

**St John the Baptist Church  
Building Committee**

**October 27, 2010  
Meeting Notes**

**Mtg. No.**                    8  
**Date:**                      January 28, 2010  
**Time :**                        7:00 pm  
**Location:**                Parish Centre

**Building Committee (BC) Members in attendance:**

Camillo D'Alimonte    [loriandcamillo@aol.com](mailto:loriandcamillo@aol.com)  
Bernie Colombe        [icolombe@dol.ca](mailto:icolombe@dol.ca)  
Jim Kennedy            519-738-4029  
Matt Sutton             [msutton@dol.ca](mailto:msutton@dol.ca)  
Ron Lepine – Chair    [rclepine@sympatico.ca](mailto:rclepine@sympatico.ca)

**Regrets:**

Dante Pagliaroli        [dante\\_pagliaroli@wecdsb.on.ca](mailto:dante_pagliaroli@wecdsb.on.ca)  
Bob Morency            [BobMorency@hotmail.com](mailto:BobMorency@hotmail.com)  
Fr. Brian                 [bjane@dol.ca](mailto:bjane@dol.ca)

**Meeting Highlights:**

**1. Opening**

Meeting was opened with a prayer (Chair) and welcoming.

The last meeting (No. 7) of the BC was a working session held on September 15, 2010 to review and prepare comments on the partial draft Bldg Condition Report. No meeting notes were issued, but a list of our on the comments on the draft Bldg Condition Report were circulated to BC members and forwarded to Sefra Architects.

**2. Committee Organization/Goals**

In order to maintain the target BC membership of 5 parishioners, several likely future candidates were identified. Matt Sutton will email contact information for candidate members to Chair, in the event Dante and Bob (absent) are unable to or do not wish to, remain on BC.

At the consensus of the BC members, Ron Lepine will continue as Chair for another year, in accordance with Terms of Reference (ToR) dated November 2009 attached.

BC Goals, as issued in November 2009, (attached) remain, with no new goals or objectives identified at this time.

In accordance with the ToR, the BC will plan on meeting a minimum of 5 times/year. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for November 17, 2010. This date was selected to meet as quickly as possible following the scheduled meeting with the Diocese and Sefra, November 3, to discuss the Updated Bldg Condition Report.

Camillo D'Alimonte has been assigned to make regular update report to the Pastoral Council on behalf of the BC.

### **3. BC 2010 Annual Report**

One of the goals of the BC is to prepare annual summary of significant repairs and upgrades completed during the past year, and issue a plan for anticipated repairs and expenses in the upcoming year. This report was prepared last year and is posted on the Parish web site.

Jim Kennedy has volunteered to collect the information for the 2010 summary and 2011 plan. R. Lepine will forward the 2009 Report and worksheets used last year to Jim as an aid in preparing the 2010 BC Report. .

### **4. On-Going Activities**

#### **2009 Roof Repairs**

The Diocese and architectural firm involved in the replacement of the Rectory, Office and Sacristy roofs in late 2009 have been notified on several occasions concerning roof drainage concerns, repairs to sidewalks damaged by the contractor, and damage to interior Sacristy walls due to water leakage. No responses received to date.

#### **Update of Building Condition Report**

The Updated Bldg Condition Report, which was scheduled to be completed in February 2010, is still not available. A partial draft was received in late June 2010. Since June, the only action known to have taken was to have a consultant (Advanced Environmental) selected by the Diocese to assess the work required to remediate the asbestos discovered in the Church crawl space. Still awaiting Advance Environmental's report.

The BC submitted initial comments and more comprehensive comments on the draft report, in June and September 2010 respectively. These comments dated August 11, and September 27 are attached.

After several attempts to get an update from the architectural firm preparing the Updated Bldg Condition Report for the Diocese, a meeting has now been scheduled with the architectural firm and the Diocese, on November 3, 2010 to discuss the report.

### **Information to Capital Campaign Committee**

Despite only having a partial draft report available, the BC Chair has on several occasions provided the Capital Campaign Committee with estimated costs to undertake the repairs identified to date in the draft report, to assist in establishing a fund raising target. The BC agreed with communications to date and endorsed a plan to submit to the Pastor as requested, a written summary of anticipated costs of repairs known to date. Action Chair.

#### **5. Next meeting**

The next Meeting of the BC is tentatively scheduled for 7 pm November 17, 2010. A confirmation and agenda will be issued prior to the meeting.

Ron Lepine, Chair BC

c.c. BC Members (above list)  
Karen McGuire

## **St John the Baptist Building Committee**

### **Terms of Reference**

Consultative (not management) advisory body, to assist the Pastor and Diocese in identifying property and building needs. Catholics have both a duty and right to participate in the inner life of the church.

Consultative role is theological based in keeping with the nature of the Church and Canon Law.

### **Role and Goal**

Maintain records, which are open to parishioners, and maintain effective communications to other Parish Committees, and Parish Council for both input and information as required.

Work with Diocesan Building manager to ensure buildings and properties are properly assessed, maintained in a manner that meets of the Parish, Diocese and local requirements

Prepare, annual summary and plan for property and building needs to Parish Council and finance Committee annually.

CURRENT GOAL IS TO ASSIST THE PASTOR IN IDENTIFYING CAPITAL NEEDS, WITH COST PROJECTIONS, FOR THE PARISH BUILDINGS AND PROPERTY WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK PROVIDED BY THE DIOCESE TO ENABLE THE CAPITAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE TO SET FUND RAISING TARGET BY SPRING 2010.

### **Organization**

Building Committee should have a minimum of three (3) Parishioners, the Pastor and Custodian.

Building Committee should be comprised of members of the Parish in good standing, and have a mix of skills or knowledge related to building/property maintenance, business planning, contracts, communication or leadership.

Suggest three (3) years terms for the Parishioners, the staggered as much as possible to maintain continuity. Building committee chair term of one-year minimum and 2 consecutive terms.

Building Committee shall meet a minimum of five times/year or more often as required.

November 2009

From: Ron Lepine [rclentine@sympatico.ca]  
Sent: August 11, 2010 3:29 PM  
To: John Bortolotti  
Cc: Matthew Sutton; Brian Jane  
Subject: Draft Condition Report

John

As per our phone conversation earlier today, and since I may not be able to attend the scheduled meeting of August 19, I am sending my initial comments on the Draft Condition Report dated June 2010. Unfortunately I have not been able to review the draft report with the Parish Building Committee as yet. Hopefully there is not too much I have missed. I will attempt to bring the Building Committee up-to-date as soon as possible, and get any further comments or questions to you.

In general the report appears to be comprehensive, and accurate. I had a few occasions of not readily identifying cross referencing between costs listed in section 3 with the recommendations in section 2. To be as brief as possible since some of these comments were discussed during our phone conversation the significant potential cost issues are in point form below:

1. The date of installation of the sloped Church roof does not appear to be documented in the report (sec. 2.2.1.1) References to the expected life of the asphalt shingles (sec. 2.2.2.1) might be cause to include the replacement of the roofing within the 10 year plan the report appears to cover. i.e. 2020 as listed in Section 3.0 "Phase 3" Work..... This might be a significant cost depending on the roofing materials selected.

2. The current draft report has the barrier free access and washroom (which would address the structural condition of the north entrance) in the 2015 - 2020 plan. I suspect the north entrance stairs and wall condition may require attention prior to that period and therefore may need to be advanced. In addition if the barrier free access is to be relocated closer to the front of the church there may be additional costs of repair to the north entrance.

I did not specifically mention these last 2 issues in our phone conversation but had noted them in my review.

4. Several references 2.3.1.2 and 2.3.3.2 discuss roof drains/downspouts and storm water being directed across landscaped areas or sidewalks. Recommendations are to ensure flow away from structures. The report does not specify whether the current grading or flow onto sidewalks/paved areas is correct or acceptable from a potential icing and slip/fall hazard. Are there more specific recommendations that can be made? i.e correct grade, connect to storm sewer etc.

5. Our current estimates for replacing the church flooring is in the range of \$80,000 to \$100,000. Your estimate of replacing carpet flooring in \$75,000 including 3/4 inch underlay. I am not sure our costs included underlay could you check this cost item?

As a general comment to help the Parish set its Capital Campaign Goal, I suspect we do not have any additional cost information at this time related to the cost repairs to the

nave floor members, asbestos removal or other structural issues. All costs in the draft report are considered by myself to be soft, but should the costs of the structural and asbestos issues which are more recent be considered even "softer" than others repairs and cause the Parish to be even more cautious and conservative in projecting the total cost of repairs without firm quotes?

Thanks for your time on the phone and if my schedule stays the same Matt Sutton and maybe others will be present at the August 19th meeting to represent the Building Committee.

Regards  
Ron Lepine

Chair SJB Building Committee

---

27/09/2010

To jbortolotti@sferaarch.com, bjane@dol.ca, msutton@dol.ca, icolombe@dol.ca, loriandcamillo@aim.com, bobmorency@hotmail.com, gminall@dol.ca

From: **Ron Lepine** (rclépine@sympatico.ca)

Sent: September 27, 2010 9:40:58 AM

To: jbortolotti@sferaarch.com

Cc: bjane@dol.ca; msutton@dol.ca; icolombe@dol.ca; loriandcamillo@aim.com; bobmorency@hotmail.com; gminall@dol.ca

John

Per my phone call last week here are some more comments on the draft Building Condition Report. Our Building Committee has had difficulty in getting together over the summer and early fall due to absences and meeting conflicts and there may be a few more comments or issues yet to be identified. We have tried not to clutter these comments with minor issues or formatting concerns, but what to focus on areas that may have a significant impact on our projected costs.

As discussed I was unable to locate my email with some comments I sent previously. As a result there may be some repeated comments. If you have a copy of my earlier email please send to me. Please confirm your receipt of these comments and we request a meeting in early October to finalize our comments and resolve any issues with the draft report. Please provide us with a few dates that would be convenient for you.

1. We feel age of installation and specs, including expected life, etc., for existing sloped roofs should be documented in sections 2.2.1.1, 2.2.2.1, 2.2.3.1 so this document provides a full account of the roofing information for future planning purposes.
2. The life expectancy of the shingles on the church sloped roof is believed to be 40 yr or more, not 15 to 20 yr as stated in section 2.2.2.1.
3. We also recommend the expected life expectancy of the newer flat roofs on the office, and sacristy be recorded in this report. sections 2.2.2.2, 2.2.4.2.
4. A deficiency related to the gap in the frieze board (section 2.2.1.1) but there is no discussion of the recommended repair in the Recommendations section following this section, although a cost of \$1K is listed in section 3.
5. Sections 2.2.2.2 and 2.2.5.2 recommend quarterly inspections by church staff and semi-annual inspections by Gillette roofing. Our comments are church staff require some training on how to conduct and record their inspections, and how much would it cost to have Gillette conduct their semi-annual inspections, especially since Gillette is an out-of-town contractor. If there is a cost to these inspections it might be more economical to have them performed by a local qualified service.
6. Related to roof inspections the Parish is on record of reporting to you that the portion of the new flat roof over the office boiler/St. VDP room does not appear to be sloped correctly and it has been reported by church staff water up to a few inches deep collects on the western portion of this roof against the east wall of the office.
7. Another follow-up items related to the new flat roofs included pending repairs to the sacristy interior walls that were damaged due to leaks in the new roof (subsequently repaired), and crack(s) in church sidewalks due to Gillette's material handling.

8. There is no observations in the report regarding the garage roofs, which we understood were within the scope of the report.
9. We believe the storm water management section of the Condition report is deficient in as much as it does not fully describe the storm water disposition systems. Are some connected to municipal sewers? parking lot drains? The municipality has apparently installed a storm water restrictor in the drain from the parking lot. What are its specs? Flooding of the parking lot and likely further erosion in the areas if the SW catch basin in the parking lot has been observed since the installation of the restrictor. Do the large roof areas drain onto the parking lot? hat is the drainage pattern for the church owned property east of the parking lot? Does the church property receive storm water flow from the adjacent former school, now owned by the town. Did the town size the restrictor to accommodate the total drainage area?
10. Recommendation 2.3.2.1 to install clean-outs at all downspout/PVC drain connections does not appear to have a cost listed in section 3 .
11. We believe recommendation no. 2.3.4.2, to assess grading away from buildings at downspout locations should have been conducted during the the assessment, not a follow-up.
12. We recommend that the time, methodology and personnel involved in the assessment of the church exterior masonry (section 2.4) should be documented in the report.
13. Section 2.4.1 2nd para. Suggests the "...exterior limestone and mortar joints appear to be reasonably good condition..." A few minor areas are identified and a modest budget of \$8K is suggested in section 3. The 2001 Condition Report sec. 3.2.2.6.1, suggest more extensive repairs to the church walls is required, up to 100% of the mortar joints, the 2001 report claimed these repairs in with the early bell tower costs in sec 3.2.3.1 so we cannot determine exactly what the author intended. It should also be noted the author of the 2001 report recommended repointing the entire rectory, this item discussed in section 2.4.3.2 "Office/Rectorry Exterior Masonry" suggests repointing of the west elevation appear to have been repaired since 2001, but have opened up again and require repointing. The 2001 report had a budget cost of of \$70,800 to repair the rectory masonry and rebuild the front porch. The 2010 draft report currently allows for about \$21,000 for porch and masonry repairs.
14. There are numerous items in section 2.4 of the draft report, which further comment would be better served in a meeting.
15. There does not currently appear to be a summary of the hazardous material assessment in the body of the report, just the consultant's report in the appendix. There is however a cost of \$8,000 assigned to removal of the asbestos plaster ceiling in the rectory basement. In my personal opinion, this cost appears to be out of line of costs being tossed around to remediate the asbestos insulation in the church crawl space.
16. SINCE ASBESTOS HAS BEEN IDENTIFIED ON SITE, DOES THE CURRENT REUGULATIONS REQUIRE AN ASBESTOS MANAGEMENT PLAN BE PUT INTO PLACE IMMEDIATELY, LABELLING, POSTING, TESTING, TRAINING ETC. IF SO CAN ADVANCE OR SIMILAR SERVICE PREPARE A PLAN AND CONDUCT THE INTIAL TRAINING AND IF SO AT WHAT PRICE?
17. There also appears to be absent in the current draft report any discussions related to the mechanical assessment, just the contractor's report in appendix B The Contractors suggestion to replace the 7 year old office boiler with a higher efficiency boiler at a cost of \$15,000 is included in section 3 cost summary. Should not this be explained in the report as X years down the road

and very discretionary? It is noted that the contractor suggests the church boiler venting does not meet current code and should be upgraded. Is this a risk? should there be a cost included for this?

Again the Parish Administration and Building Committee strongly recommend a meeting to most efficiently deal without comments and expedite the finalization of the Building Condition report.

Ron Lepine  
SJB Church