



SPECIAL BOARD MEETING AGENDA
PUBLIC SESSION

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 2016

To follow the Regular Board Meeting

A

Board Room
Sarnia Education Centre
200 Wellington Street, Sarnia

Page Reference

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Declaration of Conflict of Interest
4. Delegations:
 - a) Susan Mackenzie regarding Sarnia Collegiate Institute and Technical School 1
 - b) Sharon Nicol regarding Sarnia Collegiate Institute and Technical School 5
 - c) Chris Burley regarding Sarnia Collegiate Institute and Technical School 7
 - d) Jennifer George regarding Sarnia Collegiate Institute and Technical School 10
 - e) Kara Woolridge regarding Sarnia Collegiate Institute and Technical School 13
 - f) Kevin Forbes regarding Sarnia Collegiate Institute and Technical School 16
 - g) Mary and Ellis Ethier regarding Sarnia Collegiate Institute and Technical School 20
 - h) Scott Sills regarding Sarnia Collegiate Institute and Technical School 25
5. Adjournment

Received via email April 19, 2016
Public Delegation Request

Hello Ms. Johnston

I have attached my presentation and request to be put on the Board agenda for April 26th.

I look forward to your confirmation.

Thank You & Regards
Susan MacKenzie

April 26th presentation

Susan MacKenzie

The aim of my presentation is to provide rationale as to why SCITS is the most cost effective building with a minimum of uncertainty to consolidate students to.

Since the initial staff report, the five and ten year capital costs and the facility condition index for SCITS and St. Clair have changed so many times that we need to revisit these reports and also rely on what information the Ministry of Education provides. Funding approval for renewal needs is directly linked to the Ministry's Condition Assessment Program and it is funding that is the single most critical component for school boards.

I'd like to read you a portion of a letter written to Director Costello from the Assistant Deputy Minister of Education (April 8, 2016). It can be found on the LKDSB website.

It says;

"Assessments are conducted by a third-party assessment team, VFA, which has been contracted by the Ministry. VFA's assessors include engineering and architectural professionals who have significant expertise in assessing school condition and renewal needs. During the assessment of the site and building, the assessors are required to identify renewal events (repair or replacement) that should be completed in a five year window."

The Ministry completed its 5 year renewal needs condition assessment for SCITS in 2014. Anything beyond 2018 are internally projected numbers by Board staff (as stated by Mr. McKay at the March 29th Board meeting) and are not verified by the Ministry. It is worth noting that beyond 2018, an opportunity exists to influence the renewal needs.

The ministry's condition assessment for St. Clair was completed in 2011. The backlog of capital work at St. Clair is ministry verifiable for 2015. Again, beyond this assessment period renewal needs are internally generated staff projections. Trustee Fletcher made a worthwhile comment at the April 12th board meeting whereby he noted St. Clair does not show any significant renewal needs beyond 2015.

On April 5th, I emailed Mr. McKay with a request for the capital cost breakdown for the 2015 to 2024 Projected Total Cost of Facility Work as it was presented in the Initial Staff Report (pages 12 & 13 under FCI Data). There was an email communication between Mr. McKay and VFA that I think was accidentally copied to me. I would like to read you the directive from Mr. McKay to VFA:

"Could you please generate the report that is being requested (in the below email?) I would like to keep continuity between your presentation at the working committee meeting for SCITS and St. Clair and this request. I would then forward your email onto Susan."

This further validates how numbers can be influenced to create continuity to suit a circumstance. Not unexpectedly, the information I received corresponded with what was presented at the March 21 working ARC meeting not the Initial Staff Report as I had requested. Continuity in reporting has been lacking throughout this accommodation review and it has created considerable confusion.

Upon another request to Mr. McKay, he provided me with the full condition assessment reports done by VFA for both schools. The SCITS report is 54 pages in length, the St. Clair report 105 pages in length. It goes without explanation as to why the St. Clair report is almost double the length of the SCITS report.

The schools respective condition reports show SCITS with an FCI of 22% and St. Clair's 40%. I encourage the trustees to obtain the reports from Mr. McKay prior to May 10th. They are detailed and thoroughly describe the conditions of the schools. I fully appreciate and understand the Facility Condition Index will change as renewal work is completed, but please keep in mind that Ministry funding is directly tied to the Condition Assessment Report, not Board projections.

I would also like to address page 34 of the Final Staff Report. It is a summary of Asbestos, Accessibility, Building Code and Structural capital costs provided by Board hired consultants.

I applaud Trustee Sasseville for her questions about asbestos at the April 12th board meeting. Her questions have merit in determining the short and long term asbestos assessments for both schools.

To further expand upon the asbestos assessment costs and the architect's report on Accessibility and Building Code costs, it should be noted that pre-existing conditions do not have to be addressed unless there will be a major renovation undertaken. We know SCITS does not require a major renovation, therefore, the \$17 million in capital costs provided by Board hired consultants would only apply to St. Clair. On the same page that pegs capital costs at \$17 million for St. Clair, the report re-affirms its intent to apply for a \$14 million capital grant to undertake work at St. Clair. A \$3 million shortfall exists before the funding application is even prepared.

The 2015/16 renewal grants budget for the Lambton Kent District School Board was \$16.5 million for the entire district. I ask you to put yourselves in the position of the Ministry. You have two School Consolidation Capital funding applications before you. One is for a school requiring \$14 million in capital renewal, the other requires \$6 million. Which application would you move to the top of the pile? Don't be misled into thinking the LKDSB could also apply for a \$14 million grant for SCITS. It could not, SCITS simply does not have the renewal needs to support such a large grant. SCITS would however make a strong \$6 million School Consolidation Capital business case.

Then there is the School Condition Improvement Grant. This is where one would think an opportunity would exist to bolster a funding application using the high renewal needs of St. Clair. According to the (1) Ministry's Projected School Board Funding for the 2016/17 School Year, the LKDSB is projected to receive \$8.2 million. Even if St. Clair's renewal needs did bolster the School Condition Improvement Grant, there is no guarantee it would be spent on St. Clair.

This can be likened to a home improvement loan. You get some of your improvements done but then decide the electrical work can wait because you want to use your borrowed money for a vacation. It is not until the lights go out that you realize a quick fix and a long term debt was not the end result you anticipated.

The Ministry's Condition Assessment Report clearly identifies the SCITS building superior to that of the St. Clair building. Your decision as the Board of Trustees comes down to an assessment of risk.

Do you risk shuttering a solid building that provides a learning environment with valuable teaching spaces such as air conditioned classrooms, a large manufacturing shop and an auditorium based on the hopes of a successful funding application?

Please reflect upon the risk associated with approving the recommendations of the Final Staff Report as presented and instead, consider approving a different outcome. You are in a position to maximize your

financial opportunities by taking a steady low risk approach. Consolidate St. Clair students to the SCITS site, reduce your capital backlog by taking the St. Clair site off your books, sell the land to a developer and stay on course with your identified consolidation phases.

(1) www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/funding/1617/2016_funding_en.pdf

Received via email April 20, 2016
Request SCITS Letter Presentation

5

Morning, Ms Johnston,

I would like to submit my letter that I would like to present during the upcoming trustee meeting. I am planning to be present at the meeting, but if I am unable to attend due to work or other obligations, I request permission that someone I appoint read my letter in my absence.

If there is any complications processing my request, please email me at work immediately (the cc address), so we may together deal with it promptly.

I would also appreciate a confirmation of a receipt of this email (both email addresses.) Thank You.

Sincerely,
Sharon Nicol

Chair Jane Bryce
Vice Chair Scott McKinlay
Trustee Campbell
Trustee Dodman
Trustee Douglas
Trustee Fletcher
Trustee Hudie
Trustee McGregor
Trustee Murphy
Trustee Rising
Trustee Sasseville

I request – the next time in your travels – anywhere in the world – enjoying an in-use heritage building – consider ... what if those in charge way back when – voted to bulldoze this site because upgrading the plumbing was too expensive at the time?

What if it was me back then – in charge – standing in front of this 100 year old building. Would I have voted to destroy it rather than restore it? Or board it up to deteriorate even further? Would it be gone for future generations to enjoy because of **my** involvement?

Being a relatively young country, our potential heritage buildings are limited compared to Europe and Asia ... even compared to the United States. Combine that with our need for demolition and poured cement, it is not surprising that for those of us that can travel, our fascination with architecture leads us beyond Canada.

Your name is going to be attached to this decision forever. You have all the control here. Decide wisely because **you** will be taking ownership for what goes down in our community history books.

Sharon Nicol
Mooretown

Received via email April 20 2016

7

LKDSB April 26 Agenda Material

Hi Trish. Below, I have included the material that I wish to present to the trustees in Sarnia at the April 26, 2016 meeting. Thanks, Chris Burley

Tuesday April, 19, 2016

8

To the LKDSB Trustees;

If there is one thing that drives me crazy as a SCITS supporter, it's how we are often patronized by the board as being "very emotional" and being "full of passion". As if, those are the defining characteristics of our movement to save Sarnia Collegiate from closure. We have been extremely rational throughout the ARC process, despite being stonewalled by administration almost every step of the way. We have even agreed with the board on several points which we saw as being reasonable and serving the greater good. We have agreed that South Sarnia most likely can only support one public high school. We agree that students will be better served in a larger school population with more options for curriculum and athletic opportunities. We agree that there will be considerable cost savings available to the board by closing either one of our public high schools.

The point on which we will not waiver or compromise on, is that we believe that SCITS offers the better building to house South Sarnia's high school students. Sarnia Collegiate is approximately 25,000 square feet larger than St. Clair, has an 850 seat auditorium, an indoor swimming pool and better overall amenities. SCITS is deeply rooted in Sarnia's core economically, historically and socially. As a recognized arts, music and theater school, Sarnia Collegiate is nurtured by our city's arts community which also resides in the downtown area. SCITS was built in an era when graceful design was a requisite for school buildings. Its build quality is unrivaled at any school in the Lambton Kent district. Upon its opening in 1922, Sarnia Collegiate was hailed as the great pride of our city, a title many Sarnians still feel suits our most architecturally significant school. SCITS is also regarded by some as a war memorial, in that many of its students served in World War II, some of whom never came home.

Many of us have never campaigned for anything in our lives. We have trusted in our public school board and believed it was doing a fine job of educating our children and managing our schools. For many of us, the day we first heard that the LKDSB wanted to close SCITS, was the day we first began to question the board. We were optimistic that the overwhelming city-wide support for this beloved institution would sway administration. We felt validated by the multitude of letters of support coming from students, teachers, business interests, community groups and even our own representatives at city hall. How could all of these groups and individuals be wrong?

The plan to close SCITS was authored by a few board administrators. Somehow, they have had the power and influence to pick and choose which information should and should not be considered in the final ARC report. Ironically, they seem to feel that their original plan is best, despite the sea of contrary input from the community. We were told that the community impact of closing SCITS wasn't a concern of the board. We have been told that the historical role of Sarnia Collegiate doesn't factor into the board's equation. Well, as it turns out, it looks like the students don't matter either. How can the board justify closing the larger, more amenity rich, community-rooted and historically important school? How is this best serving our students?

Many of us were convinced that the LKDSB was determined to close SCITS from the beginning of the ARC process. Every step of the way through this process, the board has disrespected the community by minimizing our concerns. Administration's plans have been proven to be weak and full of unknown variables, still they are determined to stay the course. Why are they so quick to dismiss Sarnia city council's recommendations? Why are they closing their eyes and ears to the pleas of the community? How can they ignore the thousands of people across this city and county who are outraged at the prospect of SCITS being closed. Many of us have lost all confidence in the LKDSB. We don't trust the board's administration, their plans or their figures. Does the LKDSB want to be an adversary of the community it is supposed to be serving?

I have watched two of my childhood schools being torn down. St. Helen's over a decade ago and now, the old St. Patrick's on East Street. I have not shed a tear for either of these buildings being razed despite my wonderful memories at both schools. My fond memories will forever remain in my heart and in my mind. For many of us, saving SCITS is not about sentimentality and nostalgia, it's about what is best for our students and community, both now and into the future.

If the LKDSB had it's finger on the pulse of this community, they would realize that most of us are furious and outraged with them. We are expected to accept our public school board's verdict, that Sarnia Collegiate is not the best present and future option for the students of South Sarnia, when it has become increasingly obvious that it is. We don't want a second best option for our children and community. We already have the better school, with more amenities and we're not buying the board's message that we will be better off with St. Clair Secondary.

We don't believe the board's manufactured figures for SCITS repairs and we don't believe that SCITS is dangerously exposing our children to lead and asbestos. How could the board have justified this exposure over the last few decades since the banning of lead and asbestos? We don't believe that spending millions of dollars of provincial debt funding will give us a better high school than spending the bare minimum at SCITS will. We don't believe that St. Clair will ever have an 850 seat auditorium, an indoor swimming pool or any of the priceless features that make Sarnia Collegiate the darling of our community. We're not convinced that the board will definitely be approved for the grant money from the province.

Bottom line is...we don't trust the Lambton Kent District School Board anymore. As trustees, do you really want to hitch your wagons to this train wreck and be held responsible for this kind of mess? I can't recall a local issue that has stirred so many good quiet citizens to rage in anger like this. Voting to close SCITS will not be the end of this fight. This city will remember the day the LKDSB and trustees turned their back on this community for a short-sighted "best for the board solution". I urge you to make the responsible choice, close St. Clair Secondary and make Sarnia Collegiate, South Sarnia's public high school.

Sincerely, Chris Burley

Received via email April 20, 2016

Hi, I would like to be added to the list to speak at the april 26th meeting, thank you Jennifer George. below is my presentation.

I would like to bring you back to the basis of the recommendations contained in the Initial Staff Report. They are:

- made in the best interest of all students regarding more equitable access to programs,
- made in the interest of maintaining fiscal responsibility over the long term,
- based on an assessment of the age and quality of LKDSB building.

Made in the Best Interest of all Students Regarding More Equitable Access to Programs

No one can dispute the fact that St. Clair and SCITS must be consolidated to provide more equitable access to programs. This is after all about the students.

The risk associated with not obtaining full grant approval for St. Clair’s capital renewal needs will have a direct impact on student programs.

- * SCITS students will have to settle for a partial manufacturing shop not a full size shop they currently appreciate
- * The auditorium at SCITS is used as a daily learning space and this will be a tremendous loss to the High Skills Major in the Arts and Culture Program
- * The swimming component of the physical education program will be lost
- * Air conditioned classrooms students currently learn in are in jeopardy

Although scholarships are not directly linked to programs, they do assist students in selecting their programs in pursuit of an affordable postsecondary education.

For the record, it has been confirmed by Bill Chong, Board Member of the Catherine Wilson Foundation and Mrs. Gladly who provides the Dr. P. Gladly Memorial Scholarship, and also Denise Pyne who provides the Reanna Pyne memorial scholarship that these financial awards will cease if SCITS is closed. This amounts to seven scholarships totalling \$17,500. This is in addition to the \$15,000 the Catherine Wilson Foundation provides to SCITS as needs arise. If this is truly about the students, consolidate St. Clair to SCITS so that all students have the opportunity to work toward the 95 scholarships totalling over \$85,000 that SCITS offers.

Made in the Interest of Maintaining Fiscal Responsibility over the Long Term

SCITS has a lower backlog in the short term. The long term capital requirements are based on Board projections, not Ministry data. A good example of variation is the 2019 capital projection of \$4 million for SCITS that is for electrical and HVAC work. SCITS HVAC system was installed in 2003, and would have a service life beyond 16 years. When SCITS is Ministry assessed again in 2019, there is a strong likelihood VFA will not make this a priority.

Of the two school SCITS has the greatest potential to generate revenue for the board by offering broader community access to its amenities.

The Catherine Wilson Foundation does not only provide scholarships to SCITS but also contributes an additional \$15,000 annually for the school as needed. The foundation provided for the refurbishing of the library along with books and has also assisted for payment of late school buses. It has been confirmed with Bill Chong, a board member of the Catherine Wilson Foundation that this generous financial assistance is tied to SCITS and will cease if SCITS is closed.

When planning for long term fiscal responsibility, it is important to consider the financial contributions that come from city residents, alumni and legacies. It is with these entities that you want to preserve a strong, long term relationship with as the Ministry moves toward a focus on community partnerships. Although St. Clair has a much larger property, it is also more costly to maintain. The Ministry also encourages Boards with an

abundance of green space to include community partners. Past track and field upgrades at LKDSB schools have been in the range of \$700,000 – not a low-cost undertaking.

We must also not forget that funding is adjusted for boards that have older schools with unique features such as wide hallways, large shop spaces and auditorium spaces. I would hope that staff takes this into consideration when grant applications are submitted.

The City of Sarnia's Planning Department indicates residential growth east of Modeland and the Final Staff Report states these areas are located in closer proximity to St. Clair. This is a residential growth area that does not cater to affordable housing for young families. This area has been experiencing residential growth for many years but has not slowed the declining enrollment at St. Clair or its family or schools.

Based on 10 year enrollment projections, the LKDSB projects the St. Clair family of schools will experience a 14.97% enrollment decline. The SCITS family of schools has a projected decline of 9.50%. When planning for long term ministry funding, it appears the SCITS family of schools offers a healthier financial opportunity.

The LKDSB enrollment projections are based on current boundaries. With the proposed boundary change, if they choose, Point Edward and Errol Village students can attend Northern Collegiate. This would result in St. Clair being too large for an area experiencing declining enrollment. By consolidating students at SCITS which has a lower capacity, the odds are in favour of maintaining a higher more stable utilization rate.

Because St. Clair is due for a Ministry condition assessment this year, capital renewal needs are minimal because beyond 2015, are Board projections. Since the full \$14 million required capital funding application may not be approved for St. Clair, the end result will be a school with much higher renewal needs than that of SCITS.

In the Q&A section of the LKDSB ARC website, I'd like to follow up on a comment made in an answer to question #61

"It is preferable to apply for a consolidation grant with a lower FCI." It is my understanding that Ministry funding is tied to the Condition Assessment Program which shows St. Clair with an FCI of 40% and SCITS with an FCI of 22%. This is where it gets confusing. If a lower FCI is referable, it looks like the Board needs to get SCITS off the inventory list to quantify its reasoning to apply for funding for St. Clair. Why is there such an urgency to do this?

Would it not make more financial sense to close St. Clair, remove \$13 million from the LKDSB backlog and capitalize on the sale proceeds from St. Clair?

Based on an Assessment of the Age and Quality of LKDSB Buildings
SCITS

Based on the Ministry's Condition Assessment Program, in 2014 SCITS had an official FCI of 18.82%% and a comparable FCI of 22%. This is a testament to the quality of the building. Since 2014, SCITS has had capital improvements which would further lower the FCI.

Contrary to what some people believe, SCITS has been maintained. Figures shown on page 10 of the Final Staff Report, indicates SCITS has received approximately \$6 million in capital work since 2003. New HVAC and air conditioning including all classrooms was part of this total.

Built in an era where building material and workmanship were designed to last, her bones are good and solid for her age.

The architectural design and aesthetics are an integral part of the learning environment

The quality of the auditorium speaks for itself with the majority of improvements supported through fund raising, not Board resources.

St. Clair

Based on the Ministry's Condition Assessment Program, in 2011 St. Clair had an official FCI of 37.10% and a comparable FCI of 40.18%. The 40% FCI is unchanged from 2011.

St. Clair has had capital improvements totalling \$2,229,098 since 2003 and currently has a backlog of \$13 million. This demonstrates that the St. Clair site has not been maintained. It too has outlived its 50 year remaining service life and to the untrained eye is evident, unlike SCITS.

Long Term Fiscal Responsibility

There are two secondary schools that require more facility work 2015-2024 than SCITS. Chatham-Kent \$22,848,373 (77% utilization) and Wallaceburg District \$19,639,790 (55% utilization).

SCITS ranks #12 on the FCI (2015-2024)

Top Up Funding Loss by 2018 (pgs. 17 & 18 ISR)

Total of \$1,960,027 for the next 8 phases. SCITS represents 6% of this. SCSS represents 7%. If the loss of funding is such an issue, what about the remaining 87% loss in the next two years, amounting to \$1,704,723?

Received via email April 20, 2016

13

Hi Trish!

..... thought I would submit my material for the meeting. It's a rough draft at this point, but the ideas are there.

Kara

It can't be denied that the populations of SCITS and SCSS would benefit from the amalgamation of their student populations. Bringing them together into one school will significantly increase the number and variety of courses that can be offered and bolster all of the extra-curricular programs.

However, this amalgamation could occur at EITHER school, and unfortunately for SCITS, this was never a consideration for the LKDSB administration. The Initial Staff Report proposed ONLY the SCSS site declaring the definite closure of the first high school in the history of Sarnia.

As a member of the Accommodation Review Committee, I have been extremely committed to the examination of the process, documents and discussions. I am also extremely disappointed in the outcome. After many hours of research and meetings, the LKDSB is still proposing only one option to the trustees for the final vote on May the 10th.

SCITS students, teachers, parents, alumni, home and business owners, as well as many past teachers flocked to both Public ARC Meetings to show their allegiance, express their concerns and convey the importance of keeping the SCITS legacy alive. Scits serves as an extraordinary learning environment. It offers larger rooms and hallways than most schools, a heated pool, a concert style music room, expansive double gym with more than enough bleachers for any crowd, wrestling facilities that were recently updated with a Trillium grant and, of course, the magnificent auditorium.

These facilities are also enjoyed by the surrounding neighbourhood, as proven by the 1788 community use hours that have been logged in the past year. SCITS was designated a Priority School Initiative site to address the needs of the community/neighbourhood where socioeconomic or other barriers would otherwise hinder access and programming, as determined by the Canadian Census Data. Scits is where the surrounding community seeks social interaction. People of all ages can be found competing in sports, performing in plays, musicals, academic events, charity drives and student achievement ceremonies. It is close by and easily accessible to the immediate neighbourhood of south-west Sarnia and it contributes to the vitality of Mitton Village and the presently revitalizing "downtown" Sarnia. They cannot afford to lose this institution!

The Final Staff Report proposes that it will APPLY for a grant and POSSIBLY enhance the other location and provide some of these amenities BUT, they are applying for money that many other boards are applying for as well and therefore, they MAY NOT get anything. IF that is the case, the board's intention is to make due at SCSS when SCITS already offers these luxuries NOW.

During the ARC process, several alternative options were tabled, briefly discussed and eliminated by the board.

On page 13 of the Final Staff Report, it states that there was

"little support from the ARC members" for options described in bullet marks #1-5

This information is called into question when, on page 40, OF THE SAME REPORT, those same votes show each school's ARC members (totalling 5 from each school) voting for their school to stay open.

In addition, 5 votes were recorded supporting the option 6.1 which is:

Consolidation @ SCITS of Secondary School with the creation of the dual track City of Sarnia F.I. K-8 school, along with a portion of an English Language school at SCSS.

NOTE: 3 different options received 5 votes BUT only one has been carried forward and presented in the Final Staff Report AND both additional options involved using SCITS as the final site for the amalgamation.

It is my feeling that this option requires revisiting.

18

IF SCITS were to stay open, SCSS could be reused through 1. Redeveloping or 2. Repurposing

It doesn't take a rocket scientist to see that SCSS has much more land and per square metre, and that the land is worth a great deal more in the real estate market, due to its location.

There is detailed data to support the suggested redevelopment potential for both schools in the City Of Sarnia's Community Impact Study. Pages 22-23. The estimated dollar value per square metre is used to calculate the monies predicted for resale and to determine that SCITS would lose money in an attempt to redevelop and sell, while SCSS land could potentially make the school board between \$400,000 and \$1M in profit. This money could be recirculated to address the back log of expenditures.

NOW, the money is an enticing idea, however, saving money is too! Bear with me!

The LKDSB has also addressed the Sarnia Elementary Schools in the Pupil Accommodation Report.

On page 15, the proposed phase of the Initial Staff Report suggests closing Confed Central, Queen Elizabeth II, London Road and Lakeroad Public Schools and relocating the students to various schools to boost their % capacity numbers but they also suggest constructing a NEW elementary in Sherwood Village.

There is a need for an elementary school in the Sherwood area, as currently some 316 students are from the subdivision and bused to 4 different schools all across Sarnia. SCSS is right next to the Sherwood subdivision and could accommodate these students and possibly some of the students being displaced from the proposed closure of Queen E.

The phase further suggests relocating Errol Road students so they can use that school as a single track F.I. site

Based on data received from the LKDSB, it is obvious that there isn't enough room for all 606 F.I. students at Errol because its' OTG capacity is 435. It was suggested that 6 classrooms be added to Errol, but, I did the math and the numbers don't work out.

WHY use a school that isn't big enough and add on anyway?

SCSS would provide an exciting alternative for the F.I. students and combination with an English Language school to house the 316 Sherwood and maybe 100 or so Queen Elizabeth II students. That would result in over 1000 students and bring the numbers up to 85-90% capacity in the building.

There also is grant money available for decommissioning of extra building space if necessary.

Many creative answers have been proposed during this process and it seems that the rush to TRY for this GRANT, has moved the focus away from the possibilities that await OUR community.

Received via email April 20, 2016

16

Hi Trish,

.... Anyways, I have attached a letter from myself, as I would like to be added to the April 26th meeting.

Kevin Forbes

Hello Trustees,

I wanted to talk tonight about credibility and this process in general.

I have heard many members of the LKDSB mention how they asked the City of Sarnia to attend a meeting back in October. Yet during the City of Sarnia's presentation on April 12, Head Trustee Jane Bryce interrupted the speaker near the end and said his ten minutes were almost up. As a member of the public, I found this disrespectful, not only to representative from the City of Sarnia, but to everyone in the room that wanted to hear the presentation. If there is ever a situation to drop the formalities and 10 minute speaking limit, it is during a presentation by the largest city in the county. I found the interruption not only disrespectful, but indicative of the administration's attitude on this whole process.

Another recent example: Head Trustee Jane Bryce as quoted in the Sarnia Journal on April 20th: "The people fighting to keep SCITS open are pleading for a building and the memories they have." I am certain the City of Sarnia's report was not based on memories. I am certain that the many SCITS supporters who did not attend SCITS are not basing their decisions on memories. I am certain that the vast majority of Save SCITS supporters are not making their decisions based on memories of the school, but what they feel is both the best decision for the LKDSB and the community in general. Dialogue like that, from the board chair, not only disrespects concerned citizens with many valid concerns with this decision, but greatly contributes to any negativity now surrounding this amalgamation.

I know the administration seems to be happy with the ARC and final staff report. As an outside observer, I have been very disappointed with this whole process. I say this as not just a SCITS supporter, but as someone who was interested in ensuring whatever decision made was a good one. From day one there has been a frustrating lack of details. Very simple issues like explanations on electricity cost differences could and should have been available from the very beginning.

Last board meeting, Trustee Rising asked a good question on why electricity costs at SCITS were double what they were at St. Clair. Mr. McKay said he would have to look into it and prepare a report. We are 6 months into this process and Mr. McKay still needs to look into what the differences are? Is this not a bit absurd?

Let's do a little thought experiment. You own two houses, and they both have similar natural gas costs, one is 17% higher, but they are close enough, especially when accounting for the difference in square footage. Yet one house has an electrical bill that is 127% higher. Do you not think that you would have look into the reasons for that? I would find it very hard to believe that the administration hasn't known the reasons for the differences from the very start.

I have heard two different quotes on the HVAC systems at SCITS, one being 'immaculate' and the other being that the system is 'a Cadillac.' When compared to St. Clair, the SCITS HVAC system provides the building with much more AC, much better temperature regulation and much better ventilation and air circulation. Like many newer systems, there will be days where both the chillers and boilers are running to better regulate temperatures, and exhaust fans will be running almost constantly to provide more fresh air. Everything just mentioned requires electricity. I would make the assumption that if the ST. Clair HVAC system is upgraded to the SCITS standards, the utility difference will be much more negligible. Last meeting, Trustee McKinley said, to paraphrase, that outside of the electrical costs, the annual operating costs between the two schools are really negligible. Why has there not yet been an accurate explanation of electricity cost differences and/or discussion on how upgrading the system at St. Clair factors into these differences.

At the last meeting, Trustee Fletcher asked a direct question to Mr. McKay on what the 4 million dollars of upgrades were for at SCITS in 2004. Mr. McKay said he did not know and would have

to look into it. Many in the audience knew the answer, I did, I know the ladies from Save SCITS did. The answer to the question was even presented half an hour earlier in the City of Sarnia's report. It was for, to quote the report a "heating system replacement" and to "upgrade heating and ventilation." The City Report contains a list of building permits going back to 2003.

It seems to me one of many cases where the administration has sought to avoid a direct answer, or to further delay information that should have been available from day one. It also plays into the credibility question of these reports.

On the final page or two of the Final Staff Report, there is a quote from ARC member Kara Wooridge, quoting a LKDSB wide assessment of buildings done prior to building PE McGibbon School. The SCITS HVAC system was described as "immaculate." How then does this relate to the 3.3 million required at SCITS for 'Services' in 2015 and 4 million in 2019. In the ARC FAQ it says that quote, 'significant electrical and heating/cooling repairs.'

I would greatly question those repair numbers for an 'immaculate' HVAC system that is still fairly new. When discussing tenders for work at other school last board meeting, Mr. McKay said that for rooftop units, the typical lifespan was 15 to 20 years. 2019 may bring us to 15 years at SCITS, but I would think those numbers deserve some greater scrutiny, especially as you're not going to be replacing boilers after just 15 years, or need to replicate much of the work required for the initial upgrades in the first place.

To use a house analogy again, let's say you have an old house and upgrade the furnace and AC, which requires new ductwork and electrical. 15 years later you need to replace the AC, should that require anywhere near the same amount of money to just replace the AC unit, when all the upgrading work had already been completed? I am no expert here, but to me, those numbers require some scrutiny. For any given school it likely doesn't matter if they are accurate or if the work is even really needed in that given year, but it is much more consequential when they are including those costs in a formula to determine which school to keep open.

At the beginning of the last board meeting, a number of tenders were approved for projects at different schools. Trustee McKinley remarked how many bidders there seemed to be for these projects. Mr. McKay commented on how the board had saved 3 to 4 hundred thousand with all the different bids. Yet in the Final Staff Report on SCITS and St. Clair we are taking the rough estimates from single firms as concrete facts. I know it's not possible to have a bidding process when preparing reports like this, but the lack of, at the very least a second opinion, doesn't help with the credibility of the numbers, particularly for some of the bigger issues.

An even bigger question for me regarding these numbers would be the fact that these firms are both diagnosing all the problems and the costs. For those of us from Sarnia, it may bring to mind Centennial Park, where the consultants who found the supposed issues with the park, are the same ones who made many millions doing the remediation work. It would seem to me there is very plausible motive for a firm in this situation to perhaps overestimate either the amount of work needed or the costs involved or both.

The credibility gap extends to the asbestos issue where the administration has decided to release only a portion of the necessary information. Why should Trustee Sasseville be required to ask for information on asbestos abatement priorities to go along with the one page of quotes in the final staff report. As far as I know, this information is available and updated year after year in LKDSB asbestos reports for every school. Why is that information not included in the final report when it is needed to understand and critique the full numbers?

Like I said at the beginning, this has been a frustrating process. For something like the asbestos reports, or electricity differences, this is information the LKDSB already has but for whatever reasons has not been properly included in the discussion. It has been this way since day one and these are not the only examples. Throughout the process there has been a clear failure to

anticipate valid concerns with closing either SCITS or St. Clair and in many cases to properly address those concerns. I believe these faults, along with some very questionable statements from LKDSB officials have more than anything, led to the negativity some feel has become attached to this decision.

I would like to thank the trustees for listening, and hope that you will consider some of these concerns as you make your decisions.

Kevin Forbes

Received via email April 20, 2016

20

Hi Trish,

I'd like to request that myself and my son Ellis be on the agenda for the next board meeting. Attached is a copy of my presentation.

Thank you!

Mary Ethier

Good Evening Trustees

My name is Mary Ethier, a resident of South-West Sarnia. I am the mother of two, & a SCITS ARC member. As we are approaching the end of the process I have to admit that I probably would have gotten involved one way or another. But now I reflect back on how and why I was chosen to be a leader in this process. It was because I was at the school council meeting of 8 November, 2015. The only other parent there was my husband. I wonder, as Principal Keane was considering people for the ARC if his choice was between the only two people to attend the school council meeting, if he weighed each and thought to himself... *I wonder who will give the process the least amount of push back. A stay at home mom or the retired police officer with 30 years of police investigative knowledge, an ex-OPP instructor, the media officer for Lambton region and years of court room experience dealing with lawyers and has no fear of challenging so called experts and conclusions....* And I got the call...

Moving on.

I'd like to challenge the \$1.1 million that the LKDSB proposes to save with the closure of SCITS which include staff and utilities reductions and operating expenditures.

The savings associated with staff and benefit reductions make up 70% of this \$1.1 million but this is also true if St. Clair were to close. (Page 9 of the Q&A for South Sarnia ARC answer to question 27) so it's not an argument for the closure of SCITS vs SCSS. The only real difference is that SCITS will still cost money if it is closed because it will have to be maintained or demolished.

In all fairness, to determine the net savings in utilities, it is not as easy as providing numbers. We have to remember that SCITS is 24 thousand square feet larger than St. Clair. Other contributing factors include:

- the Manufacturing shop – a learning space- uses much energy, something SCSS does not have but will have if promises from the LKSDB are kept.
- 1788 hours of community use, two recent examples of auditorium use listed by VP Leystra at the final working meeting (21 march); on 2 April there was an Impromptu Design Challenge for Secondary School kids and on 16 April was the annual Athletics competition for grades 5-8 both put on by Professional Engineers of Ontario, Lambton Chapter. Each event used the auditorium and several classrooms for more than 5 hrs on a Saturday. Both days also had a second group in the building using space on a Saturday.
- ALL Classrooms of SCITS have air conditioning, St. Clair classrooms do not (although in fairness the science labs, library and offices do) but if the consolidation goes through then you will put A/C in SCSS and your utilities will go up.

It's been noted that hydro spikes during the summer at SCITS but this was caused by A/C use, which is obviously necessary to keep the students comfortable. Heaven help the student if SCSS doesn't get its full capital grant. "Jam tomorrow, jam yesterday but never jam today," so said Lewis Carroll who was clearly an astute judge of bureaucratic promises.

Finally the pool – with its dehumidifier, pump and heating of: Heat and water cost combined are equally efficient at both schools and that's factoring in the amount of water held in the pool.

SCITS hydro costs \$0.65 per square foot more than St. Clair. This can be further reduced by applying the Ministry's PSI grant of \$34,000 and community use revenue of \$17,118. It is difficult to compare hydro consumption with any high school in Sarnia as they are not fully air conditioned like SCITS, nor do they have the amenities.

Because my son is on the swim team I frequently visit the pool facilities. Back in January, I pointed to a crack in the south wall, and made a comment that the walls could use some refreshing. I was told the crack had been there for at least 15 years. This is the crack that a locally hired engineering consulting firm says is a structural deficiency and will cost \$1 million to repair. The 2014 Condition Assessment Report done by VFA, a third party vendor for the Ministry, makes no mention of a structural deficiency. I question why it is a concern all of a sudden.

The pool is an asset to SCITS but not for the hydro it consumes or the maintenance it requires. To make it more affordable to the LKDSB, allow the community the time to seek partnerships for the pool. A successful example is the Toronto District School Board (TDSB). It has 66 pools. 33 are managed by the City of Toronto, 31 are managed by the Toronto Land Corporation (a wholly owned subsidiary of the TDSB) and only 2 are managed by the school board itself. I grew up in Toronto and was on the private swim team called the Toronto Aquanauts. We swam at Harbord Collegiate downtown 3 times a week and Castle Frank High School (now the Rosedale School for the Arts) on the other side of downtown 2 times a week. Both pools are buried deep within the buildings. I recently called each school and found out that both pools are still functioning. In fact the Principal at Rosedale said there are swim groups in the pool before he arrives at 7am! Every morning! It's utilized by swim teams, community swim lessons, mommy and me groups, elderly aquafit groups, as well as having general community public swim times and birthday parties! These pools are thriving and paying for themselves.



Harbord CI in Toronto looks a lot like SCITS!

I spoke to the owner of a local electrical company who said that it would be very easy install a clamp-on metering system which are priced, he said, for under \$1000.00. This way usage of kilowatts could be measured and billed separately. This same system could also work for the auditorium.

By consolidating St. Clair students with SCITS, you can utilize the school to its fullest capacity, partner out the pool to maximize its potential for the school and the public. SCITS is in an area where the need for access is greatest. The potential is there. Make SCITS a money-maker for you and the community will benefit.

The Board of Trustees can, and should, choose a different outcome (as per PARG 2015) from what is presented in the Final Staff Report. I would hope the trustees look at the condition of SCITS compared to St. Clair. There are ways to involve the community to keep SCITS a vibrant hub in southwest Sarnia. The Board has the option to sell the Sherwood Village land and invest in a dual track elementary school at the St. Clair site. The School Consolidation Capital program also provides funding to right-size schools through partial demolition. The land that St. Clair sits on is too much for an elementary school and Superintendent Girardi stated (29 Feb working meeting of South P/Wyoming ARC) that the MOE does not require schools to have green space, so part of SCSS's 18 acres could be sold off to a developer. As acknowledged in the ISR (pg 14) the proceeds received from the sale of surplus properties would also be used as funding source for capital work.

In summary the LKDSB can lease the pool facilities with collective community partnership. Taking away learning spaces that contribute to higher hydro costs is not an option unless the LKDSB is of the opinion that the current learning spaces at SCITS do not enhance student programs (i.e. air conditioned classrooms and manufacturing program). Community use rental fees should be increased beyond cost recovery to include the full hydro costs.

I hope that I have disappointed Principal Keane about the push back possible from a stay at home mom; there are just too many good reasons for keeping SCITS open.

Now, my son Ellis would like to conclude with his concerns about the closure of the SCITS pool.

Hello my name is Ellis and I am in Grade 9 at SCITS. When I had to choose a high school I toured Alexander Mackenzie twice and St Clair twice but SCITS was my high school of choice. I just knew I would fit in there and I liked it as soon as I walked in the door. When school began I tried a few different activities that didn't work out but I really took to swimming and loved being on the swim team. This worried my mother because I have to swim deaf. We practised 3 times a week and I never missed one. At the local swim meet in February at the Y I placed 2nd in my event. For the swim-a-thon I swam 50 laps and raised almost \$800 to help support the team.

The future of the swim team is uncertain. If we combine at St Clair then we'd have to find time at the Y to practise. But my mom asked and there are already 3 school teams plus the Rapids swim team who swim mornings and evening several times a week, plus, the Y always keeps two lanes available for their members only at all times. With so many other groups using the pool I fear

there will be no time for us to rent lane time. So when you think about closing my school keep in mind that you're not just taking the opportunity away from me but you will be cutting off a 1000+ kids who will lose the opportunity to use an on-site pool facility.

Thank you for your time

Received via email on April 20, 2016

25

Please include the following for presentation to the Trustees at the April 26th meeting.

My name is Scott Sills, and I am in favour of keeping SCITS open.

First, I would like to thank the Trustees for allowing us to address you this evening, as well as for holding this meeting here, at Alexander Mackenzie Secondary School, rather than at the Board offices; also for going overtime in meetings; for rescheduling meetings in Sarnia rather than Chatham, for accommodating our request to have the open public input meeting in the SCITS auditorium, and for extending the ARC process.

I would like to note that when I refer to the Board, I am speaking of the employees of the LKDSB who advise the Trustees. When I refer to the Trustees, I am speaking of those who will vote on the decision as to whether SCITS should be closed.

We did not want to compete with any other schools to keep SCITS open. We made several alternate suggestions, some of which had already been implemented by this Board at other locations, yet they were rejected here in Sarnia. Once it turned into a competition, however, we did expect a fair, impartial hearing. I am not sure that we are getting that.

On the LKDSB web site, in the FAQ, question 64 asks how many times the SCITS library has flooded, and what was the cost and time of remediation each time. The answer offered, while giving the impression that it happened 7 or 8 times, was a listing of dates, invoice numbers, PO numbers, costs, and firms that performed the work. Due to previous mention of an issue with grey water, the implication was that the library was flooded with gray water 7 or 8 times. The truth was that the library flooded once, due to someone leaving the hose running when (over)filling the pool. The other flooding that occurred was in those basement areas of the school that are not accessible to the students. The library flood was not grey water. It was city-supplied drinking water. Wouldn't the easiest response to the question have been to say, "Once, due to human error when filling the pool," and then listing the cost, and the time that the library was out of service? In their enthusiasm, the Board gave a complex answer that hid the true circumstances, casting SCITS in a bad light. The public, and possibly the Trustees, will have been misled by this answer.

Question 24, from the LKDSB FAQ, asks how much the new sound board in the auditorium cost? The answer was, and I am going to quote this in its entirety, as it is sublime in its brevity: "In 2008 the SCITS Auditorium received a new sound booth. The cost was \$4000.00.". Nice simple answer. Except, again, the answer is misleading, both to the public and to the Trustees. I believe that the cost of the sound board, as are the costs of most if not all of the workings of the auditorium, was paid by monies collected via admission to the SCITS Revue or other student productions. The Board did not have to pay for this, just as they don't have to pay for the curtains, the seats, the other sound equipment, the lighting board, the other lighting equipment, the sets, the props, or much of anything else that the auditorium has. In their enthusiasm, the Board gave a simple answer that hid the true circumstances, again casting SCITS in a bad light, and again misleading the public and perhaps the Trustees.

At the last ARC meeting, on March 21st, a panel of experts was called in to answer any questions the ARC members might have. One expert explained the FCI, a critical component in determining whether the LKDSB gets the grant from the Ministry. He used a bar graph in comparing SCITS and SCSS as 1 part of the data that makes up the FCI. The bar representing SCITS was at least twice as high as the bar representing SCSS (5 Year Renewal needs, pg.5 of Asset Replacement Value Calculation, <http://www.lkdsb.net/Board-Info/arc/2015/Sarnia%20South%20Secondary/Asset%20Replacement%20Value%20Calculation%20and%20FCI.pdf> . Yet the values represented were actually quite close, at approximately \$13 million for SCSS, and \$15 million for SCITS. If anyone here made a bar graph comparing 2 numbers, the 1st draft of such a computer-generated graph would show the entirety of the scale. The graph was altered; the bottom line, so to speak, was moved up. This could be acceptable, if the y value at the bottom of the graph was labelled as 12 million, rather than not labelled, indicating a default value of 0. No such label was on the y-axis at the bottom. It also begs the question as to why the graph would be presented in such a

way. To save pixels? Now the bars were labelled, but as projected on an overhead projector, with the fuzziness that entails, it would be easy to believe that SCITS needed over twice as much money for the 5 year renewals. This would be a misguided belief. Again, the enthusiasm of the Board, or in this case, their expert, would seem to obscure what is actually happening—again, casting SCITS in a bad light. Again, the public, and possibly the Trustees, would not get an accurate portrayal of what is actually happening.

At that same meeting, I distinctly remember that Dr. Robert E. Dale, the engineer who examined both buildings, said that both schools had issues with their foundations. Yet in the final report, <http://www.lkdsb.net/Board-Info/arc/2015/Sarnia%20South%20Secondary/SCITS%20and%20St%20Clair%20Executive%20Summary.pdf>, this was not mentioned. At least it did not stand out in the report to my untrained eyes.

At considerable risk of annoying everyone one time too many, for which I apologise, I have counted 7 occasions where the 5 & 10 year renewal needs have changed along with the FCI. I find this unsettling.

Finally, at the April 12th Board meeting, one Trustee expressed concern over historical status potentially being conferred upon SCITS. Firstly, my understanding is that this would only be done if the Trustees decide to close SCITS. Secondly, such a designation would be done for a reason: The architecture of SCITS is worthy of being preserved. The designation would be a mark of distinction, and the LKDSB should be proud that this jewel is counted among their schools. I know the citizens of Sarnia are.

Thank you.