RE: Your request for access to information under Part II of the *Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (Our File TW/063/2017)

On May 2, 2017, the Department of Transportation and Works received your request for access to the following records/information:

`I would like to request, from March 2017 onward, copies of all written communications (e.g. emails, memos, reports, etc) that discuss the rationale behind cancelling the plans for a new school for the Mobile School system in favour of the proposed extension to Mobile Central High building as well as all communication from and to the department regarding the preparation and building of the extension to Mobile Central High school.`

I am pleased to inform you that a decision has been made by the Deputy Minister of Transportation and Works to provide access to some of the requested information. Please note that some correspondence responsive to this request has already been made available as EDU/041/2017 on the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy website and can be found at:


Access to the remaining record information contained within the records, has been refused in accordance with the following exceptions to disclosure, as specified in the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act (the Act):

- 40. (1) The head of a public body shall refuse to disclose personal information to an applicant where the disclosure would be an unreasonable invasion of a third party's personal privacy.
Please be advised that you may ask the Information and Privacy Commissioner to review the processing of your access request, as set out in section 42 of the Act. A request to the Commissioner must be made in writing within 15 business days of the date of this letter or within a longer period that may be allowed by the Commissioner.

The address and contact information of the Information and Privacy Commissioner is as follows:

Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner
2 Canada Drive
P. O. Box 13004, Stn. A
St. John’s, NL. A1B 3V8
Telephone: (709) 729-6309
Toll-Free: 1-877-729-6309
Facsimile: (709) 729-6500

You may also appeal directly to the Supreme Court Trial Division within 15 business days after you receive the decision of the public body, pursuant to section 52 of the Act.

Please be advised that responsive records will be published following a 72 hour period after the response is sent electronically to you or five business days in the case where records are mailed to you. It is the goal to have the responsive records posted to the Completed Access to Information Requests website within one business day following the applicable period of time. Please note that requests for personal information will not be posted online.

If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me by telephone at 709-729-5303 or by e-mail at MichaelCook@gov.nl.ca.

Sincerely,

Michael Cook
ATIPP Coordinator
Department of Transportation and Works
Enclosures

Disclosure harmful to personal privacy
40. (1) The head of a public body shall refuse to disclose personal information to an applicant where the disclosure would be an unreasonable invasion of a third party's personal privacy.

(2) A disclosure of personal information is not an unreasonable invasion of a third party's personal privacy where

(a) the applicant is the individual to whom the information relates;

(b) the third party to whom the information relates has, in writing, consented to or requested the disclosure;

(c) there are compelling circumstances affecting a person's health or safety and notice of disclosure is given in the form appropriate in the circumstances to the third party to whom the information relates;

(d) an Act or regulation of the province or of Canada authorizes the disclosure;

(e) the disclosure is for a research or statistical purpose and is in accordance with section 70;

(f) the information is about a third party's position, functions or remuneration as an officer, employee or member of a public body or as a member of a minister's staff;

(g) the disclosure reveals financial and other details of a contract to supply goods or services to a public body;

(h) the disclosure reveals the opinions or views of a third party given in the course of performing services for a public body, except where they are given in respect of another individual;

(i) public access to the information is provided under the Financial Administration Act;

(j) the information is about expenses incurred by a third party while travelling at the expense of a public body;

(k) the disclosure reveals details of a licence, permit or a similar discretionary benefit granted to a third party by a public body, not including personal information supplied in support of the application for the benefit;

(l) the disclosure reveals details of a discretionary benefit of a financial nature granted to a third party by a public body, not including personal information that is supplied in support of the application for the benefit, or
(ii) personal information that relates to eligibility for income and employment support under the *Income and Employment Support Act* or to the determination of income or employment support levels; or

(m) the disclosure is not contrary to the public interest as described in subsection (3) and reveals only the following personal information about a third party:

(i) attendance at or participation in a public event or activity related to a public body, including a graduation ceremony, sporting event, cultural program or club, or field trip, or

(ii) receipt of an honour or award granted by or through a public body.

(3) The disclosure of personal information under paragraph (2)(m) is an unreasonable invasion of personal privacy where the third party whom the information is about has requested that the information not be disclosed.

(4) A disclosure of personal information is presumed to be an unreasonable invasion of a third party's personal privacy where

(a) the personal information relates to a medical, psychiatric or psychological history, diagnosis, condition, treatment or evaluation;

(b) the personal information is an identifiable part of a law enforcement record, except to the extent that the disclosure is necessary to dispose of the law enforcement matter or to continue an investigation;

(c) the personal information relates to employment or educational history;

(d) the personal information was collected on a tax return or gathered for the purpose of collecting a tax;

(e) the personal information consists of an individual's bank account information or credit card information;

(f) the personal information consists of personal recommendations or evaluations, character references or personnel evaluations;

(g) the personal information consists of the third party's name where

(i) it appears with other personal information about the third party, or
(ii) the disclosure of the name itself would reveal personal information about the third party; or

(h) the personal information indicates the third party's racial or ethnic origin or religious or political beliefs or associations.

(5) In determining under subsections (1) and (4) whether a disclosure of personal information constitutes an unreasonable invasion of a third party's personal privacy, the head of a public body shall consider all the relevant circumstances, including whether

(a) the disclosure is desirable for the purpose of subjecting the activities of the province or a public body to public scrutiny;

(b) the disclosure is likely to promote public health and safety or the protection of the environment;

(c) the personal information is relevant to a fair determination of the applicant's rights;

(d) the disclosure will assist in researching or validating the claims, disputes or grievances of aboriginal people;

(e) the third party will be exposed unfairly to financial or other harm;

(f) the personal information has been supplied in confidence;

(g) the personal information is likely to be inaccurate or unreliable;

(h) the disclosure may unfairly damage the reputation of a person referred to in the record requested by the applicant;

(i) the personal information was originally provided to the applicant; and

(j) the information is about a deceased person and, if so, whether the length of time the person has been deceased indicates the disclosure is not an unreasonable invasion of the deceased person's personal privacy.
Access or correction complaint

42.(1) A person who makes a request under this Act for access to a record or for correction of personal information may file a complaint with the commissioner respecting a decision, act or failure to act of the head of the public body that relates to the request.

(2) A complaint under subsection (1) shall be filed in writing not later than 15 business days

(a) after the applicant is notified of the decision of the head of the public body, or the date of the act or failure to act; or

(b) after the date the head of the public body is considered to have refused the request under subsection 16(2).

(3) A third party informed under section 19 of a decision of the head of a public body to grant access to a record or part of a record in response to a request may file a complaint with the commissioner respecting that decision.

(4) A complaint under subsection (3) shall be filed in writing not later than 15 business days after the third party is informed of the decision of the head of the public body.

(5) The commissioner may allow a longer time period for the filing of a complaint under this section.

(6) A person or third party who has appealed directly to the Trial Division under subsection 52(1) or 53(1) shall not file a complaint with the commissioner.

(7) The commissioner shall refuse to investigate a complaint where an appeal has been commenced in the Trial Division.

(8) A complaint shall not be filed under this section with respect to

(a) a request that is disregarded under section 21;

(b) a decision respecting an extension of time under section 23;

(c) a variation of a procedure under section 24; or

(d) an estimate of costs or a decision not to waive a cost under section 26.

(9) The commissioner shall provide a copy of the complaint to the head of the public body concerned.
Direct appeal to Trial Division by an applicant

52. (1) Where an applicant has made a request to a public body for access to a record or correction of personal information and has not filed a complaint with the commissioner under section 42, the applicant may appeal the decision, act or failure to act of the head of the public body that relates to the request directly to the Trial Division.

(2) An appeal shall be commenced under subsection (1) not later than 15 business days

(a) after the applicant is notified of the decision of the head of the public body, or the date of the act or failure to act; or

(b) after the date the head of the public body is considered to have refused the request under subsection 16(2).

(3) Where an applicant has filed a complaint with the commissioner under section 42 and the commissioner has refused to investigate the complaint, the applicant may commence an appeal in the Trial Division of the decision, act or failure to act of the head of the public body that relates to the request for access to a record or for correction of personal information.

(4) An appeal shall be commenced under subsection (3) not later than 15 business days after the applicant is notified of the commissioner’s refusal under subsection 45(2).
Good morning everyone,

Attached are minutes from our meeting on March 15th. Please review and advise of any comments or additions. Thanks.

Chad Phillips
Engineer II
Dept. of Transportation & Works
Building Design & Construction Division
(709) 729-1640
cadphillips@gov.nl.ca
# Mobile Central High Extension

**Project Number:** 400934006

**Location:** 5th Floor Boardroom, Confederation Bldg.

**Date & Time:** March 15, 2017

**Start:** 11:00 am

**End:** 12:00 pm

**Topic:** Mobile Extension Layout Discussion

## No. 1 Extension Layout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>SNC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- TW and EECD advised SNC the extension has to accommodate the 9 classrooms and computer room as per RFP. SNC to revise and resubmit layout for review.
- EECD stated that classroom sizes in proposed layout (70-75 sq. m) can be reduced slightly to approx. 68 sq. m. Advised a classroom could be slightly smaller to accommodate extension.
- Mechanical/Electrical room not needed on each floor. Could utilize existing Mech./Elec. rooms for the extension. If space is limited, rooftop units can be considered. Entrances to the Mech./Elec. room, while not ideal, could be provided through one of the classrooms. SNC to review and provide new mech/elec rooms in revised layout.
- Existing exterior exit from music room can be moved if needed to make room for extension.

## No. 2 Cafeteria Extension

- SNC presented concept for extension to existing cafeteria.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Proposed 2000 sq. ft. extension can fit a maximum of 144 seats, bringing possible total to 270 with existing.</td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>SNC to provide estimated cost for proposed cafeteria extension.</td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Jim to forward anticipated future school population. May not need the full proposed extension to do a 2 lunch schedule based on future population. SNC will scale back the proposed cafeteria extension if 144 seats not needed.</td>
<td>ESD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>TW and EECD to have internal discussion on proposed cafeteria extension.</td>
<td>TW/EECD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td><strong>Septic System</strong></td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>SNC to forward estimate for replacement of existing septic field.</td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td><strong>LEED</strong></td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>SNC to assist with LEED exemption.</td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Email chain between EECD and Climate Change Office forwarded to SNC. OCC looking for additional info from consultant as to why some items cannot be pursued to achieve LEED.</td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>The site is restricting the options for additional parking spaces.</td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>SNC proposed utilizing land across Riverhead Rd from the school to create additional parking.</td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>TW and EECD to discuss internally and advise after SNC provides estimates.</td>
<td>TW/EECD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td><strong>Environmental Report</strong></td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>TW advised that Phase I environmental report for the existing school has not been located, its unknown if they were even completed. SNC to proceed with Phase I environmental</td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td><strong>Construction Phasing</strong></td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>To accelerate schedule, may consider tendering the site work as a separate construction package. SNC to advise when they can have a site package ready for tender.</td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Completion Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Option to include building foundations in this package to be discussed further.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Re item #1: I took mech access as being inside a classroom or external to school was a take away for me vs decided in mtg; in talking to trades folks here, the preference is obviously inside/not-classroom access, but between the two options presented, outside access preferred. We do certainly have places where access is through classrooms so it is not earth shattering either way – but if options exist, external is NLESD choice.

Re #5: We are supposed to have a traffic study that will look at traffic flow now, during construction, and post-construction and will also detail parking needs given new populations once extension is complete. Wouldn't it be better to engage traffic engineer now to inform parking space discussion?

Jim

From: Phillips, Chad [mailto:ChadPhillips@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 11:53 AM
To: Henstridge, Wendy; Hallett, Natalie; Carroll, Michael; Forward, Steven L; 'Jim Sinnott' <jimsinnott@nlesd.ca>
Subject: Mobile Ext Meeting Minutes

Good morning everyone,

Attached are minutes from our meeting on March 15th. Please review and advise of any comments or additions. Thanks.

Chad Phillips
Engineer II
Dept. of Transportation & Works
Building Design & Construction Division
(709) 729-1640
chadphillips@gov.nl.ca

“This email and any attached files are intended for the sole use of the primary and copied addressee(s) and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any distribution, use or copying by any means of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender.”

Confidentiality Warning: This message and any attachments are intended for the sole use of the intended recipient(s), and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not an intended recipient, any review, retransmission, conversion to hard copy, copying, circulation or other use of this message and any attachments is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete the message and attachments immediately and notify the sender by return email. Thank you!
Hi All,

Please note that the next Mobile Central High School Extension meeting is now scheduled for April 6th at 10:00am.

Since is away I cannot send out this update via Outlook.

Thanks
Wendy

Wendy Henstridge, P.Eng
Design Manager
Building Design and Construction

Department of Transportation & Works
Government of Newfoundland & Labrador
P.O. Box 8700, St. John’s, NL A1B 4J6
Office: (709) 729-3460
Wendyhenstridge@gov.nl.ca
Good morning everyone,

Attached are the meeting minutes and updated milestone checklist from our Progress Meeting on April 6th on Mobile High Extension. Please review and advise of any comments or corrections. Thanks.

Chad Phillips
Engineer II
Dept. of Transportation & Works
Building Design & Construction Division
(709) 729-1640
chadphillips@gov.nl.ca
MEETING MINUTES
Mobile Central High Extension
Project Number: 400934006

Location: 5th Floor Boardroom, Confederation Bldg.
Date & Time: April 6, 2017
Topic: Mobile Extension Layout Discussion

Start: 10:00 am
End: 11:00 am

Name: Company/Department:
Those in attendance:
Wendy Henstridge Transportation & Works
Chad Phillips Transportation & Works
Kim Kieley Transportation & Works
Michael Carroll Transportation & Works
Natalie Hallett Transportation & Works
Rebecca Penney Transportation & Works
Jim Sinnott NLESD

SNC Lavalin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Project Milestone Checklist</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 6 - Milestone checklist was updated. See attached.</td>
<td>TW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 3 – Checklist updated. Two preliminary design layouts were presented.</td>
<td>TW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar 3 – Checklist updated. Three revised options presented for the extension.</td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+/- 30% cost estimate received is higher than TW had anticipated. TW to meet to discuss options regarding space programming.</td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SNC to provide cost estimate for replacement of existing septic field (estimate only includes new septic field).</td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apr 6 – Checklist updated.</td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Extension Layout</td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar 15 - TW advised SNC the extension has to accommodate the 9 classrooms and computer room as per RFP. SNC to revise and resubmit layout for review</td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TW stated that classroom sizes in proposed layout (70-75 sq. m) can be reduced slightly to approx. 68 sq. m. Advised a classroom could be slightly smaller to accommodate extension.</td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEETING MINUTES  
Mobile Central High Extension  
Project Number: 400934006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mechanical/Electrical room not needed on each floor. Could utilize existing Mech./Elec. rooms for the extension. If space is limited, rooftop units can be considered. Entrances to the Mech./Elec. room, while not ideal, could be provided through one of the classrooms. SNC to review and provide new mech/elec rooms in revised layout.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Existing exterior exit from music room can be moved if needed to make room for extension.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>Apr 6</strong> - SNC presented revised layout for extension, 2 floors with 5 classrooms per floor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>TW advised several classrooms in the revised layout are undersized. SNC advised they revised classrooms based upon the minimum code size of 55 sq. m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>SNC advise current water storage tanks may not be of adequate size to accommodate extension, may have to incorporate auxiliary storage tank into extension footprint.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Current location of doors exiting Yard Storage room opening into hallway in new extension may not be adequate, can be moved to open to exterior of building.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>SNC to revise current layout to expand current small classrooms, will look into how far can extend extension without causing other problems in terms of retaining walls, access road, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.0 Cafeteria Extension
- **Mar 15** - SNC presented concept for extension to existing cafeteria.
- Proposed 2000 sq. ft. extension can fit a maximum of 144 seats, bringing possible total to 270 with existing.
- SNC to provide estimated cost for proposed cafeteria extension.
- Jim to forward anticipated future school population. May not need the full proposed extension to do a 2 lunch schedule based

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>SNC</th>
<th>ESD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>on future population. SNC will scale back the proposed cafeteria extension if 144 seats not needed.</td>
<td>TW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- TW to have internal discussion on proposed cafeteria extension.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Apr 6</strong> – Cost estimate for proposed cafeteria extension received from SNC. TW to discuss internally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Septic System</td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Mar 15</strong> - SNC to forward estimate for replacement of existing septic field.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Apr 6</strong> – Estimate for replacement of existing field received. SNC to send more detailed breakdown of septic field replacement costs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>LEED</td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Jan 6</strong> - LEED exemption is being sought for this project, but TW is having some pushback from Climate Change Office for this request. SNC-Lavalin to provide LEED scorecard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Feb 3</strong> – No update.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Mar 3</strong> – Scorecard received from SNC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Mar 15</strong> - SNC to assist with LEED exemption.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Email chain between TW and Climate Change Office forwarded to SNC. OCC looking for additional info from consultant as to why some items cannot be pursued to achieve LEED.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Apr 6</strong> – SNC to provide requested LEED information to assist with exemption.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Jan 6</strong> - SNC to update schedule.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Feb 3</strong> – SNC to send revised schedule next week. Preliminary cost estimate to be sent at a later date before next meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Mar 3</strong> – No update to schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Apr 6</strong> – Revised schedule will be sent after layout for extension is finalized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Mar 15</strong> - The site is restricting the options for additional parking spaces.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- SNC proposed utilizing land across</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Riverhead Rd from the school to create additional parking. TW to discuss internally and advise after SNC provides estimates. Apr 6 – Traffic study needed to quantify additional parking required. TW to review internally if any land adjacent to the school property is that which could be utilized if off-site parking to be provided.</td>
<td>TW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Environmental Report</td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td>Mar 15 - TW advised that Phase I environmental report for the existing school has not been located, its unknown if they were even completed. SNC to proceed with Phase I environmental. Apr 6 – SNC to proceed with Phase I Environmental.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>Construction Phasing</td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td>Mar 15 - To accelerate schedule, may consider tendering the site work as a separate construction package. SNC to advise when they can have a site package ready for tender. Option to include building foundations in this package to be discussed further. Apr 6 – No update. To be discussed once concept completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>Client Concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 6 - Operations of school must be maintained during duration of project. Issues of parking and material storage will need to be addressed as there is limited space available on site. Feb 3 – Jim forwarded email from Principal highlighting parking lot issues. Additional parking will be required as part of school expansion. Loss of parking spaces will be inevitable during construction. Based on current 3-story layout of extension, roof snow loads to be reviewed for existing building (i.e. existing gymnasium roof). Mar 3 – Testing of fire suppression flows was noted that it would deplete all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
available water supply tanks for the school, and would take several days to resupply. Testing should be undertaken during longer period when school is unoccupied, possibly over Easter holidays. SNC to coordinate with TW.
- **Apr 6** – Snow loads will need to be reviewed on areas where extension meets existing school.
- TW to coordinate with NLESD to determine if school will be unoccupied for a period over Easter break that will allow testing of the fire suppression system. Coordination with SNC over timing of testing will occur after notification from NLESD.

11.0 Other business
- **Feb 3** – SNC to conduct topographic survey this weekend.
- **Mar 3** – TW advised SNC to proceed with testing/investigations on site, including hydrant flow test, Phase I and II environmental assessment, geotechnical investigation, etc.
- Perculation testing cannot occur until the spring.
- **Apr 6** – Perculation testing will occur after temperatures rise and snow melts from septic field area.

12.0 Date of Next Monthly Meeting
- Friday, May 5th, 10:00am, Highway Design Boardroom
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANNING / PROGRAMMING</th>
<th>Required? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Responsible for Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Space Program</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SNC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Allocation Provided</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SNC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Program Sign Off</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SNC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Cost Estimate (+/- 30%)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SNC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE Evaluation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watershed Area Checked (consultation with Dept. of Environment)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SNC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone Area Checked (latest climate change data)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SNC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Sewer Services Availability</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SNC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Sewer Services Adequates (if no, who doing services?)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SNC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical Report Required</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SNC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I Environmental Report Required</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SNC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II Environmental Report Required</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SNC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazmat Report Completed in Consultation with I.H.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SNC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Accessible Building (existing building)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SNC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topographic Survey</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>TW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Survey</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>TW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Study Required</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SNC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEA on Existing</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SNC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Safety Study on Existing</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SNC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Test for Hydrants</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SNC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEMATIC DESIGN</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floor Plans - Schematic</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SNC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Sign Off on Floor Plans</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NLESD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Comparison Chart (sign off by EECD director)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>EECO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register as LEED Exemption</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>EECO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Plan Completed and Signed off by TW, School District and EECO PM</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>TW, EECO,NLESD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Education and Early Childhood Development Capital Milestone Checklist (March 3, 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 2 - Approval of Design Development</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONCEPT DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Plans - Concept</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPM Review (sprinkler, ventilation, roof anchor, and enhanced listening system)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept Design Report</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. R. Review</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling of Work Resolved with School District(including temporary existing in occupied school)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 2a - Approval of Concept Design</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED Score Card</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Plans - Design Development</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Development Report</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Environment Approval (septic tanks, large bodies of water, changing drainage, etc.)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 2b - Approval of Design Development/Update on Cost &amp; Scope</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACT DOCUMENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% Review Package</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Approval of Civil Design (hardscape, drainage)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% Review Package</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service NL Approval</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Party Review</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretender Estimate (+/- 10%)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 3 - Approval to Tender</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TENDER PERIOD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP1 - Site Development Tender Pkg. *</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender CP1 *</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award CP1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP2 - Building Tender Pkg.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender CP2</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 4 - Approval to Award</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-commitment in Place</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award CP2</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCTION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substantial Completion CP1 (estimate date)</td>
<td>Project to be tendered as one package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Completion CP1</td>
<td>Project to be tendered as one package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioning CP1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Commissioning</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof Anchor Commissioning</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial Completion CP2 (estimate date)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy Permits</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M Manuals</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As. Butts</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Completion CP2 (estimate date)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioning CP2</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warranty Inspections</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED Certification Submittal</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Site work and site services, it may be issued under stage 2
Sent comments to Wendy and Natalie prior to minutes

SNC tells me they have since supplied another floor pan with larger classrooms?

Jim

From: Phillips, Chad [mailto:ChadPhillips@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 10:03 AM
To: Henstridge, Wendy <WendyHenstridge@gov.nl.ca>; Kieley, Kim <KimKieley@gov.nl.ca>; Forward, Steven L <StevenForward@gov.nl.ca>; Hallett, Natalie <NatalieHallett@gov.nl.ca>; Carroll, Michael <MichaelCarroll@gov.nl.ca>; Penney, Rebecca <RebeccaPenney@gov.nl.ca>; 'Jim Sinnott' <jimsinnott@nlesd.ca>
Subject: Mobile Extension Meeting Minutes

Good morning everyone,

Attached are the meeting minutes and updated milestone checklist from our Progress Meeting on April 6th on Mobile High Extension. Please review and advise of any comments or corrections. Thanks.

Chad Phillips
Engineer II
Dept. of Transportation & Works
Building Design & Construction Division
(709) 729-1640
chadphillips@gov.nl.ca

“This email and any attached files are intended for the sole use of the primary and copied addressee(s) and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any distribution, use or copying by any means of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender.”
Have we received the new drawings?
The consultant needs to be informed that his line of contact is through Chad. Any and all query should come from our office, not the client's client...will make the project run much smoother if it is managed that way. Also, with a tight schedule, we need to be on control of this, it will lead to changes requested that we know nothing about.

Kim Kieley, P.Eng
Manager Facility Services Engineering
Transportation and Works - Building Design and Construction

My understanding is that there needs to be something checked; I haven't seen the new plan. We should have something soon (many, many people out sick/off today.)

Sent comments to Wendy and Natalie prior to minutes

SNC tells me they have since supplied another floor pan with larger classrooms?

Jim
Good morning everyone,

Attached are the meeting minutes and updated milestone checklist from our Progress Meeting on April 6th on Mobile High Extension. Please review and advise of any comments or corrections. Thanks.

Chad Phillips
Engineer II
Dept. of Transportation & Works
Building Design & Construction Division
(709) 729-1640
chadphillips@gov.nl.ca

“This email and any attached files are intended for the sole use of the primary and copied addressee(s) and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any distribution, use or copying by any means of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender.”

Confidentiality Warning: This message and any attachments are intended for the sole use of the intended recipient(s), and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not an intended recipient, any review, retransmission, conversion to hard copy, copying, circulation or other use of this message and any attachments is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete the message and attachments immediately and notify the sender by return email. Thank you!
SNC has sent in a preliminary revised drawing for Mobile later last week, but there was some items pertaining to the civil work they need to have checked before they can confirm to the new layout. The building footprint was pushed out slightly towards the west, so they need to check with their civil team in terms of how this will affect the retaining walls, fire access road, etc. As soon as I confirm with SNC everything is fine with the new layout, hopefully this morning, I will send along the newest drawing. Sorry for any confusion.

Chad
Attached is the revised layout for Mobile Extension. Advised there is no issue with the Civil work with this revised layout, may just lose one parking space.

Chad

SNC has sent in a preliminary revised drawing for Mobile later last week, but there was some items pertaining to the civil work they need to have checked before they can confirm to the new layout. The building footprint was pushed out slightly towards the west, so they need to check with their civil team in terms of how this will affect the retaining walls, fire access road, etc. As soon as I confirm with SNC everything is fine with the new layout, hopefully this morning, I will send along the newest drawing. Sorry for any confusion.

Chad

My understanding is that there needs to be something checked; I haven't seen the new plan. We should have something soon.

From: Jim Sinnott [mailto:jimsinnott@nlesd.ca]
Sent: Thursday, April 13, 2017 4:49 PM
To: Phillips, Chad <ChadPhillips@gov.nl.ca>; Henstridge, Wendy <WendyHenstridge@gov.nl.ca>; Kieley, Kim <KimKieley@gov.nl.ca>; Forward, Steven L <StevenForward@gov.nl.ca>; Hallett, Natalie <NatalieHallett@gov.nl.ca>; Carroll, Michael <MichaelCarroll@gov.nl.ca>
Subject: RE: Mobile Extension Meeting Minutes

Sent comments to Wendy and Natalie prior to minutes

SNC tells me they have since supplied another floor pan with larger classrooms?

Jim
Good morning everyone,

Attached are the meeting minutes and updated milestone checklist from our Progress Meeting on April 6th on Mobile High Extension. Please review and advise of any comments or corrections. Thanks.

Chad Phillips
Engineer II
Dept. of Transportation & Works
Building Design & Construction Division
(709) 729-1640
chadphillips@gov.nl.ca

“This email and any attached files are intended for the sole use of the primary and copied addressee(s) and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any distribution, use or copying by any means of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender.”

Confidentiality Warning: This message and any attachments are intended for the sole use of the intended recipient(s), and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not an intended recipient, any review, retransmission, conversion to hard copy, copying, circulation or other use of this message and any attachments is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete the message and attachments immediately and notify the sender by return email. Thank you!

avis de confidentialité: Ce courriel, ainsi que tout renseignement ci-inclus, est destiné uniquement au(x) destinataire(s) susmentionné(s) et peut contenir de l'information confidentielle. Si vous n'êtes pas le destinataire prévu, tout examen, copie, impression, reproduction, distribution ou autre utilisation de ce courriel est strictement interdit. Si vous avez reçu ce message par erreur, veuillez en aviser immédiatement l'expéditeur par retour de ce courriel et veuillez supprimer immédiatement cette communication. Merci.
Further to my previous email, if everyone could review revised drawing and send back any comments by end of day tomorrow would be appreciated. If there are any major comments or items concerning the current layout, I can set up a meeting internally for end of week to discuss before we go back to SNC about any changes. Thanks.

Chad

From: Phillips, Chad
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2017 2:26 PM
To: Hallett, Natalie; 'Jim Sinnott'; Henstridge, Wendy; Kieley, Kim; Forward, Steven L; Carroll, Michael
Subject: RE: Mobile Extension Meeting Minutes
Attachments: 644403 FLOOR PLAN.pdf

Attached is the revised layout for Mobile Extension. Robert advised there is no issue with the Civil work with this revised layout, may just lose one parking space.

Chad

From: Phillips, Chad
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2017 8:57 AM
To: Hallett, Natalie; 'Jim Sinnott'; Henstridge, Wendy; Kieley, Kim; Forward, Steven L; Carroll, Michael
Subject: RE: Mobile Extension Meeting Minutes

SNC has sent in a preliminary revised drawing for Mobile later last week, but there was some items pertaining to the civil work they need to have checked before they can confirm to the new layout. The building footprint was pushed out slightly towards the west, so they need to check with their civil team in terms of how this will affect the retaining walls, fire access road, etc. As soon as I confirm with SNC everything is fine with the new layout, hopefully this morning, I will send along the newest drawing. Sorry for any confusion.

Chad

From: Hallett, Natalie
Sent: Monday, April 17, 2017 5:25 PM
To: 'Jim Sinnott'; Phillips, Chad; Henstridge, Wendy; Kieley, Kim; Forward, Steven L; Carroll, Michael
Subject: RE: Mobile Extension Meeting Minutes

My understanding is that there needs to be something checked; I haven’t seen the new plan. We should have something soon

From: Jim Sinnott [mailto:jimsinnott@nlesd.ca]
Sent: Thursday, April 13, 2017 4:49 PM
To: Phillips, Chad <ChadPhillips@gov.nl.ca>; Henstridge, Wendy <WendyHenstridge@gov.nl.ca>; Kieley, Kim <KimKieley@gov.nl.ca>; Forward, Steven L <StevenForward@gov.nl.ca>; Hallett, Natalie <NatalieHallett@gov.nl.ca>;
Carroll, Michael <MichaelCarroll@gov.nl.ca>
Subject: RE: Mobile Extension Meeting Minutes

Sent comments to Wendy and Natalie prior to minutes

SNC tells me they have since supplied another floor pan with larger classrooms?

Jim

From: Phillips, Chad [mailto:ChadPhillips@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 10:03 AM
To: Henstridge, Wendy <WendyHenstridge@gov.nl.ca>; Kieley, Kim <KimKieley@gov.nl.ca>; Forward, Steven L <StevenForward@gov.nl.ca>; Hallett, Natalie <NatalieHallett@gov.nl.ca>; Carroll, Michael <MichaelCarroll@gov.nl.ca>; Penney, Rebecca <RebeccaPenney@gov.nl.ca>; Timmsinnott@nlesd.ca; Sid @snclavalin.com; 'Jim Sinnott' <jimsinnott@nlesd.ca>

Subject: Mobile Extension Meeting Minutes

Good morning everyone,

Attached are the meeting minutes and updated milestone checklist from our Progress Meeting on April 6\textsuperscript{th} on Mobile High Extension. Please review and advise of any comments or corrections. Thanks.

Chad Phillips
Engineer II
Dept. of Transportation & Works
Building Design & Construction Division
(709) 729-1640
chadphillips@gov.nl.ca

“This email and any attached files are intended for the sole use of the primary and copied addressee(s) and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any distribution, use or copying by any means of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender.”
My understanding is that there needs to be something checked; I haven’t seen the new plan. We should have something soon.

Sent comments to Wendy and Natalie prior to minutes

SNC tells me they have since supplied another floor pan with larger classrooms?

Jim

Attached are the meeting minutes and updated milestone checklist from our Progress Meeting on April 6th on Mobile High Extension. Please review and advise of any comments or corrections. Thanks.

Chad Phillips
Engineer II
Dept. of Transportation & Works
Building Design & Construction Division
(709) 729-1640
chadphillips@gov.nl.ca

"This email and any attached files are intended for the sole use of the primary and copied addressee(s) and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any distribution, use or copying by any means of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender."
The civil drawing previously sent out is just a preliminary civil drawing showing the new layout footprint on the site. SNC are revising this drawing to include more detail pertaining to the parking area, how the parking spaces will be affected by the extension, and providing a net gain/loss of spaces for the site. I will forward the latest drawing once it is received from SNC. Thanks.

Chad Phillips
Engineer II
Dept. of Transportation & Works
Building Design & Construction Division
(709) 729-1640
chadphillips@gov.nl.ca

Good afternoon everyone,

Attached is the revised civil drawing for Mobile Extension, after the building has been pushed out 2 meters along the western edge. 2 additional parking spaces are lost with this revision, as compared to the last civil drawing. The traffic study is being undertaken, an update will be provided as it proceeds. Thanks.

Chad Phillips
Engineer II
Dept. of Transportation & Works
Building Design & Construction Division
(709) 729-1640
chadphillips@gov.nl.ca
Potential copyright material

If you wish to obtain a copy please contact the ATIPP Office at (709) 729-7072 or atippoffice@gov.nl.ca.
From: Kieley, Kim
To: Phillips, Chad; Hallett, Natalie; ‘Jim Sinnott’; Henstridge, Wendy; Forward, Steven L; Carroll, Michael
Cc: Lahey, Paul
Subject: Mobile Extension Design manager

Just a note to clarify with everyone that Chad is the Design Manager on this project, Wendy is assigned to assist when needed. The consultant has been informed of this.

Also, note that communication with the consultant should be through Chad, or Wendy in his absence. This will ensure that nothing is included in the design that hasn’t been evaluated on a schedule/cost/functionality basis. If the client Department (DOE, NLESD) requires a change to be made, or information on the project, please request through Chad.

As always, we which to ensure the project is completed successfully and this is one of many ways we can help ensure that.

Thanks

Kim Kieley, P. Eng., FEC
Manager Facility Services Engineering
Building Design and Construction
Transportation and Works

Tel – 709-729-7198
Good morning Robert,

Below is correspondence between Education and the Climate Change Office regarding the LEED exemption request for the Mobile Extension. The Climate Change Office accepts the LEED scorecard submitted in terms of showing what points are and are not available, but there is still some pushback in terms of them wanting more information, especially in terms of metering and such, as to why this project cannot achieve LEED certification. Education is looking for assistance from SNC in order to be better able to explain our position as to why a LEED exemption is needed for this project. Please review the items below that OCC and CaGBC are looking for more clarification on, and provide any assistance in terms of better clarification as to our position on the LEED exemption. If you need any clarification, please contact myself or Wendy. Thanks.

Chad Phillips
Engineer II
Dept. of Transportation & Works
Building Design & Construction Division
(709) 729-1640
chadphillips@gov.nl.ca

Wendy & Chad,
Can you please forward the below email to our consultant and ask for their assistance in pursuing our LEED exemption?

Thnks

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone on the Bell network.

Hi Jerry, just clarify - the submission of this scorecard does not indicate we will continue to strive for LEED. It merely shows what points our consultant believes are possible and which they do not. Please accept this as backup for our previously submitted exemption request.

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone on the Bell network.

From: Collins, Jerry
Sent: Tuesday, March 7, 2017 5:05 PM
Hello Michael,

Thank you for providing this additional information on the Mobile Central High project. OCC has reviewed the attached, and we are encouraged by EECD’s efforts to continue to strive for LEED by using a preliminary LEED scorecard to identify potential smart credits to incorporate into the design of this extension.

OCC notes that this scorecard does help clarify that the project does not currently intend to include separate energy and water meters. However, as per previous correspondence, CaGBC has indicated that they may be able to offer some flexibility in terms of MPR #2 on a project-specific basis.

As such, if EECD still intends to seek an exemption from the BBB policy for this project, OCC requests that appropriate members of the project team contact CaGBC directly to confirm whether or not the project is LEED-eligible on the basis of MPR #2. This would ensure that the BBB Assessment Committee has sufficient information to consider the exemption request.

Thank you,

Jerry Collins
Policy & Program Development Specialist
t: 709.729.0975 | e: jerrycollins@gov.nl.ca
Office of Climate Change, Executive Council
Government of Newfoundland & Labrador

TurnBackTheTide.ca
Find out what Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are saying about how to build a low-carbon province with strong communities at www.gov.nl.ca/TalkClimateChange

From: Carroll, Michael
Sent: Friday, March 03, 2017 3:13 PM
To: Collins, Jerry
Subject: RE: Mobile Central High extension LEED Exemption revised.

H Jerry,
Please see the attached LEED score card for the Mobile school extension project. As you can see 2 of the pre-requisites will not be met. In addition, we are nowhere close to having enough points to get certified.

MICHAEL CARROLL, P.ENG
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT
709 729-2892 (T) | 709-729-1400 (F)

From: Collins, Jerry
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2016 4:55 PM
To: Carroll, Michael
Cc: Janes, Jackie; Crane, Gerald
Subject: RE: Mobile Central High extension LEED Exemption revised.

Hello Michael,
Further to previous correspondence on this exemption request, CaGBC has responded to ECC’s request for additional clarity on the application of MPR#2 under LEED v4 (see their response below).

Essentially, CaGBC has indicated that a shared air distribution system would not normally satisfy MPR#2 for the purpose of seeking LEED certification for the addition only. However, they have also indicated that they may be able to offer some additional flexibility on a project-specific basis, pending more direct consultation with the project team to discuss the project in more detail.

Given CaGBC’s indication that there may still be some scope for this project to pursue LEED certification, EECD may wish to contact them directly to clarify whether and how this project might still be eligible for LEED. Alternatively, in the absence of an BBB exemption, EECD could demonstrate compliance with the BBB Policy’s LEED requirements by registering the project with CaGBC and employing the sustainable building measures already identified to strive for LEED Silver.

If EECD still wishes to pursue this exemption request, we would note that there is currently insufficient information for the BBB Assessment Committee to consider such a request and would ask that EECD provide the following information:

• Confirmation on whether the project design will include separate air distribution systems and water and energy meters (including thermal energy meters, if applicable); and
• The outcome of direct consultation between the project team (i.e. EECD, TW, etc.) and CaGBC to determine whether the MPR is flexible enough to allow the addition to pursue certification under LEED v4 independently of the existing building.

Contact information for the appropriate CaGBC staff to arrange further discussions on the project is included below.

Thank you,

Jerry Collins
Policy & Program Development Specialist
t: 709.729.0975 | e: JerryCollins@gov.nl.ca
Department of Environment & Climate Change
Climate Change Branch
Government of Newfoundland & Labrador

TurnBackTheTide.ca

Join the conversation to help build a low-carbon province with strong communities at www.gov.nl.ca/TalkClimateChange

---

From: CaGBC Info [mailto:CaGBC_Info@cagbc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2016 3:08 PM
To: Collins, Jerry
Subject: RE: LEED v4 MPR Interpretation Question

Good Afternoon Jerry,

The LEED team has reviewed your questions regarding the LEEDv4 MPRs.

In order for the new addition to qualify for certification independently from the existing building, the criteria you mentioned for MPR: Must use reasonable LEED Boundaries would need to be met. The addition would need to have separate air distribution systems and water and energy meters (including thermal energy meters, if applicable). It would be acceptable to extend the existing heating, water/septic and electrical systems to the new addition, as long as
separate (sub)meters are provided per the MPR guidance. If the project involves over 1,000 sf of new construction gross floor area, cannot meet these requirements, and appears to have no D+C certification option available, the project team could request a conference call with us to discuss the matter further, as we want to be aware of where this more stringent v4 criteria is creating roadblocks. We may be able to offer some additional flexibility on a project-specific basis, but making that determination would involve more detail & personnel.

The guidance for 'Shared central systems located outside the project building or space" in the Getting Started section of the LEED v4 BD+C Reference Guide and the District Energy System guidance under EAp Minimum Energy Performance applies when a central energy plant provides thermal energy to a group of buildings (e.g., a central chilled water or steam plant), but is not applicable for central air distribution systems.

Please let us know if you would like further guidance or more detail.

Thank you,

s. 40 (1)

Client and Member Services
Canada Green Building Council
47 Clarence Street, Suite 202, Ottawa, Ontario K1N 9K1
Toll Free - 1.866.941.1184 (please fulfill the language prompt prior to entering the extension)
Direct Line - [redacted] (s. 40 (1))
Follow Us! Twitter | Facebook | LinkedIn | YouTube

2017 Call for Presentations is now open
The closing date is December 16, 2016.
Learn more >
Chad,

As discussed, this could be the new layout, I will discuss this new layout with Civil dept. on Monday because the road around the side of the building will have to move 2 meters.

This plan is very preliminary with no reviews.

---

Chad, Robert

Project Manager
Infrastructure Engineering – Eastern Canada
Infrastructure

Tel.: [redacted]
Cell.: [redacted]
Fax.: [redacted]

SNC Lavalin Inc. (BAE-Newplan Group Inc.)
1133 Topsail Rd.
Mount Pearl | Newfoundland | Canada | A1N 5G2

---

NOTICE – This email message and any attachments may contain information or material that is confidential, privileged, and/or subject to copyright or other rights. Any unauthorized viewing, disclosure, reproduction, dissemination, or other use of or reliance on this message or anything contained therein is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you believe you may have received this message in error, kindly inform the sender by return email and delete this message from your system. Thank you.
Potential copyright material

If you wish to obtain a copy please contact the ATIPP Office at (709) 729-7072 or atippoffice@gov.nl.ca.
Hi,

Has there been any update in terms of speaking with Civil on the newest layout for Mobile, if this layout is feasible? We would like to have this determined as soon as possible, as we are reviewing the current drawing. As well, what is the overall area for the newest layout? This was included on the previous drawing, but was omitted on the new one, I’m assuming as it was just a very preliminary drawing. I am in training all this morning, you can get back to me through here, if not I will get in touch this afternoon. Thanks.

Chad Phillips
Engineer II
Dept. of Transportation & Works
Building Design & Construction Division
(709) 729-3640
chadphillips@gov.nl.ca

Chad, 

As discussed, this could be the new layout, I will discuss this new layout with Civil dept. on Monday because the road around the side of the building will have to move 2 meters. This plan is very preliminary with no reviews.

Chad Phillips
Project Manager
Infrastructure Engineering – Eastern Canada
Infrastructure

Tel:
Cell:
Fax:
From: Building Technologist
Sent: April 7, 2017 3:41 PM
To: Brown, Robert (NL)
Subject: 644403; Mobile School; Proposed Layout
Cook, Michael

From: Jim Sinnott (jimsinnott@nlesd.ca)
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2017 3:09 PM
To: Phillips, Chad
Subject: Re: Mobile Extension Meeting Minutes

Yes - I can sign for Dept env.

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone on the Bell network.

From: Phillips, Chad
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2017 3:05 PM
To: 'Jim Sinnott'
Subject: RE: Mobile Extension Meeting Minutes

Thanks Jim, I have instructed SNC to go forward with the traffic study, I will check with them on the status of it.

Was speaking with [redacted] earlier, and they are preparing to do the Environmental Review of the school, and he said that they need a name, someone from ESD, essentially giving them permission to go forward with it. I assumed this would be yourself, but just wanted to confirm with you first. If this is good I will let SNC know and they will expedite the environmental. Thanks.

Chad

From: Jim Sinnott (jimsinnott@nlesd.ca)
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2017 2:57 PM
To: Phillips, Chad; Hallett, Natalie; Henstridge, Wendy; Kieley, Kim; Forward, Steven L; Carroll, Michael
Subject: Re: Mobile Extension Meeting Minutes

I understand that the extra space for classrooms is obtained by using rooftop units for mechanical - no issue with this as the larger classroom size over last version is required to ensure NFPA compliance.

In absence of a civil dwg hard to make comment on how this effects traffic flow / operations. What is status of the traffic study? Given exams in June are not typical traffic conditions, we pretty much have month of May to have them get representative traffic counts.

Jim

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone on the Bell network.

From: Phillips, Chad
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2017 2:42 PM
To: Hallett, Natalie; 'Jim Sinnott'; Henstridge, Wendy; Kieley, Kim; Forward, Steven L; Carroll, Michael
Subject: RE: Mobile Extension Meeting Minutes

Further to my previous email, if everyone could review revised drawing and send back any comments by end of day tomorrow would be appreciated. If there are any major comments or items concerning the current layout, I can set up a meeting internally for end of week to discuss before we go back to SNC about any changes. Thanks.

Chad
From: Phillips, Chad  
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2017 2:26 PM  
To: Hallett, Natalie; 'Jim Sinnott'; Henstridge, Wendy; Kieley, Kim; Forward, Steven L; Carroll, Michael  
Subject: RE: Mobile Extension Meeting Minutes

Attached is the revised layout for Mobile Extension. Robert advised there is no issue with the Civil work with this revised layout, may just lose one parking space.

Chad

From: Phillips, Chad  
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2017 8:57 AM  
To: Hallett, Natalie; 'Jim Sinnott'; Henstridge, Wendy; Kieley, Kim; Forward, Steven L; Carroll, Michael  
Subject: RE: Mobile Extension Meeting Minutes

SNC has sent in a preliminary revised drawing for Mobile later last week, but there was some items pertaining to the Civil work they need to have checked before they can confirm to the new layout. The building footprint was pushed out slightly towards the west, so they need to check with their Civil team in terms of how this will affect the retaining walls, fire access road, etc. As soon as I confirm with SNC everything is fine with the new layout, hopefully this morning, I will send along the newest drawing. Sorry for any confusion.

Chad

From: Hallett, Natalie  
Sent: Monday, April 17, 2017 5:25 PM  
To: 'Jim Sinnott'; Phillips, Chad; Henstridge, Wendy; Kieley, Kim; Forward, Steven L; Carroll, Michael  
Subject: RE: Mobile Extension Meeting Minutes

My understanding is that there needs to be something checked; I haven’t seen the new plan. We should have something soon.

From: Jim Sinnott [mailto:jimsinnott@nlesd.ca]  
Sent: Thursday, April 13, 2017 4:49 PM  
To: Phillips, Chad <ChadPhillips@gov.nl.ca>; Henstridge, Wendy <WendyHenstridge@gov.nl.ca>; Kieley, Kim <KimKieley@gov.nl.ca>; Forward, Steven L <StevenForward@gov.nl.ca>; Hallett, Natalie <NatalieHallett@gov.nl.ca>; Carroll, Michael <MichaelCarroll@gov.nl.ca>  
Subject: RE: Mobile Extension Meeting Minutes

Sent comments to Wendy and Natalie prior to minutes

SNC tells me they have since supplied another floor pan with larger classrooms?

Jim

From: Phillips, Chad [mailto:ChadPhillips@gov.nl.ca]  
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 10:03 AM  
To: Henstridge, Wendy <WendyHenstridge@gov.nl.ca>; Kieley, Kim <KimKieley@gov.nl.ca>; Forward, Steven L <StevenForward@gov.nl.ca>; Hallett, Natalie <NatalieHallett@gov.nl.ca>; Carroll, Michael <MichaelCarroll@gov.nl.ca>; Penney, Rebecca <RebeccaPenney@gov.nl.ca>  
Subject: Mobile Extension Meeting Minutes

s. 40 (1)
Good morning everyone,

Attached are the meeting minutes and updated milestone checklist from our Progress Meeting on April 6th on Mobile High Extension. Please review and advise of any comments or corrections. Thanks.

Chad Phillips
Engineer II
Dept. of Transportation & Works
Building Design & Construction Division
(709) 729-1640
chadphillips@gov.nl.ca

“This email and any attached files are intended for the sole use of the primary and copied addressee(s) and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any distribution, use or copying by any means of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender.”

Confidentiality Warning: This message and any attachments are intended for the sole use of the intended recipient(s), and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not an intended recipient, any review, retransmission, conversion to hard copy, copying, circulation or other use of this message and any attachments is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete the message and attachments immediately and notify the sender by return email. Thank you!

“Ce courriel ainsi que tout renseignement ci-inclus, est destiné uniquement au(x) destinataire(s) susmentionné(s) et peut contenir de l'information confidentielle. Si vous n'êtes pas le destinataire prévu, tout examen, copie, impression, reproduction, distribution ou autre utilisation de ce courriel est strictement interdit. Si vous avez reçu ce message par erreur, veuillez en aviser immédiatement l'expéditeur par retour de ce courriel et veuillez supprimer immédiatement cette communication. Merci.

Confidentialité : Ce courriel et tout renseignement ci-inclus, est destiné uniquement au(x) destinataire(s) susmentionné(s) et peut contenir de l'information confidentielle. Si vous n'êtes pas le destinataire prévu, tout examen, copie, impression, reproduction, distribution ou autre utilisation de ce courriel est strictement interdit. Si vous avez reçu ce message par erreur, veuillez en aviser immédiatement l'expéditeur par retour de ce courriel et veuillez supprimer immédiatement cette communication. Merci.

This email and any attached files are intended for the sole use of the primary and copied addressee(s) and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any distribution, use or copying by any means of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender.”
Hi

There are a couple of items we are looking for in regards to the newest layout for Mobile. We are hoping to get the layout signed off soon and are looking for a couple of items before we can do so, as well as a minor alteration to the new layout.

1) In the stairwell #2, it was brought up that there may be an issue of sightlines and such with having the exterior door on an angle as it presently is, as well as some space in the “wedge” that is not utilized. Is it possible to remove the “wedge” and place the exterior door perpendicular to the stairs? A drawing with my own markings on it is attached showing the change.

2) With the revised layout, is there any change to the cost estimate previously submitted? If so, can you provide an updated estimate for the new layout.

3) A revised civil drawing for the new layout is needed, similar to the one attached that was previously submitted.

4) Confirm the number of parking spaces that will be lost with the new layout being pushed out 2 meters.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me. Our office is closed on Monday, so I will be in touch Tuesday morning. Thanks.

Chad Phillips
Engineer II
Dept. of Transportation & Works
Building Design & Construction Division
(709) 729-1640
chadphillips@gov.nl.ca
Potential copyright material

If you wish to obtain a copy please contact the ATIPP Office at (709) 729-7072 or atippoffice@gov.nl.ca.
Very quick comments:
Obviously we’ll need to see the costing, as they increased the footprint, along with removing the mechanical room...
Have they figured out if they need the hall space next to the existing? (Shown here as an outside access only)

I think class sizes are much better. I don’t see M&E but maybe rooftop units or space on second floor above storage/janitors closet could be used for this? My only real concern is the exit at Stair #2. I think it would have better sightlines and flow if it was somehow perpendicular to the stairs.

MICHAEL CARROLL, P.ENG
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND WORKS
709 729-2892 (T) | 709-729-1460 (F)

Further to my previous email, if everyone could review revised drawing and send back any comments by end of day tomorrow would be appreciated. If there are any major comments or items concerning the current layout, I can set up a meeting internally for end of week to discuss before we go back to SNC about any changes. Thanks.

Chad

Attached is the revised layout for Mobile Extension. Robert advised there is no issue with the Civil work with this revised layout, may just lose one parking space.

Chad
To: Hallett, Natalie; ‘Jim Sinnott’; Henstridge, Wendy; Kieley, Kim; Forward, Steven L; Carroll, Michael
Subject: RE: Mobile Extension Meeting Minutes

SNC has sent in a preliminary revised drawing for Mobile later last week, but there was some items pertaining to the civil work they need to have checked before they can confirm to the new layout. The building footprint was pushed out slightly towards the west, so they need to check with their civil team in terms of how this will affect the retaining walls, fire access road, etc. As soon as I confirm with SNC everything is fine with the new layout, hopefully this morning, I will send along the newest drawing. Sorry for any confusion.

Chad

From: Hallett, Natalie
Sent: Monday, April 17, 2017 5:25 PM
To: ‘Jim Sinnott’; Phillips, Chad; Henstridge, Wendy; Kieley, Kim; Forward, Steven L; Carroll, Michael
Subject: RE: Mobile Extension Meeting Minutes

My understanding is that there needs to be something checked; I haven’t seen the new plan. We should have something soon.

From: Jim Sinnott [mailto:jimsinnott@nlesd.ca]
Sent: Thursday, April 13, 2017 4:49 PM
To: Phillips, Chad <ChadPhillips@gov.nl.ca>; Henstridge, Wendy <WendyHenstridge@gov.nl.ca>; Kieley, Kim <KimKieley@gov.nl.ca>; Forward, Steven L <StevenForward@gov.nl.ca>; Hallett, Natalie <NatalieHallett@gov.nl.ca>; Carroll, Michael <MichaelCarroll@gov.nl.ca>
Subject: RE: Mobile Extension Meeting Minutes

Sent comments to Wendy and Natalie prior to minutes

SNC tells me they have since supplied another floor pan with larger classrooms?

Jim

From: Phillips, Chad [mailto:ChadPhillips@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 10:03 AM
To: Henstridge, Wendy <WendyHenstridge@gov.nl.ca>; Kieley, Kim <KimKieley@gov.nl.ca>; Forward, Steven L <StevenForward@gov.nl.ca>; Hallett, Natalie <NatalieHallett@gov.nl.ca>; Carroll, Michael <MichaelCarroll@gov.nl.ca>; Penney, Rebecca <RebeccaPenney@gov.nl.ca>; 'Brown, Robert (NL)' <snc@snclavalin.com>; 'Jim Sinnott' <jimsinnott@nlesd.ca>
Subject: Mobile Extension Meeting Minutes

Good morning everyone,

Attached are the meeting minutes and updated milestone checklist from our Progress Meeting on April 6th on Mobile High Extension. Please review and advise of any comments or corrections. Thanks.

Chad Phillips
Engineer II
Dept. of Transportation & Works
Building Design & Construction Division
(709) 729-1640
chadphillips@gov.nl.ca
Chad,

See attached.

There a couple items we are looking for in regards to the newest layout for Mobile. We are hoping to get the layout signed off soon and are looking for a couple of items before we can do so, as well as a minor alteration to the new layout.

1) In the stairwell #2, it was brought up that there may be an issue of sightlines and such with having the exterior door on an angle as it presently is, as well as some space in the “wedge” that is not utilized. Is it possible to remove the “wedge” and place the exterior door perpendicular to the stairs? A drawing with my own markings on it is attached showing the change.

2) With the revised layout, is there any change to the cost estimate previously submitted? If so, can you provide an updated estimate for the new layout.

3) A revised civil drawing for the new layout is needed, similar to the one attached that was previously submitted.

4) Confirm the number of parking spaces that will be lost with the new layout being pushed out 2 meters.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me. Our office is closed on Monday, so I will be in touch Tuesday morning. Thanks.

Chad Phillips
Engineer II
Dept. of Transportation & Works
Building Design & Construction Division
(709) 729-1640
chadphillips@gov.nl.ca

“This email and any attached files are intended for the sole use of the primary and copied addressee(s) and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any distribution, use or copying by any means of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender.”
Potential copyright material

If you wish to obtain a copy please contact the ATIPP Office at (709) 729-7072 or atippoffice@gov.nl.ca.