

Wyoming/South Plympton ARC Delegation (DRAFT)

Good evening and thank you for this opportunity to share a few thoughts.

As a professional accountant and financial analyst in local industry with multi-million dollar budgets, I have found it difficult over the past few months to accept as both a taxpayer and a parent, the level of financial analysis provided for the basis of Wyoming/South Plympton ARC and to support this decision making process. If this work had been done in preparation of the ARC process, the transparency has not been there to suggest such and is still lacking as I will highlight.

As part of my job, I regularly review large capital funding applications. Business cases are required that include cost estimates, alternatives with supporting information, timelines, risk assessment, and conclusions based on solid analysis.

Decisions are based on a review of all the information and what provides the best overall value for the company in the long term... not the decision that ensures the request will get approved.

I evaluate the business cases to ensure they meet certain policy and financial hurdles. But also from an overall perspective, at the end, I sit back and ask myself, "if this was my money, my house, my future, what would I do?"

As trustees, this is your mandate on behalf of your electorate. Based on the information made available, do you have a clear understanding of the financial analysis provided and does it give you comfort that you are able to select the alternative that provides the best overall value as well as learning environment for both today and the future students of this community? I would be hard pressed at this point.

There is no comparative summary with a bottom line of the capital cost items required at each site and there is no cost estimates provided for each of the renovation alternatives. The cost estimates for each of the 6 alternatives were requested by the ARC for presentation at the final working meeting but only the overviews of the plans by the architects were available at that time. The estimates were still in development we were told.... Will these be made available to the trustees as they are not in the final staff report. There is currently only a comment in the Rationale table that says the architects have estimated that the capital cost renewal and addition costs would be higher at the South Plympton site due to additional classrooms and the replacement of the septic system; no dollar amount provided. Is the amount materially different?

Even if the required capital expansion at South Plympton is slightly larger due to the smaller starting foot print, is it potentially more value added to build more today in a more logical and forward thinking manner than to retrofit more of the Wyoming location? Again, we are told there are funding application advantages to the Wyoming site because in the eyes of the ministry the OTG capacity is higher and therefore would require less capacity expansion. Is this being short sighted?

The need for a new and larger septic system at the South Plympton appears to be helping to sway the decision toward the Wyoming site in the Final Staff Board report. The architects mentioned the cost of a new system would be about \$200K. What is the offsetting sewage charges paid to the town of Wyoming over the life of the septic system? That's the net benefit to the Wyoming site selection; not the cost of the septic system at SP as an absolute. Also,

there has been no mention of the potential for hooking into the town sanitary system that is less than a km from the site – what would be the cost of this? The sanitary line will need to be extended to support the new subdivision planned for almost adjacent to the South Plympton site. Has this been considered?

Real Estate Property valuations have not been completed for each site to know which site would have more resale value even though we are told the proceeds would go back to the capital fund. It's not a factor in the application for ministry funding... so it doesn't matter to the overall decision? However, if ministry capital funding application is not successful, this is important as the capital pool will be the funding source.

It would be valuable to see a "must have" list of required renovations with cost estimate by site, vs a "nice to have" list and associated cost. If funding is not achieved and the LKDSB must fund the renovations from their own capital pool, it will be only the must haves that will get completed for the most part likely.

Even the ongoing bussing costs from CLASS are incomplete as the new routing designs have not been completed to incorporate the co-terminus board. I don't believe we truly know what the cost savings are for the Wyoming site. It is suggested by class that there will be a reduction in the number of busses but "This reduction will provide minor, incremental mileage cost reductions for both school boards..." (final staff report, pg 18). If this comment is accurate, than the savings on transportation should be considered immaterial in the overall decision; (although it has been the subject of much discussion). Either that or the information in the Final Staff report is not quite correct.

Chairwomen Bryce can be quoted as saying "We need to look into the future and see what's best for students in 40, 50 years, not just what's going to be best for the next five years". So far in my opinion, for the Wyoming/South Plympton ARC, this does not appear to be the case since the majority of the analysis has been based on a 5-10 year view.... Coincidence that that's what the Ministry focus is.

There seems to be too large of focus on what is the best decision to support securing the capital funding from the ministry rather than what is the best overall value solution for the board, community, and most importantly the students.

I have no illusion that what I have presented was earth shattering to this process or decision. I do see the merits of both schools and agree that consolidation makes sense. What I do hope to achieve by my comments this evening is for the trustees to consider the information provided in the Final staff report and the supporting documentation from a different perspective. As a total impact to the LKDSB and the community... not a decision derived from what the best looking decision is for the funding application.

If I were in a decision maker's position, I would be asking for a lot more information and clarification from the Board before May 24th.

Thank you,
VRiess

Source:
JBryce Quote

<http://www.theobserver.ca/2016/03/15/more-financially-sound-redevelopment-opportunities-exist-for-st-clair-according-to-city-staff-report>