected physical damage (vandalism) or a combination of all.

Priorities were set as follows:

**Priority 1A:** Life Safety - due to liability issues from life and health issues.

**Priority 1B:** Legislative – due to legal requirements, including compliance with the 2006 Alberta Building Code.

**Priority 2:** State-of-Good Repair – for scheduled repairs or replacement to maintain functionality or replacement at end of useful service life.

**Priority 3:** Program Enhancement – for projects that would enhance or improve functionality but are not essential to maintain functionality.

**Priority 4:** Growth – where decisions to proceed are subject to future use of the building, and thus, is dependent on the intended use of the building.

### 5.0 METHODOLOGY

#### Setup

CCIG was provided with a list of facilities (including description, year of construction, and size) and drawings, where available. CCIG provided Canmore with a report template which was approved by Dave Hubman on October 20, 2014.

#### Review of Existing Information and Drawings

CCIG reviewed all information provided. Drawings were reviewed on site as they were available.

#### Questionnaires

Questionnaires were provided by CCIG, completed by Dave Hubman, and returned via email prior to inspections. CCIG reviewed and discerned information provided. Questionnaire responses are not included herein but are on record at CCIG offices. Questionnaires were discussed with building staff at the time of the site assessments

#### Site Inspections

The sites were visited during the work days, from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Visual measurements were taken of many building components to derive quantities and building code compliance. Defects were recorded where observed. Plenum spaces, crawl spaces, tunnels, attics were reviewed where possible (where safe to do so and without the use of special equipment or training). Model and serial numbers were collected where possible (where legible and without the use of ladders).

The following component categories were reviewed:

Structural and Architectural, including interior finishes and siteworks

Fire, Life Safety, and Fire Prevention

HVAC, Electrical, and other building systems

### Data Entry

BCA data was entered into the MS Excel template created by CCIG.

### Costing

Cost estimates were developed by CCIG using our experience with similar projects and 2014 RS MEANS Cost Data.

The costs are estimated only and proper project specifications and tendering. All repairs and replacements are to be grouped as Projects as opposed to single events. This will aid in reducing costs further.

## 6.0 SUMMARY OF DATA

Each report contains a summary of each major building category (structural, building envelope, interior finished, mechanical, electrical, accessibility, and site works) describing the components and identifying major short term recommendations.

Accessibility was discussed with regards to parking, washrooms, and other (building access, interior access, public features, and elevators).

### 7.0 ANALYSIS

As there are no established priorities provided to assist in cost-effective maintenance and rehabilitation of the buildings, we have taken the liberty to establish priorities based on the National Guide to Sustainable Municipal Infrastructure.

First priority is with safety standards. Building, site, and associated components are to meet minimum standards to reduce or otherwise eliminate the potential for unsafe conditions and to maintain a high level of overall safety by effectively removing components that are worn or defective. Poor and urgent condition ratings would be in this priority rating. This also includes legislative requirements.

Second priority pertains to the minimum condition levels (based on approved levels of service). As there are no current approved levels of service established, we have used the ratings Good, Fair, Poor and Urgent.

Fair indicates that the component is functioning with minor defects noted. Components in fair condition coincided, usually, with a State-of-Good Repair Priority. The component condition levels should be set by Canmore, to indicate that components are to be free from significant defects, etc.

Subsequently, a Good Condition would indicate that there is a low priority.

It is our opinion that all components, irrespective of facility type, are considered high-use whether open seasonally or year-round. The park facilities used seasonally may actually have more visitors on a month-to-month basis than Community Centres over the same period. The seasonal issue therefore should not be a key factor in the prioritization weighting.

If the components were to be ranked in terms of priority, then one could compare the immediate repair/replacement costs to the Total Replacement Value of the facilities in question. The higher the ratio, the higher the ranking. This ranking comparison is beyond the scope of this report.

In summary, the approach is to:

- Establish levels of service regarding all facilities and associated component conditions.
- Establish the assets.
- Identify needs.
- Identify prioritization.
- Budgeting via the packaging of projects.
- Project design.
- Project implementation.
- Performance monitoring.

## **8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

We recommend the following:

A systematic approach to the repair/replacement of the components is required. This would avoid repairs that may create further damage or are otherwise redundant or do not promote longer term viability of the component. As indicated previously, all buildings require immediate and/or short term repairs.

Urgent and high priority repairs/replacement must be executed immediately to limit liability.

It is imperative that additional 'risk' and/or 'use' signage be added to buildings deemed in need, to alert users of possible hazards and in turn limit liability.

If there is a need to further delay repair/replacement, then those facilities will require temporary repairs or areas are to be off-limits to public use.

All repairs and replacement of components are to be documented and stored in the central database system to allow easy access and amendments to the data presented.

Scheduling of repairs or replacement with other park or building restoration work.

Facility boundaries should be accurately defined to determine, without a doubt, with whom the responsibility for maintenance and/or replacement of the various components lies, e.g.) shared spaces with public school boards or tenant spaces.

Levels of service for each component should be developed and the financial/risk of reducing levels of service must be explored.

As-built drawings are required for Structural, Architectural, Mechanical, Electrical, and Site components.

Detailed, intrusive structural investigations are to be provided for all buildings and all main and associated structural components.

Provide standard definitions of building terms, etc.

Provide and track uniform component Asset numbers for all components.

The detailed level of the spreadsheet will necessitate frequent and on-going adjustment. Canmore is to track and record all events, including deviations from recommended CCIG events and costs, as they occur. This will assist in the compilation of future report updates by third parties.

## Building Condition Assessments - Executive Summary

Town of Canmore

---

It is recommended that designated substance surveys and asbestos management plans be prepared and made available to maintenance staff within the buildings. It is also recommended that suspected asbestos containing materials be removed following standard abatement procedures as opposed to maintaining or encapsulating them.

## 9.0 LIMITATIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS

The assessment of the facilities and associated components was strictly visual other than as described in the Designated Substance Surveys. Physical measurements were taken only at some areas, e.g. random guard heights.

The estimated expenditure values and totals are estimates only. Prior to the undertaking of any work, proper design and specifications must be prepared. It is at that time, through the means of physical testing, that a more accurate estimate of the repair or replacement can be determined.

The reports are not to be used as specifications for repair.

CCIG has estimated the quantity of work to be done at each site based on observations at the time of our visits.

Implementation of all recommendations, and their respective time lines, is encouraged to reduce liability or the potential for assumed liability.

Detailed construction and repair historical data were not provided by Canmore.

Costing was based on replacing the existing components. We have not included for any significant upgrades.

CCIG has taken every reasonable measure to ensure that data was captured, quantified, estimated and entered in a professional manner. Typographical errors or omission of smaller integral components or age of components, if they do occur, are not considered significant errors to warrant re-issued of reports. As such, the submission herein is considered a final report. CCIG cannot be held accountable for not incorporating new found information after the date of inspection. This would include the lapse time between inspection and reporting and between reporting and reviewing by Canmore.

### **CCI Group Inc.**

Prepared By:



---

(digitally signed)

Deirdre Roe,

Architectural Technologist

Reviewed By:



---

(digitally signed)

John Kirkpatrick,

Director, Corporate Projects