

Dear ARC Committee:

As a follow-up to the June 26 meeting I would like to share with you the following. Before doing so, let me say how much I was impressed by the professional nature of the committee and how you are approaching this difficult assignment.

It's unfortunate we live in times where often historic landmarks such as Wembley are abandoned in favour of a new building. Historic landmarks take effort to preserve but by doing so we keep a piece of history alive for our children, theirs and future generations. The proposed new school will not have the character and charm of Wembley that I can assure you, the costs to build a school like Wembley would be prohibitive. I heard one ARC member say "what will the next generation of children be faced with at Wembley with all of the repairs that are required." My answer to that is they will have a unique one of a kind school that will be a reflection of how education was delivered back in the era when Wembley was constructed and how Wembley has continued to serve the community generation after generation. Sure it's going to take a lot of effort and unfortunately the current Ministry policy penalizes you for making this a preferred option.

That I will be looking into further as surely if Wembley can be repaired for a lot less money than expanding Princess Anne, you should be congratulated and rewarded for your efforts not penalized.

I received various reports from the Board on Friday, June 27. Two of them related to Princess Anne I am attaching as it was brought up at the meeting the committee were not aware of these. In reviewing these reports, one thing I noticed is 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 and if so how, rock removal is a very costly undertaking. The subsequent report regarding the Wembley students contains sketch type drawings but is missing the narrative part of the study. I plan to follow up on this with Ms. Cayen-Arnold.

Two reports I was not expecting were related to the mechanical and electrical components at Wembley. These reports are dated June 10, 2008. I am not sure why the Board retained a consultant to look at these items. I have reviewed them and find nothing out of the ordinary; they represent typically what you would find in many of the 48 buildings under the Board's jurisdiction.

I heard mention of environmental concerns at Wembley including the "A word", asbestos. I can tell you if there was any air borne asbestos fibres at Wembley the school would be shut down. Asbestos being a hazardous substance is subject to strict rules and regulations and I am quite sure the Board has dealt with this matter accordingly.

Regarding the \$4.2 M which keeps coming up. First of all I don't agree with this number but let's say I did. Wembley does not need \$4.2 M to get the building back to a good state of repair. At the June 16<sup>th</sup> public meeting, part of my presentation dealt with getting Wembley's FCI back into range of acceptability which I indicated would be .12. All buildings except new ones are expected to have a backlog of deferred maintenance items. If \$4.2 M was injected into Wembley, the FCI would be zero which would be nice but not necessary in order to have a good building. The number I came up with using the Board's \$4.2 M figure is about \$3 M.

I'm still not clear why the board has used the 2011-2012 number of \$4.2 M versus the 2007-2008 number of about \$4 M, however because they are within 5% of each other it doesn't make much difference.

I apologize for not explaining better what I meant by the word deferred. Deferred means to schedule a repair item according to its priority and urgency. Many of the items on the Wembley list could likely be deferred for 5 to 10 years so let's not get overly concerned

about these items right now. A well thought out and managed capital asset plan will deal with the item when the need arises. Furthermore these items need to be reviewed and updated on a regular basis. I hope this helps clarify this point.

Some of the other comments I heard were “we have one chance so lets go for it”, “going for the moon”. Having heard this, it is obvious why the ARC committee is leaning towards the Princess Anne option, that’s the one that will get the Board the most money. I do believe at the public meetings and information posted on the website, this point should have been stated more visibly as it clearly minimizes the option of keeping Wembley open.

Regarding Ed Chiesa’s presentation on the brick repairs. Mr. Law indicated he didn’t think many of the bricks could be coated because of the poor condition they are in. Ed’s investigation and calculations include repairing all of the brick and then providing a protective coating over top of them for about \$400,000 versus \$1.74 M that the Board has indicated. Ed is preparing some further material on this subject which I will forward to you at a later date.

I hope this additional information is useful in your deliberations and welcome any feedback or questions you may have.

Sincerely,

*John Hamalainen,*

2166 Armstrong St.  
Sudbury, ON, Canada, P3E 5G9  
t (705) 522-5745, Ext 22, f (705) 522-5650  
Email: [johnh@consultingengineers.ca](mailto:johnh@consultingengineers.ca)