

# School District No. 8

## Consideration of School Closure FAQ

### Winlaw

What are the deferred maintenance costs for all the schools in the Slocan Valley?

Mount Sentinel	\$4,382,113
Brent Kennedy	\$1,740,669
WE Graham	\$2,029,623
Winlaw	\$1,310,393

Winlaw has the lowest deferred maintenance costs in the valley so why close it?

The dollar value alone cannot be used in the analysis. WEG (2712 sq m) is 1.54 times the size of Winlaw (1069 sq m) therefore stands to reason it will have higher deferred maintenance costs. A better analysis might be looking at the deferred maintenance costs per sq m: WEG @ \$748/sq m and Winlaw @ \$1,226/sq m.

WE Graham has a higher cost of deferred maintenance per student so why close it?

Cost per student for Winlaw in 15/16 is \$15,416 and in 23/24 is \$10,237

Cost per student for WEG in 15/16 is \$32,216 and in 23/24 is \$29,415

First of all - it would be unlikely that the Board would tolerate Winlaw's 23/24 capacity utilization of 135% with 110% being the Board's threshold. It is also unlikely that the Board would add space to accommodate Winlaw growth at the Winlaw site when there is good quality unutilized space at WEG. Therefore, it is unlikely that the Board would close WEG even while Winlaw stays open as WEG would be required for overflow.

Secondly the cost per student for WEG is so high because the building is underutilized.

Correspondingly the cost per student for Winlaw is much lower because the building is approaching capacity or over-capacity.

A better analysis may be to use the two considerations above and assess the total cost per student using 23/24 enrolment projections as follows:

\$16,954/student with Winlaw and WEG both open

$(\$2,029,623 + \$1,310,393) / (69 + 128 \text{ students})$ ; and

\$10,302/student with WEG only open

$\$2,029,623 / (69 + 128 \text{ students})$

In the “immediate” deferred maintenance category Winlaw shows \$0 and WEG shows \$21,643. Winlaw is your cheapest option so why close it?

Whether intermediate or not, the Board is working toward finalizing a long range facilities plan and is looking at a broader horizon than “immediate”. Therefore, when taking into consideration the total deferred maintenance cost per square metre and the cost per student over the planning horizon, Winlaw is not the cheapest option.

What is the potential or would be the impact if WEG was reconfigured to K-12?

This option does not address underutilization – in our opinion if we spread the population out between two secondary schools (WEG and Mt Sentinel), there is potential to weaken/dilute the secondary school offerings in the Valley. Some students from Mt. Sentinel already leave to find more options at LVR; WEG K-12 has the potential to draw students to WEG but take students from BK and Mt. Sentinel. The number of underutilized seats would not decrease in the Valley. In fact, adding a 10-12 program at WEG may decrease utilization in the valley even further as more students may migrate to LVR for a more robust Secondary program. The District already offers 6 secondary programs (not include DL) and adding a seventh site may not improve opportunities for students.

Following the public consultation meeting at WEG, has there been any information regarding to the possibility of co- ownership of a sd8 building?

If WEG were to close,

No. Co-ownership is not an option. Partnerships usually occur during a new build when partners in the community are seeking new space and provide are able to provide a capital contribution.

At present, the Board has not indicated an interest in selling WEG and leasing space back – such as the scenario being contemplated in Creston.

Could all the senior students be enrolled in MSSS?

Yes

Could all the unique programs offered at WEG be as effectively offered at MSSS? To what extent/limit or modification?

The Valhalla Wilderness Program could be offered at Mt. Sentinel. One perspective, though, is that WEG has better access to established outdoor areas. The intermediate program at WEG may or may not be offered at a different school; this would largely be determined through a transition and the emergence of a renewed culture.

If the Winlaw/WEG catchment was moved further north from BK, could all WEG and Winlaw elementary students be enrolled in Winlaw and BK, without expanding Winlaw and also allow for or not result in losing, student enrolment from sd20, given that BK's functional capacity is well over 300?

This largely depends on where catchment boundaries are moved – although won't be seriously impacted due to the legislation around school choice. Counting on enrollment from another District to inform your decision may be tenuous.

How much money do we receive for each student at WES?

How much money do we receive for each student at WEG?

Per pupil funding for enrolment is: \$7166 per Full Time Equivalent (1.0 FTE) no matter what school, with the exception of Distributed Learning (Homelinks and DESK)

Per pupil funding over the entire operating grant is: \$10,345 per Full Time Equivalent (1.0 FTE)

How much grant money do we receive for WES?

If you are referring to small community supplement the answer is: \$162,400

How much grant money do we receive for WEG?

If you are referring to small community supplement the answer is: \$280,212

What would the actual savings be for a 4 day school week in the Slocan Valley Family of schools? The 1.4% of the operating cost of the schools did not give a figure.

Based on the Profit/Loss statement done in February 2013, the 1.4% operating savings for all Slocan Valley schools would total \$33,978.

Clarify please why contractors cannot do non-union jobs on the differed maintenance list.

Please see excerpt from the CUPE Collective Agreement outlining where and how contractors may be used:

#### 5.09 Contracting Out

Work normally performed by the bargaining unit regular employees will not be contracted out without mutual agreement provided:

- (i) there are sufficient qualified, employees available to do the work within the projected time limits;
- (ii) the Board has the equipment or facilities (based on present levels) to do the work.

Determination of work to be contracted out under this clause will be made by the Scope of Work Committee (see Appendix "B") which is comprised of representatives of Management and the Union based on the current guidelines as agreed to by the parties.

No regular employee of the Board shall lose their job or suffer reduction of hours as a result of the Board contracting out work.

Who do we need to talk to about the reality of the work on the deferred maintenance? The list and associated cost are unrealistic. What in reality would they actually do over the next 10 years?

Staff can try to work on this response but it is not readily available. Ideally staff, with appropriate funding, would attend to all of the items on the deferred maintenance list, with the most emergent items prioritized first. In reality, with \$1.3m in AFG funding annually in the entire district, very little is accomplished at all sites in any meaningful way beyond roofing maintenance, small pockets of renewal (flooring, mechanical upgrades etc) and those items required to prevent a school from closing on a day to day basis (emergent).

What is the cost for each of WES and WEG to stand empty?

There are two types of empty schools:

1. Closed with doors locked utilities still remaining (most common until disposition): we estimate 50% utilities required for this type of closure and occasional grounds keeping = WEG \$24,734 and Winlaw \$10,618.
2. Closed with doors locked, plumbing flushed, windows boarded and no heat/light (less common as unsightly for the community): we estimate minimal cost for this type of closure such as an occasional lawn mowing = < \$2000 each per year

At what point do we hear that our suggestions have been considered?

There will not be a formal reporting out that your suggestions have been considered. Trustees are receiving all input submitted and are considering all information as they move toward July 5<sup>th</sup>. Questions may be asked of trustees as to their receipt of feedback and/or if they need further information. However, trustees will not be able to say they agree with the feedback, how the feedback impacted their decision or how they will decide on a particular consideration of school closure until the public consultation period is over and they debate the merits of the closure considerations on July 5<sup>th</sup>.

When do we hear what comments have some merit and have been considered? Is this all for not?

July 5<sup>th</sup>

Is there going to be any open discussion that we get to hear?

Community public consultation meetings and July 5<sup>th</sup> bylaw readings and debate

Do the Trustees care that they are going to lose students from SD8 by closing WES?

Trustees are making the best decisions they can for the physical and learning environments for existing and future students. If, as a result of the Board's facilities planning decisions, families make choices outside of SD8's public school system, it is the district's job (trustees and staff) to make the families' transitions as smooth as possible. Does the Board want to lose students? Of course not. Does the Board want to support the choices of families transitioning into and out of SD8 schools? Absolutely. Any time there is change some families will support it (we may actually attract some families that may have chosen home, independent or private school previously) and some won't (will transition out). This is the nature of change.

How do Trustees justify the consideration of wanting to maintain a vibrant community in Slocan but not the negative effects on Winlaw?

It is the principled desire of the Board to provide all students with quality learning and all staff with quality teaching environments. A long range facilities plan provides stability and sustainability for all students and communities and moves us toward achieving the learning and physical environments we aspire to. The Board should consider, but cannot be responsible necessarily for, the vibrancy or viability of each community in the District.

**Re SV-15 (rebuild WES) scoring:** it looks like there's an error in the economic rollup - should it not be

0.45 (C#1) + 0.9 (C#3) = 1.35, not 0.45? (C#2 = 0).

Criteria 1 is correct +0.9 (not sure where the 0.45 is from?) + Criteria 2 is correct = 0 + Criteria 3 is correct -0.45 (not sure where the 0.9 is coming from – think you have C1 and C3 transposed) = Correct Total Economic +0.45 (+.9+0-.45)

**Additional comments Apr 28:** It appears that criteria 1, 2 and 3 were not always summed correctly, and these errors have occurred at random. I have checked all the SV scenarios and a few Nelson scenarios as follows.

For SV-15, correctly adding the economic criteria scores increases the total score to 61.13 from 60.23.

Disagree. When you take the -.45 in Criteria 3 instead of +0.45 in Criteria 3 the score as calculated by staff is correct.

There also appear to be errors in the economic rollup for:

SV-20 (economic rollup should be 3.02 instead of 2.12, increasing the total score to 50.02 from 49.12) SV-6 (economic rollup should be 2.53 instead of 1.63, increasing the total score to 44.15 from 43.25) SV-23 (economic rollup should be 4.78 instead of 0.62, increasing the total score to 41.97 from 36.57) SV-21 (economic rollup should be 3.88 increasing the total score to 36.07 from 32.47)

N-13 (economic rollup should be 1.76 instead of 0.94 increasing the total score to 56.68 from 55.86).

Disagree. If you take the Criteria 3 scores as negative instead of positive, the scores as calculated by staff is correct. The "minus" signs are difficult to see but are on the very left hand side of the Criteria 3 column's cells.

**Re SV-16 (close WEG) enrollment:** I do not come up with the same enrollment projections as are in the document posted on the website. I added WEG SQ to WES SQ and then subtracted the increase to MSSS (to account for grades 7-10) and got different figures for 2016/17 – 2020/21 and the same figures only for 2021/22 - 2023/2024. Could you please check?

For Winlaw's Grades K-6 I added status quo WEG and Winlaw beginning in 16-17 and ending in 23-24.

For MSSS Grade 7 I added status quo MSSS and WEG beginning in 16-17 and ending in 23-24. There is a correction for Grade 8's, 9's and 10's at MSSS impacting 16/17 to 20/21. The corrected figures are in the table below and the old figures are beside the year outside the table.

Mount Sentinel					
Year	Headcount	Nominal Capacity	Capacity Utilization	Empty Seats	
11/12	364	400	91%	36	
12/13	336	400	84%	64	
13/14	325	400	81%	75	
14/15	321	400	80%	79	
15/16	302	400	76%	98	
16/17	321	400	80%	79	308
17/18	317	400	79%	83	299
18/19	307	400	77%	93	289
19/20	314	400	79%	86	301
20/21	329	400	82%	71	321
21/22	335	400	84%	65	335
22/23	321	400	80%	79	321
23/24	323	400	81%	77	323

**Additional comments April 28:** The functional capacity of BK = 314. I am wondering why this has not been considered in the SV scenario analyses as was done with analysis of N-30? That is, the functional capacity of LVR (930) was used instead of the nominal capacity of 725 to accommodate the addition of 250 grade 8, REACH and DESK students. I bring this to your attention as a matter of consistency in scenario evaluation. However, I believe that utilizing either BK or LVR at their functional capacity would be extremely detrimental to student learning and safety.

In any scenario, Functional Capacity was only considered where nominal capacity utilization was greater than 110%. In SV-16 BK's capacity utilization using nominal capacity is no higher than 98% in any of the planning years therefore functional capacity was not considered.

**Re deferred maintenance:**

I'd like to confirm that WEG has ~\$2M in deferred maintenance which is significantly higher than WES with \$1.3M? (I've since received a description of the maintenance requirements for WES so this question is really why a newer, albeit larger school, has higher needs.)

This is correct WEG has \$2m+ in deferred maintenance and WES has \$1.3m. Part of WEG was renovated and part of it is old. The old section of the WEG building has the higher deferred maintenance costs and as well WEG (2712 sq m) is 1.54 times the size of WES (1069 sq m).

**Additional comments April 28:** The total value of maintenance work listed on the attached maintenance requirement summaries for WES and WEG differ from the amounts used and scored in criteria #1, i.e., for WES, the total value of work listed on the summary is \$1,320,375 which is \$9,982 higher than the \$1,310,393 listed in criteria 1, while for WEG, the total value of work listed on the summary is \$2,043,111, which is \$13,488 lower than the \$2,029,623 used in criteria 1. If the maintenance requirement summaries are the source of the data used in scoring criteria 1, then these figures should be identical.

The reports used for scoring criteria #1 and the reports provided to PAC's were printed on different dates. The database is shared by school districts (view) and the Ministry (edit). Reports may differ from day to day based on the updates the Ministry runs on the data (increase in base rates, US \$ variances, AFG work done to date etc). As the reports provided to PAC were a courtesy and staff was out of the office, the original reports were not available to scan and email therefore new reports were produced off site to provide PAC's with a timely response to their request.

In addition, with regard to using the value of deferred maintenance as one of the criteria when considering closure of WES, it should be noted that WES has one of the lowest maintenance requirements of all schools in SD8, with only Jewett (also scheduled for closure) and the newest schools (SSS and CBESS) having lower maintenance requirements. I recognize that this is only one of 16 counterbalancing criteria used in the scoring, however the value of deferred maintenance has been continually voiced as a primary reason for undertaking the facilities plan and closing schools.

Winlaw is also the third smallest school (third smallest area) after Yahk and Jewett so it would stand to reason it has one of the lowest deferred maintenance totals as well.

#### **Re FCI:**

Could you please confirm the FCIs for WES and SNES? I cannot understand how these were determined based on the data in the posted documents.

WES: deferred maintenance = \$1,310,393, replacement cost = \$4,595,649, therefore FCI seems like it should be  $1,310,393/4,595,649 = 28.5\%$ ?? The posted chart shows FCI = 48%.

The FCI is provided by the MOE. The 48% FCI is derived from VFA's estimated replacement value of \$2.734 million divided by the deferred maintenance costs of \$1.310 million.

The replacement cost of \$4.596 million was provided by staff in consultation with Ministry Capital staff's quoting of construction cost per headcount of two of the newest elementary school builds in BC.

From Ministry of Education Capital Planning Department:

*It is important to understand that the "replacement value" calculation in VFA has no relationship to what it would actually cost to replace a facility. VFA's replacement value is simply the cost to replace all of the **existing systems** in a facility, and should only be used to calculate FCI.*

*Imagine a school built 100 years ago that's being replaced. A replacement facility built today (with the same capacity) would have completely different systems and be built to completely different standards, building codes, space requirements etc. than the 100 year old building.*

*You should never use VFA's replacement value to estimate the actual cost to replace a facility.*

**Additional comments April 28:** using the value of deferred maintenance listed in criteria 1 of \$1,310,393

and the replacement cost of \$4,595,649 used in criteria 2 (which appears to be based on the same square foot area as the current school), yields an FCI of 28.5%, one of the lowest FCIs in the district. Along with the relatively low value of deferred maintenance, mentioned in the previous point, this reduces the validity of using the FCI as a rationale for closing WES.

To achieve the Ministry of Education's FCI of 48% for WES implies that the Ministry is using a replacement cost of \$2,750,781, almost \$2M lower than the replacement cost that was used by the district in the analysis of criteria 2 ( $\$1,320,375/\$2,750,781 = 0.48$ ).

*Please see above*

**Additional comments April 28:** Similar to the FCI calculation for WES, assuming the deferred maintenance cost of \$4,668,024 listed in criteria 1 is correct, to achieve the FCI of 42% used as baseline data in the plan, it appears the Ministry is using a replacement cost of \$11,114,343, almost \$3M higher than that used by the district in scoring criteria 2.

How do we know which FCI is correct?

*Staff is using the FCI provided in the Ministry VFA database therefore the FCI used in the draft plan is correct.*

How do we know which replacement cost estimate is correct?

*Staff is using the per student cost of the most recent builds in BC. Once the Board has set a direction on May 3, engineering will be contracted to further develop costing based on design build standards provided by MOE.*

Again, this difference brings into question the integrity of the data and the analyses used in developing the facilities plan.

*Staff stands by the integrity of the data leading up to and provided in the draft plan using the assumptions clearly stated in each criteria. Of the questions above, one correction was restated (one school's enrolment, in one scenario out of 90+ capacity utilization calculations involving multiple schools each, for 5 years of the 10 year period) which would appear to be a small margin of error.*

## Creston Education Centre

There is no way a renovation of \$20,000 to ARES will be enough for the amount of work that will need to be done to move Strong Start, Homelinks and Wildflower there - what will that cover? Now that the Board has advanced the draft facilities plan, staff will be reviewing in more detail and depth, the proposed space at ARES to fine-tune the costs of the renovation. This information will be provided at the public consultation meeting as it does take some time to complete this work.

## Jewett

**My main question revolves around many of the parents in Meadow Creek feeling as though their questions, feedback and submitted proposals have been ignored. I'm sure you guys have tons on your plate right now, but what commentary can you offer regarding these concerns?**

Parents in Meadow Creek and other communities with considerations of school closure can rest assured that all trustees have received and are receiving all emails sent to [facilities@sd8.bc.ca](mailto:facilities@sd8.bc.ca) and the [consult@sd8.bc.ca](mailto:consult@sd8.bc.ca) email addresses. Staff is working to prepare responses for trustee review, to as many questions as it can, given current workloads and myriad of emails coming into the district. These responses are rolling out, generally to PAC's and Principals, as they are prepared. Between May 3 and the community consultation meetings we will attempt to answer as many questions as possible. During upcoming community consultation meetings, a presentation will be provided. Embedded in the presentation the Board hopes to answer many of the common questions that have been asked during the input period.

**I was also told that SD8 receives a Rural Incentive Grant for having a school in Meadow Creek and that parents and locals have suggested that keeping a single portable still qualifies for this grant.**

SD8 receives a "Small Community Supplement" in its annual operating grant relative to Jewett Elementary School and it does for many of the outlying schools. The grant is paid when an instructional program is provided in the community. Maintaining a K-3 instructional program in Meadow Creek, whether at Jewett Elementary or some other Meadow Creek location, qualifies Sd8 to continue to receive the Small Community Supplement. It should be noted that the supplement is calculated on the previous year's enrolment. If Jewett Elementary school's enrolment goes up or down, the grant is adjusted by the Ministry of Education the following year.

**RDCK told me that they had submitted a proposal to the board suggesting this portable be moved to Lardeau Valley Hall but they have received no feedback from you guys about this. Have you looked over the proposal, and if so, do you think this will work?**

Staff and trustees have reviewed the proposal. Before the Board can fully assess the RDCK/Community's proposal it needs more information. Staff is preparing to meet with the hall society to discuss the current proposed scenario in more depth and to discuss concerns

regarding its implementation. The outcome of this meeting will be provided to trustees. As well during the consultation period, a meeting between local government (municipalities and regional districts), the Lower Kootenay Band and trustees is planned to discuss the facilities plan, consideration of closure and alternatives. The proposal can be discussed and explained in more detail at this meeting.

### **What other options are there?**

Keep the school open as is (status quo)

Close the school altogether

Co-locate with the Hall (current proposal)

Co-locate with other community partner (owner of vacant (serviced) land or other)

Subdivide the school property and place a portable on the Jewett property; dispose of the building on original parcel

Sell the building to the community and lease back space for educational programming

Considering that the hall is an unlikely option for Jewett negotiations, I wonder what are other options the board might consider or propose? Close the existing school and sell the all but enough land for a portable...what others might staff think worthy of board consideration?

Perhaps negotiations for utilizing the hall for gym, strong start ...or?

This scenario proposed k-3 for 14 students, I do not understand why not k-5? Is there any detriment for whatever the building or portable that is determined to continue offering k-5?

In the current draft of the Plan if the Board chooses to close the Jewett building, there are two options that might be considered:

- Negotiate successfully with the Hall for the shared space and addition of a portable. It should be noted that often, when partnering at the same time as trying to close a school, the reaction is almost always “no” – it usually takes the partner some time to come to the realization that the school may actually close, and it is beneficial to partner with the District. This would allow for a public education presence to remain in the community.
- Move all students to JVH

Staff questions the viability of placing a portable on its own property due to added subdivision costs and the cost of the portable (initial capital outlay)

If the Board opted to expand Jewett to include grade 4 & 5 students, projected student populations indicate that there would not be a significant increase in student population. We do question this particular scenario in terms of learning opportunities for grade 4 & 5 students in a predominantly primary environment.

### 1) Maximizing space utilization at Jewett

#### Strong Start

- In the last 5 years there has been 3084 visits to Strong Start program
- Strong start: 20 children registered with 762 visits; these need to be accounted for in the ‘utilization’ figure
- If so then we have 14 enrolment and 20 strong start = 35 students and a utilization of 37%
- a Homelinks Component that runs out of Jewett.

- For 1516 there are 4 homeschoolers registered at JVH and 0 at Jewett – where would the District pull students from in order to homeschool/Homelinks?
- Maybe it would be more viable if the space was shared - split cost of a classroom rental - homelinks by day and adult distance Ed by night
- If Sd8 was offering the programming we would not rent the space from ourselves. If there are other partners that want to provide adult distance ed in Meadow Creek they could come forward and make a request for space? One classroom rental would bring in a small amount of operating revenue but would not relieve the district of capital pressures.
- Adult distance Ed could be a standalone or joint with Selkirk college
- Agreed, would need to see what the space request was to determine rental income.

## 2) Reducing operating costs

- Go to a 4 day/wk
- Neighbouring Grand Forks indicated that the 4-day week nets them approximately 1.4% operating savings. This would net SD8 \$4,606 in operating savings (\$328,991 from the income statement document x 1.4%) . A 4-day week does not relieve the district of any capital pressures.
- save up the phys Ed and arts times for that day a week and have a few local artists / sports leaders spend that day a week possibly utilizing the hall gym and field.
- The cost savings for a four day week would in part be saving on heat and light on the extra day the school would be closed and less staff time.
- Remove bus and have parents share transportation of kids
- Violates CUPE collective agreement; cannot support
- Bus: daily cost of approx 141.86 x roughly 38 weeks = 26,953 saving. That 27k is around 60% of the 46k they wanted to save
- Bus driving is CUPE work

## 3) Reducing and clarifying FCI costs

- \$180,000 for SBS modified Bitumen Renewal, I looked at some online calculators and based on a flat roof where I estimated there's maybe 5000 square feet of roof and the cost using the most expensive certified professionals gave me a quote of less than \$40,000
- Sent to Larry & Bruce
- item \$10,846 LAN System
- Sent to Larry & Bruce
- also \$7013 to replace the basketball back stops on the outdoor court I recall buying a full basketball setup for less than \$200 and it's not rocket science to install.
- Sent to Larry & Bruce
- several line items regarding the HVAC and electrical systems, finding professionals to confirm the work is actually needed and is really a requirement for a school the size of Jewett
- The requirements report was provided by professionals: architects and engineers.
- The exit sign replacement for 9k and 8431.00 for signage- verify

- Sent to Larry & Bruce
- ask the board the process for awarding contracts to contractors for those items not covered by board staff. Anything that they do not have staff to do, gets put out to tender, like roofing.
- CUPE maintains the district's buildings on a day to day basis, except that work for which CUPE is not qualified. For the work that is contracted out, that work is tendered. Qualified contractors are able to bid on all contracts.
- get a list going of what is really needed; go through requirements list and prioritize essentials, verify costs
- Sent to Larry & Bruce

4) Community owning Jewett facility

- sell the school to a local group for at or near the price of \$75,000. I do not ask that the price be \$1.00 as you are trustees, however lets be open in the event that a \$10,000 maintenance upgrade is needed immediately...
  - have the local group maintain the school
  - the School Board lease the school space at Jewett and the school be maintained and hopefully its usage grown.
- Board's policy is 90% of appraised value. Appraisal would need to be done. Board will need to maximize capital disposal dollars for future capital projects while balancing the community's needs.
- is it possible to buy school at end of June for say \$1, we cover insurance and such, do required repairs and immediate work required over the summer, and sell it back for the \$1 plus costs? I am not sure of timeframe and feasibility or transfer, lawyers and other such costs, or where to get funding for repairs, but would keep liability off of community. Ideally would prefer to find more uses for school and keep it as is but with more use and income.
- Initially while a creative solution, the district may be grieved by CUPE; may be liability for Board if work is done on volunteer basis and not by tender with required contractor certification?

## Trafalgar

I have concerns that simply adding classroom space to Blewett to accommodate its growth and the addition of Grade 6's and 7's will not provide adequate gym, bathroom and other space. What can be done about that?

Now that the Board has advanced the draft facilities plan, staff will be working to have the addition engineered as well as run through the Ministry's capital planning design aid tool. The engineered estimates and the design aid report will determine if additional amenities such as office, gym, library and bathroom space is required. The District will do its best to provide this information at the public consultation meeting pending the availability of the finished report from our engineers.

What is the plan for all the Life Long Learning (LLE's) the students take part in during their three years there?

Will LLE's be offered at the potential schools which will now become K-7 or K-8?

What will actually happen to LLE's?

Will LLE's only be offered at the 9-12 level?

Will LLE choices now be condensed as the space within a school is now smaller?

The Life Long Learning opportunities at Trafalgar were created at the school, by the staff, students, parents and community. We are delighted that it has been such a successful part of the school experience. Several schools in our District offer similar experiences. We believe that the new curriculum contemplates this kind of learning opportunity. In the event that Trafalgar Middle School is closed, schools where students are redirected would consider how best to transition and support learners. PAC's may request that schools consider similar opportunities as the LLE to which you are referring.

What happens to the French Immersion?

In the current draft of the plan, French Immersion grades 6 and 7 would attend at Central School, and grade 8 at LVR.

SNES: deferred maintenance = \$4,668,024, replacement cost = \$8,219,860, therefore FCI seems like it should be  $\$4,668,024/\$8,219,860 = 56.8\%$ ?? The posted chart shows FCI = 42%.

The FCI is provided by the MOE. The 42% FCI is derived from VFA's estimated replacement value of \$10.389 million divided by the deferred maintenance costs of \$4.384 million (report printed May 2/16).

The replacement cost of \$8.220 million was provided by staff in consultation with Ministry Capital staff's quoting of construction cost per headcount of two of the newest elementary school builds in BC.

From Ministry of Education Capital Planning Department:

*It is important to understand that the "replacement value" calculation in VFA has no relationship to what it would actually cost to replace a facility. VFA's replacement value is simply the cost to replace all of the **existing systems** in a facility, and should only be used to calculate FCI.*

*Imagine a school built 100 years ago that's being replaced...A replacement facility built today (with the same capacity) would have completely different systems and be built to completely different standards, building codes, space requirements etc. than the 100 year old building.*

*You should never use VFA's replacement value to estimate the actual cost to replace a facility.*

Were other stakeholders included in defining these filters and in the filtering process?

No. Staff advised the Board the first step in scoring was a "fit" analysis.

Filtering results in 20/29 Nelson FoS scenarios being excluded from scoring

–Removes a large number of possibly diverse solutions, while other solutions with individual schools well over %110 capacity were scored

Agreed. Where a few schools were over 110% and the overall capacity utilization is > 85% a case could be made to the ministry for renewal (rebuild or major reno)

Filtering results in 20/29 Nelson FoS scenarios being excluded from scoring

–Removes a large number of possibly diverse solutions, while other solutions with individual schools well over %110 capacity were scored

Agreed. Where a few schools were over 110% and the overall capacity utilization is > 85% a case could be made to the ministry for renewal (rebuild or major reno)

Are there really only 3 scenarios in Nelson (N-4, N12 and N13) that don't push a single school over 110% capacity?

Yes.

Notable skew towards scenarios that address Blewett over-capacity (without solving this issue) .

Agreed; downfall of family of schools scoring; doesn't rule out some of the other pieces that impact only one or two sites as we move toward a draft plan.

How is it possible to filter scenario N-23 one way or the other with no stated location for Wildflower (table reads "Wildflower to ???")

On slide 28 the scenario is reflected as submitted, in that the person who submitted the scenario did not indicate where Wildflower should go. On Slides 51-55 a determination was made to move Wildflower to Trafalgar due to capacity underutilization, "room" and the inclusion of Wildflower's middle school grade configuration. In the absence of particulars, assumptions were made in order to score the scenario.

How is it possible to filter scenario N-23 one way or the other with no stated location for Wildflower (table reads “Wildflower to ???”)

On slide 28 the scenario is reflected as submitted, in that the person who submitted the scenario did not indicate where Wildflower should go. On Slides 51-55 a determination was made to move Wildflower to Trafalgar due to capacity underutilization, “room” and the inclusion of Wildflower’s middle school grade configuration. In the absence of particulars, assumptions were made in order to score the scenario.

What is SD8’s proposed solution for the Nelson Board Office (N-2), as their building has the highest FCI in all Nelson FoS?

We will place students first in the draft plan and see if admin fits in a school (increases capacity utilization). Otherwise will be looking at leased space; currently researching this at the moment.

Is the reason that Blewett is already at 147% under status quo? If so, can you please provide the % of students that are out of catchment at Blewett?

Yes 147% is because of status quo. 35 students in the 15/16 year are out of catchment at Blewett (or approx. 24% in 15/16)

If this is a large number this catchment effect is skewing the scoring of scenarios towards those that directly effect Blewett only or keep FoS utilization >85% at the expense of individual schools.

Agreed. That’s why as we move toward the draft and final plans, the smaller pieces that may not have been scored overall will/can be considered if they are a good fit.

Top 4 ranked solutions after scoring do not solve the Blewett over-capacity issue so why filter based on Blewett?

It makes a case for renewal with the Ministry. We can demonstrate the need for new or renovated space.

Moving Wildflower to an older building with a higher FCI does not make sense and is likely a temporary move, as closure/rebuilding of TMS ranks as all top 3 scenarios

–How is this factored into the scoring of the scenario?

There are over 300 students attending at TMS with the existing FCI. Programming and learning takes place. If some students can attend at TMS then more could also attend there.

# Salmo Elementary

## Yahk

## District

### Re fit analysis:

Preamble: Filter #3 allows for a scenario to be scored even if it results in a school's capacity utilization reaching 224% (SV-26). There are many other scenarios in the Slocan Valley, Nelson and Salmo families of schools with multiple schools having extreme overcapacity including the highest ranked Nelson scenario (N-29) where three schools have capacity utilizations of between 114% and 168%. We don't believe that catchment adjustments can accommodate such levels of capacity overutilization. The superintendent recommends a capacity utilization of 70-75% for optimal learning environments (criteria 7) and the Ministry of Education prefers 85%. Note that if the the school or add a portable, that is an additional scenario requiring different scoring.

This feedback will be considered as will all comments, during this feedback period as we move toward Draft 1 of the plan at the end of the month.

1. Why are scenarios being scored with capacity utilization well exceeding 110% when such extreme overcapacity is detrimental to students and facilities?

In the case where the over-capacity in some schools creates an overall 85% capacity utilization in the family of schools, there may be a case made to the Ministry for a rebuild/renovation and renew the asset base. The Ministry capital branch has certain capacity utilizations it looks for when determining new space for districts. The board certainly would not fill a school to 168%, however having a good utilization rate district wide, may make a case for new space which improves the overall facility condition for the district.

2. Why was a capacity utilization cap of 110% used and not the recommended levels of 75% or 85%?

110% was used in the fit analysis and because schools can operate effectively at over 100% capacity. SD8 has seen elementary schools operate over capacity from time to time (Winlaw, Blewett for example) and some high schools in the province have or have had on-going over capacity utilization. The 75% capacity utilization was used in one Criteria: 7

“Schools within Preferred Capacity Ranges” weighted at 7 points. 85% is the Ministry’s threshold of “good” capacity utilization and can make a case for renewal. If we used all the same capacity utilization such as 75% as high scoring in all criteria it would defeat the purpose of the competing criteria. Perhaps 75% is optimal for learning but not optimal for renewal. The strength of the criteria and its weighting is it uses capacity utilization as a strength and a weakness depending on the principle.

4. We request that you remove filter #3, and exclude all scenarios resulting in the capacity utilization of any impacted school exceeding 110%. Will you do this?

This feedback will be considered as will all comments, during this feedback period as we move toward Draft 1 of the plan at the end of the month. An answer cannot be provided this evening.

### Re Scenario scoring:

1. How were scenarios for school closures scored if there was no description of the schools where students would attend? Examples are C-11 (close Creston Ed Centre) which scored 53.30. It appears that it was scored with C-2 (close CEC, move to ARES), however these scenarios received different scores. Could you please explain the difference?

The differences were in Criteria 3 (custodial savings), 5, 6, 8, 9 and 16. The team leads for the group scoring have reviewed the scores to explain. Criteria 3 custodial savings in C11 were based on moving to Adam Robertson whereas C-2 was based on not knowing where the student were moving and a straight closure. Criteria 16 is different because one of the factors is the total educational score. The assumption our team made with regard to the educational criteria in these scenario is that HL and Wildflower are already presumably program choices that require students to travel from an extended area. C-2 was scored lower because of the unknowns.

2. Similarly, how were scenarios that didn’t reference schools at all scored? e.g., C-7 (Oppose town bypass, score = 49.57), C-13 (PCSS Outdoor rec area, score = 48.38)

Scenarios that didn’t reference schools were scored as status quo except in those criteria that were impacted (ie. Cost, savings etc.)

3. How were school rebuilds that did not change capacity or reconfiguration scored? Many rebuilds scored highly, however, intuitively, it seems that the educational scores would change minimally or not at all – is that correct?

New builds were scored using the same method as all scenarios. They would score high in criteria 1 because SD8 offloads the old building’s deferred maintenance costs, low in criteria 2 because the up front initial capital cost is high, and Criteria 3 is neutral because it is basically status quo. Often a new build saves fossil fuel but costs more in electricity.

In terms of operational scoring, when an old building is replaced the quality, safety and sustainability increases with a new build so score high in this group.

Strategically a new build also scores higher: lots of community acceptance,

opportunity to partner, etc. The assumption by the educational scoring team was that a rebuild would be right-sized and generally keep the same configuration, unless otherwise specified in the scenario proposal.

4. Why were several Nelson and Slocan Valley scenarios not scored? Examples are N-1 and N-11 (close TMS, elem K-8, LVR 9-12 with and without AI Collinson respectively) when other scenarios that resulted in similar overcapacity utilization at several schools were scored (e.g., N-29) and all would create Nelson FoS capacity utilization >85%?  
N1 was not scored because it did not bring the family of schools to >85% capacity; only to 77%. N1's capacity utilization will be posted to the web.  
N11 was not scored because it would have brought all Nelson elementary schools well above 110% and the likelihood of new space or new build at all Nelson Elementary Schools was extremely unlikely. Given some feedback we've received at facilities@sd8.bc.ca around re-opening Central as a K-7, N-11 may be revisited as a result once the fit analysis has been re-run.

### Concerns over data integrity:

There are many instances of data inconsistencies, and anomalies, e.g.,

1. Several Nelson and Creston scenario scores differ between what is in the posted presentation and in the scoring rollups. We understand that some scenarios may have been re-scored between the presentation date and the data being posted, however people may not be aware of this. Therefore, could you please post an update to these presentations or a note to use the scoring sheets to see the scores?  
We can add a note near the presentation to indicate scoring may have been updated and that the presentation may be out of date.
2. A few scenarios change from one document to another and from one screen to another, e.g., N-10 is listed on the posted scenario list as "Close Redfish, move students to JVH & Hume".  
The posted scenario list is correct. N10 is the Redfish scenario. In the Nelson presentation (slide 29) the Redfish scenario shows the Trafalgar N-10 as being scored, however it does not appear on any scoring sheet despite meeting filter 3 (closing Trafalgar would have to increase Nelson FoS capacity utilization above 85%).  
On the Nelson presentation slide, N10 and N9 were transposed. The slide correctly reflects N10 Close Redfish etc and N9 has been moved down to the "not scored" list. The slides have been corrected and the presentation will be re-posted to the web as "corrected"
3. In addition, N-23 changes from "Close Central, move DESK to LVR, Wildflower to ???, IT, Reach to LVR" on slide 28 to "Close Central; Move DESK to LVR, WF to TMS, Reach to SNES" on slides 51-55.

On slide 28 the scenario is reflected as submitted, in that the person who submitted the scenario did not indicate where Wildflower should go. On Slides 51-55 a determination was made to move Wildflower to Trafalgar due to capacity underutilization, "room" and the inclusion of Wildflower's middle school grade configuration. In the absence of particulars, assumptions were made in order to score the scenario.

4. Capacity utilization for KC-1 (CBESS K-9, LVR 10-12): why are there changes to enrollment at JVH and Jewett? Those schools would not be impacted under this scenario.

DPAC is correct; the corrected KC-1 Utilization will be posted to the web.

4. Why does the fit analysis for many of the excluded Nelson scenarios (slide 30) show Blewett 147% as a reason for being excluded when Blewett would not be impacted in these scenarios? e.g., N-16 (Move Wildflower to Al Collinson), N-15 (close DESK), N-17, N-8, etc.

Blewett will be 147% in status quo; therefore in scenarios where Blewett is unaffected, it will still be 147%.

### Re scoring:

1. Re Criteria #7: (Provide schools within preferred capacity range) - A scenario scores 1 point with capacity utilization exceeding 85%, whether it be 86%, 186% or 224%. We recommend that capacity above 110% should result in a negative score for this criterion. Assuming scenarios with capacity utilization exceeding 110% are not screened out (as we requested earlier), would you revise the scoring for this criterion to penalize scenarios where schools have capacity utilization over 110%?

This feedback will be considered as will all comments, during this feedback period as we move toward Draft 1 of the plan at the end of the month. An answer cannot be provided this evening.

5. Re Criteria #10 (Improve safety and quality of educational facilities) – why is facility age considered in the ranking? Does the FCI not take the age into account sufficiently?

Age is not a consideration in FCI. FCI considers deferred maintenance costs divided by cost to rebuild. Age does not factor into the deferred maintenance costs; deferred maintenance costs are determined by the condition of the systems the architects and the engineers audited.