



**REVIEW of PUBLISHED INFORMATION**

**Regarding**

**RAINBOW**

**District School Board**

**Sudbury West**

**R.H. MURRAY PUBLIC SCHOOL**

**PROPOSED CLOSURE**

---

The information in this document has been gleaned from Rainbow DSB documents on their web site and, where not available, prepared by the author.

---

Thomas Price

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The potential closure of R.H. Murray Public School has been recently proposed. The proposal has been presented as the best of a number of alternatives being considered by the Rainbow District School Board. Documentation regarding the proposed closure has been posted on Rainbow DSB web site.

This report was prepared as an analysis of the web site information on behalf of concerned parents that will be affected by a closure of the school.

### CONCLUSIONS:

- There is *insufficient information* presented in the web site postings to justify any changes from current conditions.
- There are sufficient *irregularities* in the web site postings to justify a complete review of the data.
- There is *no comparison of alternatives* presented to demonstrate that R.H. Murray should be closed.
- Capital, operating or maintenance costs for alternatives have not been presented.
- There is ample evidence to demonstrate that the closure of R.H. Murray will be detrimental to the students, in terms of
  - Time effectiveness
  - Risk
  - Personal identity
  - Learning accessibility

### RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Further progress towards the closure of the R.H. Murray Public School should be delayed until a clear and accurate picture of the alternatives is available and can be reviewed by the trustee and parents within the R.H. Murray boundary.
- All boundary areas in Sudbury West should conduct a review similar to this one.

# INDEX

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
INDEX	3
1.0 INTRODUCTION	4
2.0 REFERENCE INFORMATION	5
2.1 Revisions	5
3.0 SUMMARY	6
3.1 PRIORITIES	6
3.2 TERMS & ABBREVIATIONS	6
3.3 DATA SUMMARY	8
4.0 ANALYSIS	9
4.1 VALUE TO STUDENT	9
4.1.1 Omissions	9
4.1.2 Inclusions	11
4.2 VALUE TO BOARD	13
School Condition	14
Location	17
Enrollment	17
Cost to Operate	18
Supports	19
Summary	19
4.3 VALUE TO THE COMMUNITY	20
4.4 VALUE TO THE LOCAL ECONOMY	20
Local Development	20
Growth/Reduction	21

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION:**

The Rainbow District School Board is in the process of reviewing the present and future utilization of schools in the Sudbury West area. This area includes the following primary and secondary schools:

- Copper Cliff Public School
- George Vanier Public School
- Jessie Hamilton Public School
- R. H. Murray Public School
- Lively District Secondary School

School Valuations have been prepared and are posted on the Rainbow web site. This report reviews and analyzes, to the extent possible, the information in the valuations using information down-loaded on December 24, 2007.

Options are being considered for redeployment of the assets but no information is presented indicating how those options fare against the current situation.

### ***BASIC PREMISE: It takes a village to raise a child.***

While the above seems obvious and not in need of repetition, the concept and benefits are not at all clear to many who are in positions to affect the creation and sustainability of villages. Schooling plays a major role in “Village” life and therefore is a non-negotiable principle to those who value this concept in the rearing of their off-spring.

The parents and students of R.H. Murray Public School all value “Village” life and are extremely concerned that, in spite of every effort to enable a school capable of being the focal point, external forces are placing the “Village” at risk. These parents have seen a steady erosion of the facilities that make a “Village” by the centralization of everything from service stations to grocery stores to governmental services and even including churches into urban areas where anonymity is now creating social problems. Many of these social problems are avoided in a “Village” where personal identity is a badge to be worn proudly instead of a liability to be minimized and hidden.

This report is designed to fairly analyze all of the data that seems to be placing the school at risk and where possible find factors beneficial to the survival of the school and the “Village”.

## 2.0 REFERENCE INFORMATION:

The following reference material was down-loaded from the Rainbow web site on December 24, 2007 and is the basis for all analyses contained in the report.

- Sudbury West ARC – Public Meeting #3 September 19, 2007
- City of Greater Sudbury – Demographics April 26, 2007
- Rainbow DSB – Utilization Rating February 21, 2007
- Rainbow DSB – Enrollment (Not dated)
- Rainbow DSB – 5 year Capital (to 2010 – 2011)
  - Copper Cliff Public School Dated March 30, 2007
  - George Vanier Public School Dated April 2, 2007
  - Jessie Hamilton Public School Dated April 2, 2007
  - R.H. Murray Public School Dated April 2, 2007
  - Lively District Secondary School Dated April 2, 2007
- Rainbow DSB – School Valuation Framework
  - Copper Cliff Public School Dated March 19, 2007
  - George Vanier Public School Dated March 19, 2007
  - Jessie Hamilton Public School Dated March 19, 2007
  - R.H. Murray Public School Dated April 4, 2007
  - Lively District Secondary School Dated March 19, 2007

## 2.1 REVISIONS:

Rev.	Date	Pages Revised	Description
A	Jan 6/08	3 5 17 19	Updated Index Added List of Revisions Updated demographics by City of Sudbury Supports

### **3.0 SUMMARY:**

The valuations posted on the web site are incomplete for the purpose of decision making and require more input before reasonable consideration of changes to the current situation can be meaningful. It may be that some of the information is available at the Rainbow DSB but are simply not included in the Sudbury West site.

Examples of some of the information needed but not on the web site include but are not limited to the following.

- Taxation bases for each school
- Asset values for each school
- Rationalization of costing process used for capital forecasts
- Cost of capital
- Bussing costs for each school
- Snow removal costs for each school
- Labor costs for each school
- Distributables to each school
- Comparison between current conditions and the options being considered

With the data that is available from the web site, preparation of this report has been hampered by a number of areas where information is either in conflict within the various reports, does not adhere to reasonable practices or is not presented.

The Rainbow DSB web site presents information that brings into question the practices of the Rainbow DSB and/or organization(s) responsible for assembling the information and it is recommended that the Ministry of Education be approached to perform an audit of the practices in evidence.

### **3.1 PRIORITIES:**

Following the lead defined in “Sudbury West ARC – Public Meeting #3 September 19, 2007” the following priorities were assumed in trying to analyze the information:

- Value to the student
- Value to the school board
- Value to the community
- Value to the local economy

### **3.2 TERMS & ABBREVIATIONS:**

The following terms and/or abbreviations are used in this report.

Rainbow DSB	Rainbow District School Board
OTG	On the Ground Capacity
ADE	Average Daily Enrollment

FCI  
LDSS

Facility Condition Index  
Lively District Secondary School

### **3.2.1 OTG:**

- Reflects the number of student spaces available within a school.
- Based on Ministry of Education funding benchmarks.

### **3.2.2 ADE:**

- Actual Average Daily Enrollment numbers except where forecasted into the future.

### **3.2.3 FCI:**

- Facility Renewal and Repair Cost\* divided by Replacement Cost of Asset.

\* Cumulative capital projects for 2006 – 2007 (1 year) appear to have been used in determining the FCI for current conditions while cumulative capital projects for 5 years (2010 – 2011) is used for the FCI for 2010 – 2011 conditions.

### 3.3 DATA SUMMARY:

The following summarizes data from the web site documentation and itemizes other data that is necessary in evaluating the circumstances surrounding each school. As noted previously, a large portion of the necessary information is not available from the documentation.

#### RAINBOW

District School Board

#### CURRENT

No change - maintain present

2007 dollars	Copper Cliff	George Vanier	Jessie Hamilton	RH Murray	Lively DSS	TOTALS
OTG Capacity	288	480	302	158	852	2080
AD Enrollment	213	346	337	105	399	1400
Size (square feet)	35144	47200	28417	15188	127380	253329
Asset Value						
Depreciation						0
Maintenance	47260	39854	18823	24558	54473	184968
Building	36484	32242	12129	11396	40553	132804
\$ per square foot	1.04	0.68	0.43	0.75	0.32	0.52
Property	10776	7612	6694	13162	13920	52164
Operating costs	60489	77330	51468	28091	188383	405761
Utilities	60489	77330	51468	28091	188383	405761
\$ per ADE	284	223	153	268	472	290
Supplies						
Snow removal						
Bussing						
Labour						
Distributables						
Other	779	646	597	467	949	3438
Security	779	646	597	467	949	3438
TOTAL	108,528	117,830	70,888	53,116	243,805	594,167
\$ per OTG	377	245	235	336	286	286
\$ per square foot	3.09	2.50	2.49	3.50	1.91	2.35
Taxation Base						
\$ per OTG	0	0	0	0	0	0

While the “Sudbury West ARC – Public Meeting #3 September 19, 2007” refers to options for the Current situation, none of the above information was available for any of the options.

## **4.0 ANALYSIS:**

The analysis has been carried out in the same sequence as the “School Valuation Framework” used by the Rainbow DSB and is categorized into the following sections:

- Value to the student
- Value to the School Board
- Value to the Community
- Value to the Local Economy

While every effort has been made to understand how the “School Valuation” data is valued and what weight the Rainbow DSB applies to the data, there is little in the Valuations to indicate any relative values towards decision making. Therefore some license has been taken in trying to value the various items.

### **4.1 VALUE TO THE STUDENT:**

#### **4.1.1 OMISSIONS**

Value to the Students in the School Valuation documents omits or down-plays four major factors of consideration to the students:

- Time effectiveness (time commitment versus instruction time).
- Travel risk due to bus miles.
- Security
- Identity

#### **Time Effectiveness:**

The total time commitment to schooling includes instruction time, travel time to and from school and homework time. The time required for travel versus the actual schooling time, excluding homework time can be used to determine how time effective a school is for the students attending. Obviously, the higher the travel time, the less time effective a school is.

#### **Travel Risk:**

Travel risk is associated with the kilometers traveled each day in going to and from school. The greater the distance, the greater the risk.

Both Time Commitment and Travel Risk are of major consideration both currently and in considering that the Ontario Government wants to impose all day school on the youngest of our children. Currently the smaller ones often arrive home asleep on the bus.

Increasing either of these factors comes close to constituting child abuse.

**Security:**

While the School Valuations concentrate mainly on the security within the school, there are many other factors influencing how secure children feel in their surroundings, including:

- Knowing all of the adults they come into contact with, in their day.
- Knowing where to go if they are threatened in their travel to and from school.
- Exposure to outside influences adjacent to the school.
- Knowing the other children of other age groups and having confidence in reporting misconduct without fear of reprisal.

**Identity:**

Each adult and child desires and values recognition for accomplishments, deeds and, identification and correction of misdemeanors. For children, this recognition is a key to development and how well they progress in life. With larger total enrollment in a school it becomes increasingly difficult to provide this personal identity contact.

**Summary:**

Because of the high value of these factors to the students, a valuation system has been structured showing the current conditions.

<b>RAINBOW</b>		<b>CURRENT</b>				
<b>District School Board</b>		<b>No change - maintain present</b>				
<b>2011</b>		<b>Copper Cliff</b>	<b>George Vanier</b>	<b>Jessie Hamilton</b>	<b>RH Murray</b>	<b>Lively DSS</b>
	OTG Capacity	288	480	302	158	852
	AD Enrollment	204	362	346	145	466
	10 yr Ave. Utilization	71%	75%	115%	92%	55%
	% students bussed	32%	76%	80%	97%	80%
1.0	Student	25	42	58	116	293
1.1	Instr. Time (hrs/day)	5	5	5	5	5
	(hrs/day x ADE)	1,021	1,812	1,730	724	2,328
1.2	Travel time	25	96	159	248	383
1.3	Travel (Bus km)	5	4	7	23	37
1.4	Travel risk	3	12	20	32	138
1.5	Time effective	10	9	9	26	9
1.6	Security					
1.7	Identity					

The lower the total is for Item 1.0 the higher the value is to the student. Items 1.6 & 1.7 require a joint evaluation by students, parent groups and teachers to establish how the students value them in their school environment.

Clearly, travel factors have a major negative impact with the net result that students being transported considerable distances are at a major disadvantage relative to other students.

This type of valuation is required for each of the schooling options being considered.

## 4.1.2 INCLUSIONS

Factors in the School Valuation documents relative to Student Values deal primarily with physical conditions deemed to be of value to the students. While no value has been placed on these physical conditions, a summary of them is offered below. The summaries are the percentage of physical conditions listed in the report that each school has in place.

<b>RAINBOW</b>		<b>CURRENT</b>				
<b>District School Board</b>		<b>No change - maintain present</b>				
	<b>2011</b>	Copper Cliff	George Vanier	Jessie Hamilton	RH Murray	Lively DSS
	OTG Capacity	288	480	302	158	852
	AD Enrollment	204	362	346	145	466
	10 yr Ave. Utilization	71%	75%	115%	92%	55%
	% students bussed	31.8%	76.2%	79.7%	96.7%	80.4%
1.0	<b>Value to Student</b>	91.1%	64.1%	66.8%	72.4%	73.1%
1.1	Physical Space	87.5%	66.7%	58.3%	75.0%	95.8%
1.2	Grounds	90.0%	60.0%	80.0%	70.0%	60.0%
1.3	Courses	89.5%	78.9%	84.2%	68.4%	94.7%
1.4	Extracurricular	100.0%	60.0%	0.0%	60.0%	0.0%
1.5	Scholastic [05 -06]	70.8%	61.2%	78.2%	66.8%	61.0%
1.6	Accessibility	100.0%	22.2%	66.7%	66.7%	100.0%
1.7	Security	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
1.8	Proximity					
	Travel time	25	96	159	248	383
	Travel [km]	5	4	7	23	37
1.9	Support	85.7%	85.7%	85.7%	42.9%	85.7%
	ADE per Ed Asst.	81.7	725	173	290	155
1.10	Funds	?	?	?	?	?
1.11	Summary	?	?	?	?	?

There are several issues with this valuation:

- Accessibility
- Security
- Funds
- Summary

### **Accessibility:**

Accessibility deals almost entirely with mobility issues with no mention or reference to hearing, visual, emotional or cognitive challenges. There is no inference or reference to accessibility to learning which should be of the highest value to the students. It is difficult to find a relationship between handicapped parking spaces and student values in primary schools.

The scholastic achievement of the R.H. Murray students, in spite of negative travel factors is an indicator that accessibility to learning at the school is high.

**Security:**

Security deals entirely with physical security systems. There is no mention of student training, staff training, bus security (loading and unloading) and qualifications of staff and bus drivers to adequately deal with a security issue.

**Funds:**

Funds is categorized into three groups:

- Raising funds
- Corporate donations
- Contributions to the community

While all of these are interesting, there is nothing to indicate a value to the students. In fact, corporate donations, raises some disturbing questions:

- Why is Copper Cliff the only recipient of funds from Vale Inco?
- Why are Copper Cliff and Jessie Hamilton the only recipients of funds from the Greater City of Sudbury?
- Why is Copper Cliff the only recipient of funds from the Rainbow DSB?

While fund raising is in the tens of thousands of dollars, with the exception of R.H. Murray, there is no indication of how or where these funds have been used. Accomplishment must be accompanied by accountability to be meaningful.

**RAINBOW****District School Board web site**

3 year annual average

	Copper Cliff	George Vanier	Jessie Hamilton	RH Murray
AD Enrollment	213	346	337	105
Fund Raising	1576	18513	29864	7300
\$ per ADE	7.40	53.51	88.62	69.52
To community	?	4960	?	6000
\$ per ADE	?	14.34	?	57.14
Corp. donations	650	400	500	2300
\$ per ADE	3.05	1.16	1.48	21.90

One time events	Copper Cliff	George Vanier	Jessie Hamilton	RH Murray
Vale Inco	13000			
City of Sudbury	5000		13000	
Rainbow SB	5000			

**Summary:**

The summaries are also categorized into three groups:

- Why do students choose this school?

- What is unique about this school?
- What is the value of the school to the students?

The first question is redundant. The vast majority of students don't choose their schools. Either parents or the school boards determine which school a student goes to.

The second question has some merit but the answers provided show no indication of value to the students.

The third question is absolutely redundant in that Section 1 of the Valuation Framework, in its entirety should be determining the value to the students.

## 4.2 VALUE TO SCHOOL BOARD:

4.2.1 The following presents a comparison of the Value to School Board.

<b>RAINBOW</b>		<b>CURRENT</b>				
<b>District School Board</b>		<b>No change - maintain present</b>				
<b>2011</b>		<b>Copper Cliff</b>	<b>George Vanier</b>	<b>Jessie Hamilton</b>	<b>RH Murray</b>	<b>Lively DSS</b>
	OTG Capacity	288	480	302	158	852
	AD Enrollment	204	362	346	145	466
	10 yr Ave. Utilization	71%	75%	115%	92%	55%
	% students bussed	31.8%	76.2%	79.7%	96.7%	80.4%
2.0	<b>Value to Board</b>					
2.1	Physical Space	87.5%	66.7%	58.3%	75.0%	95.8%
2.2	Courses	89.5%	78.9%	84.2%	68.4%	94.7%
2.3	Scholastic [05 -06]	70.8%	61.2%	78.2%	66.8%	61.0%
2.4	School Condition					
	Constructed	1937	1950	1958	1956	1956 - 1970
	Present FCI	62%	69%	64%	72%	40%
	Present renewal	\$3,100,000	\$4,401,023	\$3,123,706	\$1,886,772	\$6,787,251
	5 year FCI	67%	76%	76%	98%	49%
	5 year renewal	\$3,400,000	\$4,861,579	\$3,725,472	\$2,574,505	\$8,298,996
2.5	Location					
	Percent bussed	30.0%	65.8%	80.1%	96.7%	80.4%
	Average distance	2.00	4.97	3.41	11.50	19.75
	Average daily time	10	24	34	53	32
2.6	Enrollment					
	Capacity	311	480	302	158	860
	Current	233	346	337	110	410
	Utilization	74.9%	72.1%	111.6%	69.6%	47.7%
	5 year	170	349	314	87	371
	Utilization	55%	73%	104%	55%	43%
	10 year	160	341	340	83	312
	Utilization	51.4%	71.0%	112.6%	52.5%	36.3%
2.7	Cost to operate/year	\$108,528	\$117,830	\$70,888	\$53,116	\$243,805
	Utilities	\$60,489	\$77,330	\$51,468	\$28,091	\$188,383
	Building	\$36,484	\$32,242	\$12,129	\$11,396	\$40,553
	Grounds	\$10,776	\$7,612	\$6,694	\$13,162	\$13,920
	Security	\$779	\$646	\$597	\$467	\$949
	Cost/current enrollment	\$465.79	\$340.55	\$210.35	\$482.87	\$594.65
2.8	Supports	85.7%	85.7%	85.7%	42.9%	85.7%
2.9	Summary	?	?	?	?	?
	School Area (sq ft)	35144	47200	28417	15188	127380
	Cost/sq ft	\$3.09	\$2.50	\$2.49	\$3.50	\$1.91

4.2.2 Items 2.1, 2.2 & 2.3 are identical to “Value to the Student” values. There is no indication anywhere whether the items listed in the Valuation Frameworks are items desired by the Rainbow DSB and it is therefore impossible to determine if having a listed item is of value or not.

**School Condition:**

4.2.3 Item 2.4 is interesting but does not present the entire picture. The following table shows the “Renewal” costs, the replacement capital costs and the savings for doing renewal as opposed to new capital.

**RAINBOW**

**District School Board web site**

	Copper Cliff	George Vanier	Jessie Hamilton	RH Murray	Lively DSS
OTG Capacity	288	480	302	158	852

2006 - 2007	\$3,182,476	\$4,401,023	\$3,123,706	\$1,886,772	\$6,787,251
AD Enrollment	213	346	337	105	399
Utilization	74%	72%	112%	66%	47%
FCI	62%	59%	64%	72%	40%
Replacement	\$5,133,026	\$7,459,361	\$4,880,791	\$2,620,517	\$16,968,128
Savings	\$1,950,550	\$3,058,338	\$1,757,085	\$733,745	\$10,180,877

2010 - 2011	\$3,456,924	\$4,861,579	\$3,725,472	\$2,574,505	\$8,298,996
AD Enrollment	170	349	314	87	371
Utilization	59%	73%	104%	55%	44%
FCI	67%	76%	78%	98%	49%
Replacement	\$5,159,588	\$6,396,814	\$4,776,246	\$2,627,046	\$16,936,727
Savings	\$1,702,664	\$1,535,235	\$1,050,774	\$52,541	\$8,637,731

2014 - 2015					
AD Enrollment	153	341	340	83	312
Utilization	53%	71%	113%	53%	37%

The FCI numbers are presented in an “Accommodation Review Committee” document dated February 28, 2007. Since this is more than 50% into the school year of 2006 – 2007, one should be able to assume this capital was invested as planned in 2007. It appears that the money was not invested.

4.2.4 In reviewing the numbers, there is indication that the investment of 2006 – 2007 renewal money would have saved about \$18,000,000 versus construction of new facilities and \$1,600,000 in renewal costs that will now be required by 2010 – 2011.

\$19,381,228 2006 - 2007 Renewal  
 \$37,061,822 2006 - 2007 Replacement  
 \$22,917,476 2010 - 2011 Renewal

However, the numbers and the manner in which they are reported leaves considerable doubt as to their validity.

4.2.5 There were two sets of renewal costs available on the web site, one dated January 29, 2007 and one dated March 30, 2007. The following table compares the detailed costs and presents a number of disturbing questions.

**RAINBOW**

1/29/2007 Projection

District School Board web site

3/30/2007 Projection

**5 YEAR CAPITAL**

to 2011	Copper Cliff	George Vanier	Jessie Hamilton	RH Murray	Lively DSS
OTG Capacity	288	480	302	158	852
Architectural	1,673,059	2,172,482	1,749,400	645,950	2,849,380
	1,658,440	2,172,482	1,749,400	645,950	2,854,581
% of total	48%	45%	47%	25%	34%
Per OTG	5,758	4,526	5,793	4,088	3,350
Carpeting	3%	5%	3%	10%	0%
Millwork	24%	35%	26%	54%	0%
Mechanical	750,270	821,584	553,029	630,607	1,515,900
	693,620	821,584	553,029	630,607	1,137,435
% of total	20%	17%	15%	24%	14%
Per OTG	2,408	1,712	1,831	3,991	1,335
Electrical	283,862	277,719	116,168	113,300	1,148,012
	283,862	277,719	116,168	113,300	1,921,140
% of total	8%	6%	3%	4%	23%
Per OTG	986	579	385	717	2,255
Land/Parking	123,711	483,294	409,964	789,782	1,265,704
	194,980	483,294	409,964	789,782	865,840
% of total	6%	10%	11%	31%	10%
Per OTG	677	1,007	1,357	4,999	1,016
Sports fields	50%	28%	32%	53%	22%
Parking lots	9%	23%	10%	6%	26%
Site improvements	42%	49%	58%	41%	52%
Handicap	150,000	553,634	382,733	41,000	325,000
	150,000	553,634	382,733	41,000	325,000
% of total	4%	11%	10%	2%	4%
Per OTG	521	1,153	1,267	259	381
Environmental	476,022	552,866	514,178	353,866	1,195,000
	476,022	552,866	514,178	353,866	1,195,000
% of total	14%	11%	14%	14%	14%
Per OTG	1,653	1,152	1,703	2,240	1,403
AHU Study	8%	6%	8%	10%	8%
AHU Repair	69%	55%	69%	86%	68%
Facility Condition	67%	76%	78%	98%	49%

TOTALS	3,456,924	4,861,579	3,725,472	2,574,505	8,298,996
\$ per OTG	12,003	10,128	12,336	16,294	9,741
Square feet	35,144	47,200	28,417	15,188	127,380
\$ per square foot	98	103	131	170	65

4.2.6 During February and March of 2007, a considerable amount of money was shuffled within the Copper Cliff Public School and the Lively District Secondary School estimates. Since the total numbers didn't change one must assume that accounts where money was taken out of were padded significantly or the money is needed and will not be available.

In the case of Copper Cliff	\$71,269	put into Land/parking	+ 57.6%
	\$14,619	taken from Architectural	- 0.8%
	\$56,650	taken from Mechanical	- 7.6%
 In the case of LDSS	 \$773,128	 put into electrical	 + 67.3%
	\$399,864	taken from Land/parking	- 31.6%
	\$378,465	taken from mechanical	- 25.0%

This type of number shuffling is generally an indication that a total number is set arbitrarily and people work within them as opposed to budgeting for identified needs. It is extremely disturbing to see evidence of such a cavalier approach to spending taxpayer money and protecting the value of taxpayer assets.

4.2.7 The costs for R.H. Murray are out of line with the other schools in the following areas:

- Carpets 10% of architectural versus 3% to 5% \$64,595
- Millwork 54% of architectural versus 24% to 35% \$348,813
- Land/Parking 31% versus 6% to 11% \$789,782
- AHU repair 86% of Environmental versus 55% to 69% \$304,325

If these costs were in line with the other schools, there would be a reduction in renewal cost for R.H. Murray of about \$850,000 or about 33% and in turn lower the facility condition from 72% to 40%.

#### **Carpets:**

This appears to be an unwarranted estimate considering that there currently are no carpets in the school and there does not appear to be a need for any.

#### **Millwork:**

It is difficult to rationalize this amount of millwork at the school and the Board should provide justification for the projected expenditures.

#### **Land/Parking:**

The larger portion of this cost is \$652,207 for "Sports Fields" and "Site Improvements". This is incomprehensible to people familiar with the school and justification for these projected expenditures should be provided by the Board.

**AHU Repair:**

The estimated cost for AHU repair is identical to the cost for George Vanier, a school more than three times the size of R.H. Murray. Justification for the projected expenditures should be provided by the Board.

**Location:**

- 4.2.8 The information contained in the Valuation Framework, Value to the School Board documents varies from the Value to the Student. The variation is not large and does not warrant any degree of analysis.
- 4.2.9 There is NOTHING in this section of the Valuations to reflect what the value of location means to the Board or to the taxpayer. Location within a school boundary dictates the cost to bus students. Within the Sudbury West boundary area, location would dictate site location for any proposed alternative locations. This would appear to be gross over-site in the valuation process.

**Enrollment:**

- 4.2.10 The OTG for Copper Cliff Public School increased from 288 to 311 (about 8%) between February 28, 2007 and March 19, 2007. There is no indication in the documentation why or how this capacity increase occurred in two weeks.
- 4.2.11 The documentation indicates forecasted enrollment for a 5 year projection and a 10 year projection.

A report is posted on the web site relative to demographics. Title of the report is:

City of Greater Sudbury  
An overview of demographics &  
development in the western portion of the  
City of Greater Sudbury  
April 26, 2007

*Revision A*

*City of Greater Sudbury  
An update of demographics &  
development in the western portion of the  
City of Greater Sudbury  
September 19, 2007*

By its inclusion on the web site one would assume that this information was used to project enrollments. However, since it was published only after the Valuation Frameworks were completed this can not have been the case.

If the data contained in the report was available prior to the completion of the Valuation Frameworks in spite of the conflict in publication dates, the data does not support the information in the Frameworks.

- The report indicates that the Walden area has the lowest rate of population decline in the Greater City.
- The report does not break out the population by school boundaries.
- The report does not take into account the population demographics of the Whitefish Reserve. A number of native students are enrolled at R.H. Murray and presumably will continue to be enrolled there. It is therefore necessary to have some indication of how the native student count is expected to vary over the next 5 years and 10 years. This is totally absent from the report and presumably from the enrollment forecasts that have been published.
- The report shows an increase in single family dwellings of close to 100% for the Walden area but does not divide this into school boundary areas or even into community areas.
- Population Ages 0 – 14 (2001 Census) is dated and of no useful purpose in estimating future enrollments.

**Net Result:**

*There does not appear to be any logical reasoning for including the study on the web site other than to imply that the demographics have been used in forecasting enrollment numbers. This is obviously not possible from the report.*

**Cost to Operate:**

4.2.12 A summary of the operating costs is presented below.

<b>RAINBOW</b>		<b>CURRENT</b>				
<b>District School Board</b>		<b>No change - maintain present</b>				
<b>2011</b>	<b>Copper Cliff</b>	<b>George Vanier</b>	<b>Jessie Hamilton</b>	<b>RH Murray</b>	<b>Lively DSS</b>	
OTG Capacity	288	480	302	158	852	
AD Enrollment	204	362	346	145	466	
10 yr Ave. Utilization	71%	75%	115%	92%	55%	
% students bussed	31.8%	76.2%	79.7%	96.7%	80.4%	
2.0 <b>Value to Board</b>						
2.7 <b>Cost to operate/year</b>	\$108,528	\$117,830	\$70,888	\$53,116	\$243,805	
Utilities	\$60,489	\$77,330	\$51,468	\$28,091	\$188,383	
Building	\$36,484	\$32,242	\$12,129	\$11,396	\$40,553	
Grounds	\$10,776	\$7,612	\$6,694	\$13,162	\$13,920	
Security	\$779	\$646	\$597	\$467	\$949	
Labor						
Bussing						
Snow removal						
Distributables						
Cost/current enrollment	\$465.79	\$340.55	\$210.35	\$482.87	\$594.65	
School Area (sq ft)	35144	47200	28417	15188	127380	
Cost/sq ft	\$3.09	\$2.50	\$2.49	\$3.50	\$1.91	

4.2.13 As indicated earlier in this report (Section 3.3), there are four major omissions from the operating cost summary.

- Labor costs (teaching and custodial staff)
- Bussing
- Snow removal
- Distributables

All of the operating costs, including the four major ones that have been omitted must be considered in any decision making process relative to alternatives and should be available to demonstrate the reasons for the decisions.

#### 4.2.14 Some anomalies within the information provided require explanation.

- It is difficult to rationalize why building operating costs for Jessie Hamilton and R.H. Murray are essentially the same in spite of Jessie Hamilton being almost twice as large as R.H. Murray, having more than double the student population and having a student population 15% in excess of its capacity.
- It is even more difficult to rationalize why the Grounds operating costs for R.H. Murray are the highest of all four primary schools and the same as LDSS.

R.H. Murray grounds costs are presented as almost double the costs for George Vanier in spite of George Vanier being 3 times the size with a student population more than double the R.H. Murray student body.

R.H. Murray grounds costs are presented as almost double the costs for Jessie Hamilton in spite of George Vanier being 2 times the size with a student population more than double the R.H. Murray student body and 15% in excess of its capacity.

R.H. Murray grounds costs are presented as the same as the costs for LDSS in spite of LDSS being more than 8 times the size with a student population more than 3 times the R.H. Murray student body.

#### **Supports:**

4.2.15 This section of the Valuation Frameworks documents the staffing of each subject school. There is no value system indicated for these positions and no indication of whether there is a need for the position at the subject school.

For the purpose of this report the occupied positions for each subject school has been presented as a percentage of the listed positions.

*It is noted however, that R.H. Murray qualifies and additional funding is supplied to the Rainbow DSB for “rural” classification. While Ministry guidelines stipulate that this funding is to cover the cost of a full time principal, R.H. Murray does not a full time principal. How are these funds being used?*

#### **Summary:**

4.2.16 One should expect this summary to totalize and summarize the values of the preceding sections such that a summary value to the Board is presented. This is not the case and only verbalized opinions are presented.

### **4.3 VALUE TO THE COMMUNITY:**

- 4.3.1 It is obvious from the information presented for each subject school that the authors had tremendous difficulty in trying to determine what factors could be seen as being of value to the community or even who the community is.

It is evident that each community (?) values their school for different reasons and that these reasons are directly tied to the character of the community.

Assigning values to these that can be used in comparing alternatives would be a fruitless exercise as all alternatives will change the character of the community and to differing degrees destroy the value that the school presents.

- 4.3.2 It should be relatively obvious that a local community group that currently makes use of the school facilities will no longer be able to do so if that school is closed. Since a comparison of the impact of alternatives is not available on the web site it is impossible to assess the benefits/penalties that will result within each community.

i.e. Where will handicapped accessible polling stations be located if R.H. Murray is closed?

### **4.4 VALUE TO THE LOCAL ECONOMY:**

- 4.4.1 One should expect to see the following in establishing a value to the local economy.

- The portion of the school tax base that is required to sustain operation of the school facility and how this will change for proposed alternatives \*.
- Local residents directly employed by the school.
- Local residents indirectly employed as a result of the school presence.
- Amount of money flowing into the economy from local school employment, operating and maintenance needs.
- Is the quality of education and conditions surrounding the school sufficient to inspire or sustain the current population? As evidenced in Section 4.2.11, the Walden area has the lowest population decline in the City of Greater Sudbury and one of the largest percentage increases in single family dwellings. Is the quality of schooling a factor in this?
- Is this attraction sufficient to identify the school area as a future stable employee pool?
- Is the school facility available to facilitate local employer use for employee training?

***\* It is important that all cost factors including capital, operating, maintenance, etc. be considered so that local industry can determine if their future taxation will be increasing or decreasing due to schooling and if those changes will affect their***

*viability if they remain in the area. The current information does NOTHING to identify the capital.*

There is NOTHING in the Valuation Frameworks to indicate any of the above.

**4.4.2 Local Development:**

This section deals only whether the school is an asset to local housing development or not. There is no indication of value to development of local industry which is ultimately the factor affecting the housing. This will become increasingly important in the future as commute distances to and from work will be heavily impacted by fuel costs. Elliot Lake has good access to schools, but without jobs the community almost disappeared. Many small communities further north are also at risk in spite of good schools but without employment. It is stretching the limits of credibility to suggest that schools are an asset to housing developments as a significant value to the local economy.

If this is a factor in the housing development affecting the local economy, then it would appear to be a forgone conclusion that closing R.H. Murray will terminate any further development in the west end.

**4.4.3 Growth/Reduction:**

Of the four primary schools with School Valuation Frameworks, only R.H. Murray indicates any defined commercial/industrial growth.