

memo

To: Wembley Accommodation Review Committee (ARC)
From: Doug Nadorozny
CC: Kirk Dopson, John Hamalainen
Date: 6/24/2008
Re: Post Script to Public Presentation

Unfortunately, the last Public meeting leaves me feeling no more confident that a good and proper process will be followed. I wish to emphasize the following points with the ARC since you have ultimately been tasked with advancing the best possible option for the Board's consideration.

- Despite assurances to the contrary, there is no doubt in my mind that the administration has somehow (perhaps inadvertently) interfered with the community's access to the school council on this matter. The explanation from one of the school council members at the meeting only further clouded the issue. In essence, the question that remains is, how can the school council that has two dedicated positions on the ARC, not be expected to play any role in the ARC process? This contradiction is both puzzling and shocking.
- Despite the administration's refusal to provide printed copies of all relevant documents before the last meeting, the about-face at the meeting should have at least been acknowledged as such, rather than pretending that the documents were always available, thereby insinuating that three different speakers fabricated a fact. If the minutes are accurate, they will actually reflect that two different answers were given to the question during the evening. The first, was that an FOI is "the normal way these things are done". The second answer to the same question, offered from another staff member was that there was no reference to FOI and that the documents would absolutely be made available. All relevant documents now need to be made available as part of an open and transparent process.
- There was no good answer given as to why the accommodation review did not include the whole area instead of just one school. While both Ministry and Board policy recommend otherwise, the Board elected to do a one-school review, ignoring the potential impacts of any proposed solutions on the rest of the affected schools, Princess Anne in particular. The only defense of this position that was given was that "it was not in the best interest to have massive public hearings on this issue". I find this acknowledgment astonishing and on its own, it is likely grounds for an administrative review of this whole process by the Ministry.
- There are a number of glaring factual items that need to be reconciled before a preferred option can realistically be presented as a legitimate solution to the Wembley problem, specifically:
 - It makes no sense that the Ministry accepts \$125/sq ft as the replacement cost of Wembley for the purpose of calculating the FCI, yet also accepts \$210/sq ft as the cost to build the solution. If this is in fact "a Ministry position that the Board has no control over", as stated Monday night, then this needs to be addressed directly with the Ministry since it results in a

memo

flawed decision making tool, inflating the FCI for Wembley.

- There are still no detailed estimates of the cost of the preferred solution. Nor have the detailed FCI calculations for Princess Anne been disclosed so they can be compared to the Wembley costs. The \$7M+ is at this point only a best-guess, while the Wembley costs seem inflated and contemplate over-ambitious requirements to repair the facility. (As per Mr. Hamalainen's presentation.)
- The explanation of the PTR status of Princess Anne school, a fact that was not disclosed during the first 3 public sessions of the Accommodation Review Process, is unclear and vague. Answers from Board officials to the questions about the FCI and the PTR status of Princess Anne continue to be evasive.
- On the surface, it now appears that the preferred solution to the \$4.2M Wembley problem is a \$7M+ investment in another school (not including the upgrades required at Princess Anne to correct already existing primary class size issues). When both schools are nearly at capacity, and in neighborhoods that appear to be stable, there is no rational reason to accept an additional \$3M investment beyond what is required to fix the original issue. If there are additional benefits that support the extra \$3M+ investment, those benefits need to be acknowledged and presented to the school communities. (Wembley and Princess Anne)
- It seems that for the most part, the Princess Anne community has no idea of the magnitude of the changes that are proposed for their school via the preferred option for the Wembley accommodation. There is also rumored to be an asbestos issue with Princess Anne so it would be interesting to know whether or not the added costs of dealing with this hazardous substance have been included in the rough estimates for the required work at Princess Anne.

Since there are no more public meetings currently scheduled for this process, I would appreciate being advised of any steps that are taken towards moving to a final recommendation. I can be contacted as noted below.

Thank you in advance for considering my input. All the best with this most difficult task that you all face.

Doug Nadorozny
Home: 705-670-8679
Office: 705-674-4455 x4624
Cell: 705-688-6080
Email: doug@nadorozny.com