

## QUESTIONS RECEIVED REGARDING THE ACCOMMODATION REVIEW FOR WEMBLEY PUBLIC SCHOOL

Updated: August 15, 2008

These questions may have been received more than once but are only captured here as a single item. Questions received on or before June 16, 2008 have been addressed in the minutes of the Public Meetings.

**Q. Why is this review about a single school, contrary to Ministry guidelines and Board policy?**

A. The Ministry Guidelines and Board Policy indicate that, "Wherever possible, accommodation reviews should focus on a group of schools within the board's planning area". This particular review was not about excess space but about the condition of Wembley PS. The board has conducted a single school review before (Warren PS).

**Q. Are there still excess pupil spaces TODAY within 8 km in the surrounding schools and if yes, where are they?**

A.

The following elementary schools are within 8 km from Wembley P.S.

### 2007/2008

<u>School</u>	<u>Distance from Wembley (km)</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>Avg Daily Enrol</u>	<u>Surplus</u>
Alexander	1.0	250	218.5	31.5
Princess Anne	1.5	190	177.5	12.5
MacLeod	2.5	472	563.5	
Gatchell	2.4	90	56	34
Lansdowne	2.5	365	291.5	73.5
Queen E	3.6	184	169.5	14.5
R.L. Beattie	4.4	362	336.5	25.5
Long Lake	5.0	89	73.5	15.5
Algonquin	5.9	250	253.5	
Copper Cliff	6.2	288	202	86
Adamsdale	6.5	259	178	81
Westmount	6.6	181	119	62
Churchill	8.0	418	363.5	54.5

**Q. What are the details on Princess Anne option costs? What is the total amount proposed to be invested in Princess Anne, including costs to resolve current PTR status of that school? Is it appropriate that these detailed amounts were not considered when the options were developed?**

A. The plan would be to address the primary class size pressures at Princess Anne PS at a cost of approximately \$1.3 M plus an addition to accommodate all

the students from Wembley PS at the Princess Anne site at a cost of approximately \$4.6 M. The cost to address the capital needs at Princess Anne is approximately \$1.1 M. The committee had this information for consideration.

**Q. What do Princess Anne parents think of the plan...have they even been consulted?**

A. Following Public Meeting No. 3, a letter was sent home to the parents/guardians of Princess Anne P S students. The letter gave some background and the option that affected Princess Anne P S. The letter also invited input on the options and described how this could be done and important dates ahead.

**Q. Will a proper option review be done that reflects accurate information, and real impact on the whole community – Wembley’s and beyond?**

A. That is the mandate of the ARC.

**Q. Is Princess Anne also a PTR school, and what is their FCI score?**

A. Yes, as are a number of our schools. The FCI for Princess Anne is predicted to go above 65% in the next 5 years.

**Q. It seems that we have possible alternatives available to us to significantly reduce the cost of repairs to Wembley, and people who are prepared to offer their expertise and assistance. Are we prepared to accept their assistance and investigate our options further, or is this a done deal?**

A. The committee sees the deferring of repairs as a “fall back” position if sufficient funding is not available.

**Q. When exactly did the board know that the issue of PTR funding and excess spaces was no longer relevant?**

A. This was a criterion in 2003-2004. This criterion to obtain capital funding was no longer applicable after 2006.

**Q. Why can’t Wembley be expanded?**

A. The Wembley Public School site is approximately 3.06 acres. The Princess Anne Public School site is approximately 7.5 acres.

When the Ministry's facilities audit was validated by Castellan James + Partners, an assessment of site expansion potential was performed at the same time. It was determined that Wembley did not have site expansion potential, and that Princess Anne did. This was a high level assessment and there is simply a

column indicating yes or no to site expansion potential.

**Q. For the Princess Anne option, is there some sort of worded material associated with the sketches? (ie. memo or email)**

A. A narrative was not obtained.

**Q. Which of the three primary school enhancement options are included in the \$6 to \$7M total price estimate? Would it be possible to get a little more detail on the \$6-7M project estimate? Just estimates of the three main components would be great.**

A. The value of the primary enhancements is approximately \$1.3M. The value of the capital maintenance portion (as defined in the facility assessment that determined that Princess Anne was PTR) is approximately \$1.1M. The value of the Wembley accommodation portion is approximately \$4.6M.

**Q. Is there a copy of a study on why the Wembley site is not large enough and why the school could not be expanded outwards or upwards?**

A. This conclusion is based on a review of site conditions, size, and potential for expansion, which is part of our inventory of data for all of our facilities.

**Q. For the Princess Anne subsequent feasibility study for accommodating Wembley students, there were two sketch type drawings but the narrative section of the study was not included. Is this available?**

A. An architect was hired to prepare plans to address the primary class size accommodation pressures at Princess Anne Public School, which we were going to go ahead with. Once the Wembley accommodation review began and the option of moving the Wembley student population to Princess Anne was put forward, we asked the architect to provide a high level assessment of the expansion potential, which did not include a narrative. We did not want to spend money on further details at this point.

**Q. Who was the contractor who undertook the brick repairs in 2004?**

A. The contractor is Capital Construction and the architect is Castellan, James + Partners.

**Q. In reviewing the reports, it appears that about 40% of the Princess Anne site is covered by what the consultant describes as a “relatively steep rock outcrop”. Has that factor been taken into consideration? Rock removal is a very costly undertaking.**

A. The consultant reviewed the entire site, therefore, all conditions were considered to develop options. As per the site drawings and cost breakdowns provided in the consultant's report, the options provided are not proposed on the rock outcrop, therefore, there is no rock removal necessary. The rock out crop is not a significant portion of the property, at perhaps 20%.

**Q. What is the number of square feet included in the proposed expansion of Princess Anne to accommodate the Wembley students? (ie. how much larger does the school need to be?)**

A. The proposed addition to Princess Anne is approximately 21,000 sq ft. to accommodate all Wembley P.S. students.

**Q. If the capital costs for Princess Anne Public School are only \$1.1 million, how could Princess Anne be designated PTR (prohibitive to repair)? The \$1.1 million seems to be a small amount relative to the building value. Would it be possible to get the same building facility information on Princess Anne that was presented regarding Wembley?**

A. The 5-year cumulative capital projects for Princess Anne P.S. are \$3,490,892 creating an FCI of 119%. As part of the addition at Princess Anne, we are planning on changing the boiler, for example, which is a cost captured in the new construction and not the \$1.1 million quoted. Also, included in the \$3,490,892 is approximately \$800,000 worth of site improvements. We will attempt to address most of these site improvements as we proceed with the new construction. Our focus will be on the existing part of Princess Anne P.S. and address items such as plumbing, electrical, and lighting, to bring the facility to a fair to good FCI.