

LRFPfeedback

From: Magee PAC
Sent: Saturday, January 23, 2021 3:43 PM
To: LRFPfeedback
Cc: Allan Wong; Carmen Cho; Chair (Vancouver DPAC); Maria Hubinette; Skybren Richards
Subject: LRFP Vision
Attachments: 2021-01-23_Letter to Board regarding the LRFP.pdf

Dear VSB Trustees,

Please find our letter to the Board regarding the draft LRFP and our perspective regarding your visioning document into the future.

Sincerely,
The Magee PAC

LETTER OF SUPPORT OF BOARD'S VISION FOR SCHOOLS INTO THE FUTURE
From The Magee PAC Executive

January 23, 2021

Vancouver School Board
School District #39
1580 West Broadway
Vancouver, BC V6J 5K8

To the Attention of the Vancouver School Board Trustees

Dear Trustees:

The Vancouver School Board (VSB) and Parent Advisory Councils (PACs) have a common purpose: supporting safe and excellent education for our children. Of course, an important upcoming event is your vote on the Long Range Facilities Plan (LRFP) and we realize the urgency of the funding. At the same time, given the integral role the LRFP plays in facilities planning and approval for seismic projects, we urge you to look at two key goals that we feel need to be addressed:

1. Foreground the VSB vision to highlight the need for long-range planning and neighbourhood designing with schools as key elements
2. Funding models pertaining to education must consider socio-cultural and economic factors in creating flexible dynamic educational funding models

The VSB's vision for the Long-Range Facilities Plan (LRFP) is "to support student learning and well-being through: Neighbourhood schools; Safe schools; Vibrant learning spaces; and Community partnerships. The LRFP is intended to support this vision by providing the processes and facilities necessary to improve student outcomes". The Board has responsibilities to students, families, and the larger communities. Thus, we argue that foregrounding this vision in this document for the Ministry is critical so that they are pressed to clearly see the need for truly long range planning, as well as how substantial education is to the future in terms of workforce and social citizenship.

The spaces that house the learning are important and the need to have them properly funded is essential to the outcomes. We believe that you must communicate a strong vision to the Ministry that not only fulfills your financial responsibilities and educational duties more conservatively, but which highlights the goals and objectives that you see as important for them to reflect on. These goals and objectives may be less tangible in the current moment given the complexity we face at this time but embedding this plan more evidently in this larger vision creates the space for that to continue to weigh in future decisions. The Ministry must start hearing this resounded by the School Board Trustees, who are elected to represent and act for their constituents. Long-term investment requires the monies for properly resourcing capital projects upfront for the future. We must emphasize to the Ministry the need for financially supporting a vision that is whole and integral and equitable by bringing this well thought vision into reality by allocating sufficient funds, realizing that the rewards and benefits are coming down the line as a social dividend from the value added by these decisions.

In addition to foregrounding the vision that reminds us about longer-term gains, we further outline considerations for education funding models. We must call on the Ministry of Education to transform its educational funding model from something primarily fiscally driven into the larger set of costs that it truly represents. These models must be flexible and dynamic and consider socio-economics factors. We realize that the budget is an important consideration and the Board must consider the limitation of the current year's funding in its allocation, but we must advocate to the Ministry and push this envelope. We believe that there is more to planning than quantitative data, whether we talk about monetary concerns or school enrollment numbers. We understand that the data is not static and that this is considered a dynamic document, but key elements and their stages must be considered dynamic for planning purposes for it to be truly so. Immutable is the fixed past and the shaping future; of which, we can have affect on the later. Cultures and societies transmute and it is within those socially and culturally evolving perspectives where true growth can root. The contextual relevancies and understanding of the responsibilities must guide the overall planning of these spaces beyond the "kids in safe seats" motto. Politicians at all levels must begin to see that educational investments in our children seed potential for incredible return in the future if we value it sufficiently in the present.

We are aware that many of you are parents and that you share many of the same ideas, hopes, and concerns that we do for all the children and for their collective future. This is not the time to state the case softly or timidly but for courage into the future. Our kids have shown incredible courage and resilience through what has been a difficult year, but COVID is only the tip of the icebergs that they must have the skills and training and base knowledge to tackle the challenges before them, such as climate change and the weight of all of the interconnectivities that will intersect their lives. They deserve the advocacy that your leadership can provide on their behalf. We owe it to them. Do not weaken this document by understating the urgency, but make it your best shot for defending excellence in public education and their future by proclaiming the necessities that are reflected in your vision and do it with primacy within the LRFP document.

The problems facing our children are large and cannot withstand a meagreness in our actions for their benefit. Continue your efforts to vision and re-vision at each vantage point gained, and please make this document's vision something for which the current Board and future Boards can hold up as a beacon in lighting the way forward.

We thank you for your genuine efforts and for understanding the critical trust you hold.

Yours truly,

The Magee PAC

LRFPfeedback

From: Gladstone PAC
Sent: Saturday, January 23, 2021 9:36 PM
To: LRFPfeedback
Subject: LRFP Feedback from Gladstone Secondary PAC Exec

We, the PAC Executive at Gladstone Secondary School, are writing in strong support of all six amendments that our VSB39 DPAC has proposed to the draft LRFP document currently under consideration. The proposed plan does not integrate equity as a guiding principal and does not address accessibility, and this is of major concern to us. We also want to see clear numbers around how many school aged children actually live in (and are forecasted to live in) each neighbourhood, not a plan based on current school enrolment numbers. Finally, we also feel the LRFP should be aligned with the trustees' vision, not relegated to an appendix for information purposes only.

We are aware that the LRFP is a "living document", however many of these issues have been brought up before and have remained unaddressed. Please consider making these changes now, as the effects of leaving the issues unaddressed fall on the district's most vulnerable students.

Sincerely,
Gladstone Secondary PAC Executive

LRFFeedback

From: J M
Sent: Sunday, January 24, 2021 11:07 AM
To: LRFFeedback
Subject: Feedback

Hello,

"City of Vancouver planned developments will not be included in this analysis work until they have been approved and are moving to the construction phase."

If this is an assumption by the board, it's very short sighted, particularly in my Joyce-Collingwood community, which is and will undergo increased densification, unlike many parts of the city.

And if Carleton is closed, which I hope it isn't, it will be a loss to the community. Moreover, the VSB should not sell any land to private developers. If the grounds of Carleton need to be repurposed, there must be some creative way to keep the historical buildings for use.

Jeff Mazo

LRFPfeedback

From: Jennifer Wilshire
Sent: Sunday, January 24, 2021 11:09 AM
To: Estrellita Gonzalez
Cc: LRFPfeedback; Chair (Vancouver DPAC); Shahira Sakiyama; Zahra Esmail
Subject: Laura Secord Elementary PAC Support For Adding Strategic Vision to LRFP

Dear Trustee Gonzalez,

The Laura Secord Elementary PAC supports adding the Strategic Vision to the core LRFP document instead of having it as an appendix.

Thank you for your consideration,
Jennifer Wilshire
(on behalf of the Secord PAC Executive)

LRFPfeedback

From: L P
Sent: Sunday, January 24, 2021 4:04 PM
To: David Green; Shamirah Khan; Carmen Cho; ghinfo@gov.bc.ca; Suzanne Hoffman (Superintendent); EDUC.Minister@gov.bc.ca
Cc: LRFPfeedback; Janet Fraser; Allan Wong; Ricky Huang; Jennifer Reddy; Barbara Parrott; Oliver Hanson; Lois Chan-Pedley; presidentsoffice
Subject: Feedback LRFP 2021_ Strong Public Education

I'm a simple parent, citizen and expectator of this reality.

Canada is a great country. This greatness needs to be sustained and nurtured otherwise is fragil. Our government system Parliamentary Democracy allows individual rights for equality and education. The stronger bases of a strong country are "Health" and "Education" through which the society is able to progress and offer a quality life for their citizens.

By today January 2021 our "Health" base country is challenged and threatened by a pandemic COVID-19. Today January 24th, 2021 the city of Vancouver, "Education" base will be debilitated by LRFP Long term Long Range Facilities Plan 2020-2021 (pursued and presented since 2018). This plan is going forward into seismic improvements for school's buildings and close schools for sale of the land. Land which is a public asset and the decision to lose it will affect the shape of the communities.

The Ministry of Education took this decision because it is government's land at the end. The Vancouver School Board (VSB) goes into this vote process as a courtesy, not a meaning of matter (BC School Act). The District Parents Advisory Council (DPAC) has been diminished in their concerns and ignored their voice by no logical answer questions. The LRFP document is full of unclear detailed data and well covered for sensitive content.

Vancouver, British Columbia city real estate is expensive. The negative to keep the land even as a rent model, has just money interest (involving billions).

Is it immoral to lose this land. No prevent space to reduce classes of 15 or less students (more in this time of COVID pandemic that will remain by years), No to enforce strong public education with well paid staff and support educational programs (music, sports, and languages). Is immoral got this money and fell down well paid contracts full time with benefits to teachers (continuing pursue the new education model part time teachers no benefits). As well after the sale, ask parents for fundraising money for school projects.

I expect this Feedback goes into the records and won't be deleted in order to hide the reality of this LRFP.

This is my right as a simple parent to speak out.

Thanks to those who worked to avoid it and tried to raise their voice on this.

The greatness of Canada is fragil. Public Education and their spaces are a right (BC School Act).

Lidia Perez

--

LRFPfeedback

From: Sarah Westwick
Sent: Sunday, January 24, 2021 9:59 PM
To: Carmen Cho; Estrellita Gonzalez; Fraser Ballantyne; Janet Fraser; Lois Chan-Pedley; Oliver Hanson; Barbara Parrott; Jennifer Reddy; Allan Wong; Ricky Huang
Cc: LRFPfeedback
Subject: LRFP feedback

Dear Trustees,

as a parent of students in the Vancouver Public School system I am troubled by the current Long-Range Facilities Plan.

In looking at projections for school enrollment the document does not consider the number of school-aged children or younger children currently living in each catchment, nor is there any indication that the VSB has consulted with the City of Vancouver over its' plans for densification. Furthermore, the whole idea of "right-sizing" is "wrong-minded" as it does not place any value on dedicated spaces for music and art in the elementary schools. Currently only 30 of the 89 elementary schools in Vancouver have a space for teaching music (as opposed to Burnaby where all but 2 schools have fully dedicated music rooms, and those two schools use the gym stage for teaching music). This is detrimental to our children's education and needs to be rectified.

I am concerned as well about the lack of plans for seismic upgrading for Gladstone Secondary, which is listed as having 0% of its space as seismically safe and yet is nowhere on the list for upgrades.

I also fully support the six amendments that DPAC has put forward for consideration.

Thank-you for your consideration,

Sarah Westwick

LRFFeedback

From: Elin Sigurdson
Sent: Sunday, January 24, 2021 10:18 PM
To: Carmen Cho; Estrellita Gonzalez; Fraser Ballantyne; Lois Chan-Pedley; Janet Fraser; Oliver Hanson; Barbara Parrott; Jennifer Reddy; Allan Wong; Ricky Huang; LRFFeedback
Subject: VSB Lands and Planning - Motion against selling VSB-owned lands

Dear Trustees,

I am writing to express my strong support for Trustee Reddy's motion, which seeks to keep public lands held by the VSB in public hands. I commend Trustee Reddy's reasoning on this matter to you, as she expresses it in her piece [published in the Vancouver Province recently](#).

The future of our school system relies on our ability to make smart and savvy use of the assets that we currently hold, and that our students benefit from past decisions made to obtain and protect those assets.

We are all counting on the school board to use creative and long-range thinking to ensure that our students and the public have the greatest long term educational benefits. Retaining lands owned by the VSB will permit that.

I strongly encourage the trustees to support Trustee Reddy's initiative and to retain lands held by the VSB.

Yours sincerely,
Elin Sigurdson

LRFPfeedback

From: Robert Ford
Sent: Sunday, January 24, 2021 10:25 PM
To: LRFPfeedback
Cc: Janet Fraser; Allan Wong; Fraser Ballantyne; Lois Chan-Pedley; Carmen Cho; Estrellita Gonzalez; Oliver Hanson; Barbara Parrott; Jennifer Reddy; Ricky Huang; Chair (Vancouver DPAC); Suzanne Hoffman (Superintendent)
Subject: Please do not pass the LRFP without it being heavily corrected

Hi,

This sentence in the LRFP is a mistake. "City of Vancouver planned developments will not be included in this analysis work until they have been approved and are moving to the construction phase."

How do you plan without taking into consideration the COV's work? It makes no sense.

Plus there are errors.

I confirmed with the Henry Hudson Elementary office on January 15 that there are 389 kids at Hudson right now.

The LRFP shows 2020 at 378. It shows 345 for 2021.

These are wrong. To illustrate how bad this is, pretend you are at Hudson during recess or lunch. Pick 11 kids at random. Slap them each across the face and tell each one that they don't matter. They don't exist. They not worth being counted. Then imagine you told their parents what you did.

Sound graphic? Maybe. But being counted matters.

Please send the LRFP back for revisions. There is real harm in doing it wrong.

Thanks,

- Rob.

LRFPfeedback

From: emily beam
Sent: Sunday, January 24, 2021 11:03 PM
To: Carmen Cho; Estrellita Gonzalez; Fraser Ballantyne; Lois Chan-Pedley; Janet Fraser; Oliver Hanson; Barbara Parrott; Jennifer Reddy; Allan Wong
Cc: LRFPfeedback
Subject: Jan 25 Input

Hello,

I'm writing this evening to support Trustee Reddy's motion to keep public land public and not sell them. I fully support her reasons shown below. I also support the DPAC amendments to the LRFP.

My daughter will be entering kindergarten this year. My family was in a privileged position to be able to move so that she could have an elementary school within walking distance that wasn't at threat of being closed and had been seismically upgraded. Even in our new area, I see other families considering french immersion programs because they think their kids will have a better learning experience. We are creating a segregated school system where those who have the means can pick better outcomes for their children, and others have to deal with overcrowded, unsafe, unsupportive learning environments. This is deeply troubling to me. I recognize that the Vancouver School Board is in a tricky situation, but selling off property to solve (some of) today's problems will not serve us well into the future. Where's our 100 year plan? How can we ensure that we don't leave future generations in a worse situation than we've been left in?

Sincerely,
Emily Beam

From Jennifer Reddy (<https://www.onecityvancouver.ca/sbpublicland>):

First, it is our responsibility as school trustees to act as stewards for school land, which is unceded xwməθkwəy̓əm (Musqueam), Skwxwú7mesh (Squamish), and səliłwətaʔl (Tsleil-Waututh) territory, and hold it in trust for all children. Second, given the scale of Vancouver's housing crisis, this land has the potential to be redeveloped into affordable housing and other public goods, generate long-term income for the cash-strapped School Board, and address the persistent underfunding of public education. Third, the Long Range Facilities Plan consultation process which engaged over 4,000 individuals shows that the public does not support the sale of Vancouver School Board land. I believe it is our responsibility to keep all public land public, and not to sell pieces or portions, whether or not they are currently used for schools.

LRFFeedback

From: MELANIE CHENG
Sent: Sunday, January 24, 2021 11:10 PM
To: LRFFeedback
Subject: Mailgate rates this: [SPAM]: URGENT- Feedback from Melanie Cheng - Bruce Elementary - Long Range Facilities Plan and VSB vote on report
Attachments: 02 VSB Report - major assumptions.pdf; 03 Major development planned in Joyce Collingwood.pdf; 01 VSB Report - no need to keep Bruce.pdf
Importance: Low

Dear Sirs/Mesdames:

It was just brought to my attention today the VSB has prepared another report which contemplates the closure of Bruce Elementary in the long range plan.

I'm attaching key page of this report (see **attachment 01** to this email), which states as a likely scenario "there will be a very weak business case for the Ministry to support a seismic project at Bruce."

A major assumption underlying this report is that City of Vancouver developments should be excluded in planning for schools (see **attachment 02** to this email).

City of Vancouver developments need to be a factor. I am a resident in Joyce-Collingwood. There has been significant growth in this area. At **attachment 03** to this email you can see that there are a significant number of developments planned in the future in this area as well. Any decision regarding seismic upgrades must consider City of Vancouver's initiatives to increase density significantly in the Joyce-Collingwood area.

Enrollment at Bruce Elementary has steadily grown in the past few years. Now, there's no room at Bruce for more kids due to the increasing enrollment. Our school has been turning kids away who live in this catchment due to shortage of space at our school. The VSB report does not reflect an accurate understanding of what is going on at our school and the growth in our changing community.

We understand that seismic upgrade decisions are costly and cuts do have to be made. However, Bruce fills a much needed gap.

The many resources once available at Carleton Elementary are no longer an option for families in this area due to the fire at that school.

Bruce Elementary serves neighborhood families. It's a part of our social fabric. There are vulnerable families living in the many Joyce-Collingwood housing cooperatives walk to nearby Bruce for school. Our school supported these families by giving free breakfast and reading program before school so the kids are prepared for learning. Many of these families don't have vehicles to drive longer distances to Grenfell or Renfrew. In these difficult times, families (including mine) have an even greater reliance on local schools supports.

We understand that difficult decisions must be made. We ask that the unique feature of developments in our area and the number of vulnerable families in the co-operatives of our area be key factors in your consideration to provide seismic upgrades to Bruce.

If anything, upgrades to Bruce should be considered before Grenfell or Renfrew, as your own report shows that the building condition of Bruce Elementary is far worse than both Grenfell and Renfrew. Further, Bruce is closer to Joyce Skytrain than either Grenfell or Renfrew. If Joyce Skytrain is to be an urban oriented transit hub as per the City of Vancouver's community plan, then it would be more suitable to use Bruce as it is the area's closest K-7 school to Joyce Skytrain.

Please reply by email to confirm receipt of the above comments.

Kind regards.

Melanie Cheng

6.11.5 WINDERMERE FOS

- 39.6% of the operating capacity in the Windermere FOS is rated as safe
- 60.4% of the operating is rated as high risk
- Grenfell is a supported project in the SMP. Enrolment at Grenfell is forecast to decline significantly by 2029.
- Renfrew is prioritized in year 1 of the 2021-22 five-year capital plan submission to the Ministry. Enrolment at Renfrew is forecast to remain stable until 2029.
- The enrolment forecast for the Windermere FOS is projected to be generally declining until 2029.

School Name	Building Condition Rating	Seismic Risk Rating	SMP Status	OC	2019 Total Enrolment	2029 Total Forecast Enrolment
Grenfell	Poor	H1	Supported	489	410	245
Bruce	Very Poor	H1	Unsupported	308	246	237
Norquay	Poor	Completed	Completed	752	638	594
Collingwood Annex	Fair	Completed	Completed	176	132	141
Renfrew	Poor	H1	Unsupported	620	483	486
Total				2345	1909	1703

Future Scenario

Scenario 1: Grenfell is advanced in the SMP

- If Grenfell is approved, there would be 1417 seismically upgraded spaces within the Windermere FOS
- The Windermere FOS would have a deficit of 286 seismically safe or medium risk spaces

- There will continue to be insufficient seismically safe capacity within the Windermere FOS or at nearby schools in other FOS to accommodate students from schools that are at high seismic risk within the Windermere FOS

Scenario 2: Grenfell and Renfrew are advanced in the SMP

- If Grenfell and Renfrew are advanced in the SMP, there would be 2036 seismically upgraded seats within the Windermere FOS
- There would be sufficient seismically safe capacity to accommodate all students forecast to enroll in the Windermere FOS
- If Grenfell and Renfrew seismic upgrade projects are completed and there is enough operating capacity for the forecast number of students in the Windermere FOS, there will be a very weak business case for the Ministry to support a seismic project at Bruce.

2.4 MAJOR ASSUMPTIONS

The following major assumptions were used in this LRFP:

- The student enrolment data in this LRFP is from September 2019 and the enrolment projections are for a ten-year planning horizon to 2029. Some District projections are for a 15-year planning horizon to 2034. Unless otherwise indicated, the student enrolment data is for the K-12 Regular Program. Specific reference to enrolment data for District programs and the International Student Program will be made as necessary
- The District will continue with its long-standing enrolment procedures
- The enrolment projection methodology currently used by the District will remain for planning purposes but with the local knowledge component improved to consider student yields from City of Vancouver developments that have been approved and where a timeline for completed construction and occupancy can be determined. City of Vancouver planned developments will not be included in this analysis work until they have been approved and are moving to the construction phase.
- The seismic mitigation program may have an end date after 2030. Every Vancouver student will have a safe seat at the end of the program
- A goal of the SMP is to have replacement schools either as the lowest cost option with the Ministry of Education providing funding or by the VSB contributing the additional capital funds for the replacement option when the lowest cost option is a seismic upgrade.
- The District will generate capital revenue through the Capital Asset Management Plan to support enhancements to projects in the SMP or to contribute to new schools or other capital assets
- For determining capacity utilization to support capital plan submissions the operating capacity of a school is determined by *adjusting* its nominal capacity to reflect class size, based on class size limits in the local collective agreement, while recognizing that the Ministry of Education no longer mandates a 95% capacity utilization target.
- The District recognizes the importance of accessibility of facilities across the District and that it is important to define and measure accessibility concerns in order to guide future seismic upgrades and new school builds
- The LRFP will reflect the directions outlined in the District's Strategic Plan
- The LRFP is a dynamic document that will be revised as needed but updated at least annually.
- The Plan is an operational document to support staff work to inform the annual Five-Year Capital Plan submission
- The Plan will comply with Ministry of Education requirements and guidelines

2.5 PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PROCESS

The Board of Education engaged the VSB community in a broad consultation during 2020 in response to Recommendation #14 of the Draft 2019 LRFP. As per the recommendation, this engagement was

Kingsway & Joyce Street Development Pipeline

As of December, 2020



Address	Type	Units	Storeys	Comments
5055 Joyce Street	Rental	360	36	Includes 1 floor of below-market rental housing
3279-3297 Vanness Avenue	Social Housing	102	6	
3235 Clive Avenue	Condo & Rental	68	6	
5163-5187 Joyce Street	Condo	293	32	
5427 Joyce Street	Condo	46	6	
3042 Kingsway	Condo	21	4	
3068 Kingsway	Rental	30	6	
3070 Kingsway	Rental	40	6	
5050-5080 Joyce Street	Condo	256	29	Currently selling
3583 Kingsway	Rental	104	6	Currently leasing
Total Units		1,320		

Michael Buchan* Principal

604.647.5079

michael.buchan@avisonyoung.com

*Michael Buchan Personal Real Estate Corporation

Mitch Knoepfel Associate

604.757.4942

mitchell.knoepfel@avisonyoung.com

E. & O.E.: The information contained herein was obtained from sources that we deem reliable and, while thought to be correct, is not guaranteed by Avison Young Commercial Real Estate (B.C.) Inc.

LRFFeedback

From: Margaret Tassie
Sent: Sunday, January 24, 2021 11:34 PM
To: LRFFeedback
Subject: Trustee's vision

Dear VSB Trustees and Staff,

I write to express my concern that the document produced does not have as its foundation the vision of elected trustees. Their policy views - as democratic representatives - must form the foundation for VSB work. Their views, as elected representatives who listen to the public, must find legal expression in VSB work.

I support the amendments advocated by DPAC, I oppose the sale of land and I generally support the remaining elements of the DPA position.

Sincerely,
Meg Tassie

LRFFeedback

From: Susan Kuo
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2021 12:46 AM
To: LRFFeedback
Cc: dpac; Suzanne Hoffman (Superintendent)
Subject: VSB Long Range Facilities Plan

Vancouver School Board
Long Range Facilities Planning Committee
1580 West Broadway,
Vancouver, B.C. V6J 5K8

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing as a concerned parent with one child who graduated from the Point Grey Mini School in 2019 and another child currently in grade 9 at the same school.

I was very concerned to find out that not only was Point Grey Secondary School removed from the list of schools waiting for a seismic upgrade but it is now on the list for potential closure.

There are several years why closure of Point Grey Secondary School would be detrimental to the community:

1. In the very near future there will be an increased population of high school students with the building of the 2916 condominium residences being built for the new Oakridge Mall development, the new residential units at Arbutus Ridge and the new multi unit residences at 41st and Cambie, some of which have already been built and some are in the process of being built.
Eric Hamber and Macgee have been upgraded but are at a smaller capacity now and Churchill is already at full capacity. Remember Yaletown, when the City of Vancouver neglected to factor in schools for the residents who would live there? This is still causing many students to have to be bused to a school far outside of their catchment.
2. Point Grey Secondary School is an important part of the community of Kerrisdale and is used for many activities outside of school hours. The Vancouver Youth Bach choir have had concerts there, there are many groups such as Vancouver United Football Club who use the fields for their games and practices and many people in the community use the track and grounds for their daily exercise routine.
3. It has also been frequently used by the film industry in Vancouver and is thus a source of revenue for the City of Vancouver.
4. Vancouver takes pride in being an eco-friendly city but tearing down a whole school instead of upgrading and renovating the school it is not eco-friendly! This is especially true because Point Grey Secondary School is a heritage building with many unique architectural qualities.

The VSB Long Range Facilities Committee should not be so short sighted when they are making long range plans for schools!

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Susan Kuo
M.D., C.C.F.P., F.C.F.P.
Clinical Assistant Professor
UBC Faculty of Medicine

LRFFeedback

From: Jenny McClean
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2021 7:02 AM
To: LRFFeedback
Subject: DPAC proposal

Hello VSB,

I am asking that you are transparent with DPAC by sharing the data with them.
Any moves to do with school closures and other changes should be worked on by data sharing with DPAC.

Sincerely,
Jenny McClean

LRFFeedback

From: Suzanne Hoffman (Superintendent)
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2021 8:36 AM
To: David Green
Subject: FW: LRF Feedback

From: Hamber PAC
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2021 6:35 AM
To: Suzanne Hoffman (Superintendent); Robert Schindel; Carmen Cho; Janet Fraser
Cc: chair; Vik Khanna
Subject: LRF Feedback

Dear Trustees

We are in receipt of DPAC's written concerns to be submitted to the Trustees at the VSB Board meeting scheduled for January 25, 2021.

As Hamber PAC execs, we are in support of DPAC's specific concerns set out in their position paper, as it relates to the following:

1. The Vision must be included in the LRF document and not in the Appendix.
2. The emphasis on real transparency throughout the planning process, with the inclusion of current, broad-based data such as future demographics (ie: CoV population forecasts) and enrollment projections by catchment, as well as forecasting choice programs and district program enrolments. Such information was not adequately considered in the seismic planning and design for the Hamber build and the Hamber PAC has voiced it's concerns since the project inception that the new school may not meet the demographic demands of the neighborhood upon completion as a result. It is important that future long-range facilities planning overcome similar shortcomings.
3. The review of the 95% capacity utilization target by a stakeholder working group to avoid long-term planning decisions without any transparency in understanding such targets.
4. The planning of facilities should address accessibility for individuals with physical or learning disabilities as well as equity-seeking populations.

We urge the Trustees to incorporate DPAC's recommendations into the VSB Long Range Facilities Plan to ensure a robust, binding document for the benefit of students and communities.

Sincerely
Eric Hamber PAC

LRFPfeedback

From: Eleanor Reardon
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2021 1:19 PM
To: Jennifer Reddy
Subject: Feedback on Draft Long Range Facilities Plan, etc.

Dear Trustee Reddy, and VSB members generally,

I am writing to address what I see as inconsistencies between the Draft Long Range Facilities Plan and the Educational Vision set out by the Trustees; I am also concerned about the process around stewardship and possible sale of public lands (which is happening behind doors closed to public input) and around Preferred School Size.

The Trustees' vision is clear: seats in safe schools should be available in neighbourhoods for the kids "where kids live, and will live", and should serve their needs. The main body of the LRFP, however, seems to consider priorities other than seismic safety (a very important and massive effort) to be aspirational, secondary, and risks further entrenching past neglect. My letter will outline what this means for our small community school.

Tillicum Annex Elementary (annexed to Hastings Elementary) is a small school that serves a population that is in large part low-income, and often has needs that can only be met in a small school setting, where every teacher knows every child. The use of the school building has changed over its life as educational goals have changed: lowering capacity to make room for a library, a sensory room, and a Strong Start program. Enrolment has been up in recent years, and stands at 130, with present capacity for 136.

Section 5.10 of the LRFP seems to suggest that small schools are less optimal learning environments, which naturally leads to the idea to consolidation is both an efficient use of resources and best for learning outcomes. Having more information about the work being done on Preferred School Size will be very helpful - my own feeling is that, particularly in the earliest grades, small and comfortable is a very important goal; that our small school allows for support that would be impossible at a larger school.

Our community reflects the stated goals of VSB Trustees: a neighbourhood school attended by kids who live nearby, within walking and biking distance, and often next door to their classmates, with a focus on literacy, community support, and indigenous awareness. The school community and the city have worked to get as many families as possible walking and cycling to school, and our PAC has funded an Indigenous-focused learning garden, among so many other programs and school supports.

We are a tight-knit community housed in a building that is in "very poor" condition, with the highest seismic risk rating, and is not on any list of schools presently being considered for upgrading. Our building and funding reflects the effects of past policy: open catchment lines have at times resulted in lower enrolment, which resulted in lower funding and less frequent maintenance and repair; and when enrolment has dropped farther we have been considered for closure.

Tillicum's enrolment numbers, in the LRFP, are projected to decline over the next decade, with 107 students in 2019 and expected enrolment in 2029 being 103. This year, however, we have 130 students, and what I have seen in my neighbourhood is families that continue to move in and to grow - a pattern that can surely only continue as the city pushes to create new density and more new housing is built along our section of Hastings Street.

I witnessed the process of Garibaldi's closure, though not as a parent, and sadly fear that decline in some schools is by design - the goal being to get the school to a point where no argument can be made for its revival. This process is not only disingenuous but counter-productive. Our school community, parents and staff together, have done and are happy to continue doing the work of maintaining community connections that we all agree are fundamental to a strong society, to raising engaged citizens - and we would like to do it in a safe building, without the distraction of periodically having to justify and even fight for our existence.

When a small community school is closed we lose so much more than the building. Land in Vancouver is valuable, but selling off school property (territory unceded by First Nations) creates more distance between schools that are our community hubs. It is a betrayal of the public trust and contrary to the Trustees' Educational Vision, which holds that neighbourhood schools are a priority, and should be included in the main body of the LRFP, with all else lining up behind that vision.

In conclusion: I don't think the Long Range Facilities Plan embodies the Vision of our elected Trustees; I feel strongly that the process should be far more transparent and am dismayed that so many citizen-parents feel actively excluded from it, and from decisions about disposal of public lands; and as 42% of our elementary schools have a capacity of

under 300, I think the conversation on Preferred School Size should also be public and include the experiences of parents. The common thread here is that I would very much like for VSB staff to show their work and encourage consultation as promised.

I would like to see:

- a) application and enrolment data by year attached as an appendix.
- b) population data and calculations and projection methodology attached as an appendix.
- c) a clear statement of how staff has arrived at operating capacity that reflects current educational values and goals, such as sensory rooms, art and music space, etc.;
- d) a clear statement on the target percentage of capacity in use;
- e) more about the work being done around Preferred School Size, with more opportunity for parents to speak to it;
- f) much more lead time being given to parents to absorb relevant information, and a real effort being made to include our views; and
- g) most importantly, the Trustees' vision included in the main body of the LRFP as guiding principles to be reflected in every step.

Sincerely,
Eleanor Reardon
Tillicum Annex DPAC Representative
With the support of the Tillicum Annex PAC

LRFFeedback

From: Kate Vincent
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2021 2:22 PM
To: Jennifer Reddy; Allan Wong; Barbara Parrott; Estrellita Gonzalez; Carmen Cho; Oliver Hanson; Janet Fraser
Cc: LRFFeedback
Subject: VSB Draft Long-Range Facilities Plan

Greetings,

I am writing today to urge you to support the District Parent Advisory Committee's (DPAC) six amendments to the District's Draft Long-Range Facilities Plan.

What's wrong with the current plan? Imagine a document that relegates the Trustees' vision to an appendix with no legal standing and fails to disclose basic information, such as the number of school-aged children who live within school catchment areas. Consider what it means when the VSB's facilities plan fails to mention equity within any of its decision criteria and provides no standards for accessibility at a time when seismic upgrades do not guarantee basic features such as elevators for wheelchair access. Ask what it means when this plan intentionally ignores the City's population forecasts when considering whether to build or close schools, and refuses to disclose how many seats the District seeks to eliminate through "right sizing". These are fatal flaws that will lead to bad decisions for our kids, with the largest impacts borne by the most vulnerable students.

Adequate facilities are essential to a viable and effective school system, and the strength of our public school system is vital to the health of our community. Don't allow our current students and the students of the future to be hindered in their educational outcomes by short-sighted bureaucrats.

Sincerely,

Kate Vincent
Former DPAC member

LRFFeedback

From: L TOM
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2021 5:51 PM
To: LRFFeedback; Carmen Cho; Estrellita Gonzalez; Janet Fraser; Fraser Ballantyne; Lois Chan-Pedley; Oliver Hanson; Barbara Parrott; Jennifer Reddy; Allan Wong; Suzanne Hoffman (Superintendent)
Cc: dpac; vik khanna; Lillian Tom
Subject: Long Range Facility Plan for Point Grey Secondary

Dear Trustees,

I am writing to advocate for the retention and seismic upgrade of Point Grey Secondary School. I oppose the proposed plan to combine Point Grey Secondary with Prince of Wales Secondary.

The super size of a combined school would negatively impact both the student and teacher experience. There would be a loss of the intimate community that is currently at each school; students would have a higher likelihood to get lost in the academic and social struggles that occur in any high school - a larger school would exasperate this problem.

The location of the current schools allow for better walkable access for students from each of the catchments. This is meant to be a goal of the City of Vancouver to increase walkability in our neighbourhoods. Point Grey Secondary offers close proximity to Kerrisdale Village, giving students the opportunity to engage and identify with the neighbourhood.

Point Grey Secondary School should be considered a heritage building - protected and restored. It is a historically significant building that has been identified by the Heritage Vancouver and the Vancouver Heritage Foundation as an endangered building worthy of conservation.

Please reconsider the proposed plans and place Point Grey Secondary back on the list for seismic mitigation and move to have the building designated as a heritage building.

Thank you for your consideration,

Lillian Tom
Kerrisdale Resident and Point Grey Secondary School Parent

LRFFeedback

From: Susan Wasserman
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2021 8:41 PM
To: Janet Fraser; Carmen Cho; Estrellita Gonzalez
Cc: LRFFeedback
Subject: Long Range Facilities Plan

Dear Trustees,

We are writing about the Long Range Facilities Plan. We urge you to do everything in your power to ensure that the planned school for Olympic Village gets built in a timely fashion. As residents of Olympic Village, although we do not have school-age children, we are concerned that young families are moving out of our neighbourhood because there are no available schools for their children in this catchment area. Please be sure that the District Parents Advisory Council's proposals are included in your plans.

Sincerely,

Susan and Jerry Wasserman