EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Overall Impressions

This is a vibrant, fully functioning school that is operating "at its capacity". The basic building and its additions are solid with the notable exception of the exterior windows that have deteriorated considerably. The other major issue is the acoustic spray prevalent in the original building (1956/58) on the ceilings and upper walls. If the asbestos content in the spray is proven to be high, this should be a primary concern with regards to prioritizing any future renovations or remedial work.

2. Space Adequacy

The school is rated for 1,995 students and currently houses 1,870 students and 135 staff. The combined total of classrooms is 77 with two additional classrooms in Home Economics. This just meets the required 80 classrooms if 25 students are allocated per class.

Designated Library space is undersized (658 vs. 900 m^2). There are, however, a number of staff resource areas that did not enter into the existing area total.

Space for Physical Education staff is substantially undersized. P.E. staff are cramped 3 per small office (both male and female) and staff shower/change facilities are minimal. The study did not make price allowances for modifications or increases to the Phys. Ed. staff areas.

The overall building area exceeds guidelines by 30%. A large percentage of this is the Cafeteria, Kitchen, Servery and Dining space. Generally, the layout appears efficient and the spaces are utilized to their maximum.

3. Site

The site is very attractive – the building is well set back off 111 Avenue and 135 Street and surrounded by parks and sports facilities to the west and north of the building. Landscaping could be improved with more trees to the 111 Avenue/135 Street side but this is a minor issue and has not been budgeted for in this study. The two parking areas to the south and east of the building are adequate for staff needs. There is a minor problem with students parking in the north lot but this is

overcome by “tagging”. Both vehicular and pedestrian access to the building are logical and sufficiently separated as far as safety is concerned.

4. Exterior

The issues are the grade at the building face, roofs, glass block and windows.

The grade has dropped over much of the building perimeter. This is not an uncommon problem and the remedy is rather straightforward. The problem is a pressing issue in one location only – the east elevation of the gymnasium where water seepage has been encountered in the basement dressing rooms.

A significant portion of the original roof has been replaced in recent years. It appears to be time for the remainder.

The glass block found over the windows in the 1956/58 wing needs to be re-grouted (ie: removal and re-application).

The most complex issue to resolve is the replacement of the windows in the 1956/58 wing. It should be possible to remove and replace the existing sash (fixed and operating) and repair/re-finish the existing frames without removal. Further investigation may suggest total replacement but this might affect the glass block over and thereby further complicate the process.

The concern voiced by staff over the windows in the 1962/68 wing seems to originate from the operating windows. The frames are thermally inefficient to begin with and ice/dirt build-up around the openers and subsequent “forcing” of the windows to open and shut them have loosened the hardware and seals over time. A replacement of hardware and seals is recommended.

5. Interior

The interior is generally well maintained and has weathered well. It has benefited from the use of terrazzo floors and glazed concrete block walls – surfaces that are very durable. There is a possibility that the gymnasium hardwood floor may need replacement due to repeated sanding/re-finishing cycles and subsequent thinness of the planks. The floor thickness should be verified (this study allowed for re-finishing of floor only, not replacement).

The potentially big issue is the acoustically sprayed ceilings in the 1956/58 wing. It is assumed that the spray contains asbestos. If it is in a sufficient concentration and of a nature that asbestos particles become airborne whenever the texture is removed or scraped then there is a serious issue. The study has assumed that asbestos removal will be required and that new T-bar ceilings will be installed everywhere in conjunction with new HVAC, sprinklers, and re-lighting.

6. Mechanical

A major upgrade is recommended for the ventilation and heating systems. Ventilation improvements can be implemented using an exposed system (ie. no T-bar ceiling/painted ductwork) or one that incorporates a ceiling. The architectural budget allows for the latter. The heating system can utilize overhead radiant panels suspended in a new T-bar ceiling or floor-based radiators. The latter would require renovations to any existing millwork. Hence, the T-bar ceiling option is considered the less expensive and is reflected in the pricing.

An overall controls upgrade has been recommended.

Sprinklers are required throughout and these will be installed concealed over the proposed T-bar ceilings.

7. Electrical

A major upgrade to the power distribution system is recommended as well as re-lighting throughout, utilizing T-8 lamps and electronic ballasts to improve lighting quality. Receptacles have been added to all classrooms.

8. Barrier-Free

To make all areas of the school accessible to persons in wheelchairs three major components are required:

a) Vertical conveyances – ie: elevators and ramps
b) Power assisted door operation and unimpeded paths of travel
c) Washroom facilities allowing wheelchair access

The report budget allows for two elevator shafts, one for the 1956/58 wing and one for the 1962/68 wing. This is recommended in view of the differing floor levels between the two major wings. It may be possible, as an alternative, to locate one elevator shaft between the two wings and have the elevator open on intermediate levels. This will require the construction of new passageways/corridors accessing the elevator. The latter analysis can be carried out with the renovation project.

Summary of Observations and Recommendations:

Evaluation Ratings 3 or less

The estimated construction cost for the remedial work identified in the attached evaluation forms has been based on the Costing Unit Rate Chart developed by Alberta Infrastructure and supplemented by unit prices taken from industry sources. All estimates are based on Edmonton costs.

1	Site related work	$ 80,820.00
2	Building exterior	670,160.00
3	Building interior	1,640,560.00
4	Mechanical	2,984,625.00
5	Electrical	1,172,000.00
6	Portables (not applicable)	0.00
Total Estimated Cost		$6,548,165.00
7	Space Adequacy Assessment	
	Existing Total Area (m^2)	21,229.0
	Projected Required Area (m^2)	15,526.0
	Surplus (m^2)	5,703.0

Further Investigation

- Check light fixture ballasts for PCB (5.4.2)

School Data Plan Information

Site Plan – September 1979

Basement Plan – Rev. December 18, 1981

Main Floor Plan – No date

Second Floor Plan – No date

Area Summary – January 22, 1980

Facility Management Guide – 1999