

**CALGARY BOARD OF EDUCATION
REPORT TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

**Regular Agenda
December 6, 2005**

To: BOARD OF TRUSTEES

From: Dr. Brendan J. Croskery, Chief Superintendent of Schools

Re: **Facility Condition Report**

Purpose: Information and for the Record.

Executive Limitations Reference: EL-12: Asset Protection
EL-13: Facilities/Accommodations
EL-13E: Facility Condition Report Information Requirements

Originator: Donald M. Dart, Superintendent, Business Operations and Environmental Services

Resource Person(s): Dieter Hoerz, Director, Facility Operations Services
Dave Gray, Manager, Facility Maintenance Services
John Marshall, Project Engineer, Facility Maintenance Services
Pauline Wong, Manager, Financial and Administrative Support Services

I. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended:

1. **THAT** this report be received for information and for the record.

II. ISSUE

Executive Limitation EL-13: Facilities/Accommodations, section 2 (c), requires that a Facility Condition Report be submitted to the Board on an annual basis consistent with the reporting requirements outlined in Executive Limitation EL-13E: Facility Condition Report Information Requirements.

III. BACKGROUND

Executive Limitation EL-13: Facilities/Accommodations section 2, states that the Chief Superintendent shall not fail to ensure effective use of capital funding through long-range facility plans that support Ends policies. In accordance with Executive Limitation EL-13, Facility Operations Services herewith provides the Facility Condition Report for the Calgary Board of Education (CBE) schools. EL-13E specifies that the Facility Condition report shall contain information that includes:

1. Information regarding the functional building standards required for program delivery;
2. The mean and median of facility operating costs, by square metre, for the Calgary Board of Education; and
3. Information provided on each Calgary Board of Education facility grouped by sector, within Areas, and including:
 - (a) Age of the building;
 - (b) Type of construction used;
 - (c) Estimated lifespan;
 - (d) Projected capital costs, including deferred maintenance requirements;
 - (e) Status of major operating systems;
 - (f) Facility operating costs by facility and per square metre for each facility;
 - (g) Plant operations and maintenance funding level;
 - (h) Identification of issues that may affect the future viability of the facility;
 - (i) Environmental issues that may affect the operation of the facility; and
 - (j) Any other information that, in the opinion of the Chief Superintendent, should be provided to the Board of Trustees.

As a first priority the CBE continues to provide sufficient resourcing to ensure a safe environment for learning.

Care should be taken when interpreting the 'Total Condition Index' contained in Attachment 1. The index represents a measure of a facility's condition within three major categories. However, the functionality of the space is not considered in the process. The information from this report is primarily used to help establish the priorities for the maintenance of the CBE's physical facilities.

IV. ANALYSIS

Standards

Functional building standards for new school facilities are established in the Alberta Infrastructure and Transportation (Learning Facilities Branch) School Infrastructure Manual. Appendix 7 and 8 of the manual outline the area allowances for a facility and the instructional and non-instructional spaces. In addition, Design and Construction has developed comprehensive design guidelines, which include parameters for new schools.

Combined, these documents provide significant direction in the provision of facilities that are suitable for the delivery of the education program.

A school building must also meet the statutory code requirements, such as the building, electrical and plumbing codes established by the Province. Also an authority having jurisdiction, such as the City of Calgary or the Fire Marshall, can impose additional requirements on the facility owner in support of codes, bylaws or local requirements. Preferences for such things as a specific information technology system may influence the corporate building standards.

The building requirements for a new school are a standard against which one can measure the adequacy of existing facilities.

Building Information

A significant amount of information that is required under Executive Limitation EL-13E has been assembled into the chart contained in Attachment I. The facilities have been grouped by Area, by Sector and by division (Elementary, Junior/Middle and Senior). Closed facilities, leased sites and administrative or unique settings are shown in their respective grouping under an “other” category.

(a) Age of the building

A single number cannot easily represent the age of many of the CBE’s buildings. Often the original structure has had one or more additions. In order to better reflect the age of the facility the construction dates of the original building, and all subsequent additions or major modifications, are included in Attachment I.

(b) Type of construction use

Sandstone (1908 to 1920)

There are 10 sandstone type buildings with stone masonry walls, wood floor joists and lath and plaster interior finishes.

Branton Style Buildings (1950 to late 1960’s)

There are approximately 45 Branton style buildings, which have a wooden frame, stucco exterior and drywall and/or plaster interior. Some of the junior high school facilities of this structure type have a brick exterior. The windows are of wood frame construction, and are generally in very poor condition.

New Construction (late 1960’s to present)

Most of the newer buildings have a structural steel frame, steel stud walls, a brick exterior and drywall interior. The windows have an aluminum or fiberglass frame.

Individual building construction types are described in Attachment I using the abbreviations noted below. Up to two exterior finishes may be listed under ‘Fin1’ and ‘Fin2’ (finish 1, finish 2). The construction of the outside wall is identified

under 'Framing'. The construction of the supporting structure, or skeleton of the building, is noted under 'Struct'.

Blk	concrete block
Bri	brick
Conc	concrete
Glu	glue-laminated wooden structural members
MS	metal siding
PC	pre-cast concrete
Ste	steel studs
Sto	sandstone masonry
Str	structural steel
Stu	stucco
WF	wood framing
WS	wooden siding

(c) Estimated lifespan

In general the design life of the CBE facilities is in the range of 50 years. However, the components that make up a building have different life expectancies. For example: roof (20-25 years); wood frame windows (30 years); stucco exterior (30 years); wood door and frame (30 years); partitions, lockers (30-40 years); heating plants (30-50 years); electrical installations (40-50 years). To achieve the design life, ongoing capital investments are required to replace the various building components (i.e. windows, boilers, ventilation system components, finishes). With continued investment in component replacement, it is possible to utilize a facility beyond the original design life.

Establishing the remaining life of any one building is difficult and costly. The process would involve a review of each building component by knowledgeable individuals so that a professional opinion could be rendered. Such an assessment must be made with some knowledge of the potential for future investment and in consideration of Executive Limitation EL-13, section 4(b) to extend the facility lifecycle. On a 'do nothing, go forward' basis, the remaining life of a facility is equal to the shortest remaining life of any one major component.

Sandstone and Branton style buildings pose major concerns at this time because a number of these facilities have components that are currently beyond their design life and cannot be properly addressed within the present funding levels.

Although a building may be in a good state of repair, it can be rendered functionally unfit as a result of a change in use. As the curriculum changes, older facilities may become unsuitable in their configuration and renovations to upgrade the building can become cost prohibitive. At that point, the facility has reached the end of its useful life.

(d) Projected capital costs, including deferred maintenance requirements

Against the CBE schools listed in Attachment I are shown an up-to-date value of deferred facility maintenance and projected capital costs to replace or upgrade major building components and to address curriculum needs. A thirty percent (30%) soft cost allowance has been included to provide for consultants' fees, permit costs, design and construction contingencies and GST.

The projected capital costs have been extracted from multi-year capital plans and previous viability reports.

The Alberta Infrastructure and Transportation (AIT) Facility Evaluation Project was conducted in 1999/2000 in order to establish the value of the deferred maintenance in school buildings. The value of any completed work has been removed from the record. An inflation factor (Statistics Canada Price Index for institutional building construction in Calgary) of 23.2% was used to adjust the original reported costs, in an effort to keep the audit information current.

The original AIT report did not provide cost estimates for the abatement of construction materials such as asbestos. These materials are managed by CBE through a management plan specific to the material. The cost of any deferred roofing work, which was not included in the original report, has been added for each site.

In lieu of an annual audit to update the list of deferred maintenance projects, a 2% per year aging factor has been applied to the base costs. A comprehensive audit, complete with construction project scope, costing and background information, could cost upwards of \$500,000.

AIT has initiated its undertaking to update the 1999/2000 facility audit. To date forty-three CBE facilities have been re-evaluated. Data is only available for thirty of these sites. The new deferred maintenance values emanating from the re-audit have been included in Attachment I in the column headed 'AI Re-Ev Maint & Upg'. To date, in all cases except one, the value of deferred maintenance is significantly less: 37% to 99% less.

AIT has advised that a new definition for deferred maintenance has been adopted. In the new assessment, it is not considered material if a building component has exceeded its design life. In the previous audit, if a component had surpassed its design life, it was automatically considered for replacement and the associated cost was noted as deferred maintenance. In the new audit, if the same component is functional at the time of the review, then no deferred maintenance cost is attributed to the component. Further, the audit scope has been limited to a five-year timeline. Only that work which is deemed by the consultant to be necessary within the next five years is recorded. Work that may be necessary in the sixth, or successive, year is disregarded. These two adjustments to the process of establishing the scope of deferred maintenance have resulted in substantially lower estimated values of deferred maintenance.

An additional six schools have been scheduled for evaluation in 2005, with the potential for additional schools through the balance of the year. It is expected that AIT will re-audit 20% of the schools throughout the province each year.

The total value of deferred maintenance is \$426 million compared to \$322 million in 1999. The value of the deferred maintenance, excluding leased and sold sites, is \$398 million.

(e) Status of major operating systems

The evaluations shown in Attachment I are based on those used in the 1999/2000 AIT Evaluation Project. Details of the Province's rating system are outlined in Attachment II.

The rating process evaluates a building's condition by evaluating its individual components. The mechanical, electrical and structural systems represent the three major operating systems within a facility. The overall **mechanical condition** is represented by the total of the point scores for the boiler, HVAC (*heating, ventilation and air-conditioning*) and plumbing systems. Similarly, the **electrical condition** score encompasses the electrical distribution, lighting and life safety systems. The **structural condition** incorporates information about the roof, and the exterior and interior finishes. The higher the score the poorer the condition of the major operating system.

Attachment III shows those schools that have an AIT 1999/2000 report rating of 1 point for a specific major building component and the rationale for the rating. The single point rating was deemed to be of an emergency or critical nature.

The total building condition index is an aggregate of the mechanical, electrical and structural point scores for the facility. The range for CBE facilities is from a low of 10 to a high of 200, and for CBE operated schools 10 to 140. The higher scores represent those facilities in greatest need of remedial work. All safety related matters are addressed first. Any additional planned remedial work is conducted within available funding provided through the Infrastructure Maintenance Program (IMP). The funds are applied to the highest priority projects.

The facility ratings for the current Education Centre site have not been included. An assessment for that facility was provided to the Board under a separate report pertaining to Administrative Space.

(f) Facility operating costs by facility and per square metre for each facility

The 2004/05 operating cost for each site, a sum of the direct cost of utilities, caretaking and maintenance, is provided in Attachment I. Overhead costs, such as supervision costs, are not included.

A mean cost of \$47.69 per square meter and a median cost of \$45.99 per square meter can be used as a basis for comparing the costs of individual schools.

Some facilities have a cost per square meter significantly higher than the mean. One key factor for this increase may be attributed to higher facility maintenance costs due to such projects as painting of a school or the installation of a major piece of mechanical equipment (ie. new chiller). These types of projects increase the maintenance cost of that particular facility, resulting in a higher cost per square meter. Secondly, due to local school circumstances, caretaking staffing levels may be higher than called for by formula. For example, a smaller school may warrant a .6 FTE complement, however the CBE is committed at this time to staffing schools no lower than 1 FTE. This staffing criterion also increases the cost per square meter.

(g) Plant Operations and Maintenance (PO&M) Funding level

For the fiscal year 2004/05 the PO&M funding was based on a formula that was applied to the aggregate of the school facilities within the CBE's jurisdiction (gross area adjusted by closed, administrative and leased space X rate X utilization factor). Funding for the first seven-twelfths (Sept. 1, 2004 to Mar. 31, 2005 inclusive) of the fiscal year came from AIT. Funding for the remaining five-twelfths (Apr. 1, 2005 to Aug. 31, 2005 inclusive) of the fiscal year came from Alberta Education, due to the transfer of PO&M budget responsibilities from AIT to Alberta Education effective April 1, 2005. In addition, late in the 2004/05 school year, some additional residual funding was apportioned to school boards based on the formula that had been in place for the 2004/05 fiscal year.

The general formula was used to approximate the level of PO&M funding for each building reported upon in Attachment I. The calculation yields a total PO&M funding value of \$60,313,862 for 2004/05. The utilization rate was an important factor in maximizing the funding since any utilization over 66% enhanced the level of the funding.

Administration buildings do not receive this funding, as these are supported by the 4% Administrative funding available through Alberta Education.

Effective the 2005/06 school year a new formula has been implemented by the Province, with resources being allocated to school boards primarily on a per pupil basis, while at the same time provincially infusing an additional \$23.5 million in funding for the Sept.1, 2005 to Mar. 31, 2006 time frame.

(h) Identification of issues that may affect the future viability of the facility

Should a major component of a facility (i.e. heating system, water supply) fail and not be addressed, the facility would become inoperable within a short period of time. Similarly, if a significant piece of equipment fails, such as the chiller in an air-conditioning system, a portion of a school may become unusable during a particular season.

The accumulation of deferred maintenance may ultimately render a facility unsuitable for its intended purpose. When the value of deferred maintenance reaches an estimated cost greater than 75% of the replacement cost of the building, the building is generally considered prohibitive to repair. Unless the backlog of maintenance items are addressed, the facility will eventually be unable to properly accommodate those functions for which it was designed.

(i) Environmental issues that may affect the operation of the facility

Some CBE facilities have been identified as having one or more environmental issues such as asbestos, lead based paint, and/or PCB's. This information is not detailed in the facility condition report but is maintained under different programs within the CBE. The presence of these materials in CBE facilities does not necessarily pose a safety or health risk, unless such materials are adversely impacted (i.e. during a renovation or construction project). The cost of dealing with these materials, and complying with regulatory authorities, must be considered when evaluating any specific renovation project.

The CBE has developed and implemented an Asbestos Management Plan for facilities containing asbestos. This plan provides direction in the management of asbestos materials both now and into the future. Asbestos removal is done by certified contractors and in accordance with the requirements outlined in the Alberta Occupational Health and Safety Act and the associated regulations.

The quality of indoor air is sensitive to the operation of the mechanical ventilation equipment, the integrity of the structure and the level of cleanliness. Should circumstances prevail that permit excessive water infiltration or interrupt the provision of fresh air, the interior environment could be rendered unfit, and the facility may have to cease operation until repairs are made.

Mould in CBE facilities has become a larger issue more recently as a result of the larger amounts of rainfall over the preceding year. When situations arise, testing results guide the CBE's actions. Usually outside expertise is retained and remediation is undertaken as necessary to re-establish a healthy indoor learning environment. On occasion, temporary relocation of the occupants is necessary. First efforts are to adjust the space utilization within the facility to accommodate the occupants. If necessary, the occupants are reassigned to another facility while the remedial work is undertaken. Unfortunately these circumstances are not predictable and the CBE, in conjunction with the Calgary Health Region, rely on proven emergent situation response procedures to address the conditions as they

become evident. In an extreme case, moulds could render a site unusable until remedial measures are complete.

Regulatory requirements, such as the cessation of the use of refrigerant R11 by 2005, could cause a facility, or portion thereof, to become unsuitable for program delivery during a particular time of the year. With the completion of the 2005 projects, the CBE no longer has R11 systems in place.

(j) Any other information, that in the opinion of the Chief Superintendent, should be provided to the Board of Trustees

No other information is being reported at this time.

V. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The CBE currently spends approximately \$12 million annually on ongoing building maintenance and \$24 million in caretaking operations. In addition it is estimated that the Calgary Board of Education requires a minimum overall investment of \$15 million annually to maintain the “status quo” in facility-deferred maintenance. The recent levels of investment in the facilities through available IMP funding envelopes were \$14 million in 2000/2001, \$7.2 million in 2001/2002, \$7.1 million in 2002/03, \$8.9 million in 2003/04, \$7.2 million in 2004/05 and \$8.7 million in 2005/06. The experienced funding rate suggests that the backlog of facility maintenance work, now estimated at \$426 million, will continue to increase. It should also be noted that the Modernization Block Funding that addresses major functional upgrades to buildings to meet curriculum or code requirements was last received in 2001/02.

Some options in dealing with the deferred maintenance are:

- a) Increase the level of funding for maintenance and restoration work through Alberta Education.
- b) A reintroduction of modernization type funding to address deferred maintenance as well as program upgrades. Current information suggests that the development of the previously mentioned Revitalization Fund has not progressed significantly.
- c) The closure and demolition (or disposal) of identified school facilities that have a high level of deferred maintenance to eliminate the future expenditure on maintenance at those sites. Under the new PO&M per pupil funding model there would be no funding for the redistribution to the remaining sites.
- d) Long term financing of deferred maintenance combined with savings in operating costs such as utilities through public/private partnerships.
- e) Utilization of capital reserves to provide needed replacement of major building system components or modernizations.

Combining the above options could enable Facility Operations Services to substantially reduce the deferred maintenance in the CBE’s schools over the next 15 to 20 years. The Board has established a separate capital reserve to attend to the future replacement of major systems and components for leased buildings.

The utilization rate was an important factor in maximizing the PO&M funding, since any utilization over 66% enhanced the level of funding. Under the new funding model, the number of students within a facility directly establishes the level of PO&M funding that the facility attracts. Empty facilities attract no funding, although there are ongoing costs associated with their retention.

VI. IMPLEMENTATION CONSEQUENCES

The individual detailed analysis of building components will continue to be used to plan and allocate future IMP and other maintenance funding. The IMP priorities are clearly established in the School Infrastructure Manual, as issued by AIT. The CBE needs to continue to be creative in working with AIT, and other partners, if the current levels of deferred maintenance are to be reduced in the future.

The Province's facility audit process has undergone significant change. The new reporting process does not rate the facilities or give status statements on the major components. In future years the CBE will not be able to draw information from the new audit in order to fulfill the information requirements of EL-13E. A much greater reliance will have to be placed on internally developed information.

VII. CONCLUSION

This report is provided in compliance with Executive Limitation EL-13: Facilities/Accommodations and related Executive Limitation EL-13E: Facility Condition Report Information Requirements and is forwarded to the Board for information and for the record.

Dr. Brendan J. Croskery
Chief Superintendent of Schools
CALGARY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Attachment I: Facility Condition Report Summary by Area/Sector
Attachment II: Alberta Infrastructure and Transportation Rating System
Attachment III: Facility Components with One Point Factor Ratings

Facility Condition Report Summary by Area/Sector

Key	
E	Elementary
J	Junior
S	Senior
O	Other
Fin1	Finish 1
Fin2	Finish 2
Struct	Structural
Oper&Maint Funding	Plant Operations & Maintenance Funding

NOTE: The numerical condition value of a major operating system (included in the attached chart) is derived from an assessment of each of the component subgroups noted below. Each subgroup is assigned a value, in consideration of the condition of the listed individual components, and the total of the subgroups represents the general condition of the major operating system. These specific subgroups are viewed as the key indicators of the overall status of the major operating system.

Major Operating System Component Sub-group

Mechanical	boiler(s) fans, ventilation rates, coils, control system sewer and water lines, backflow prevention, plumbing fixtures
Electrical	electrical distribution, control system, main service lighting fixtures fire alarm, exit and emergency lighting
Structural	roofing exterior finish, windows, exterior doors flooring, interior paint finish, primary structural components
Total Condition Index	the sum of three major operating systems noted above

School	E	J	S	O	Year	Building	Fin1	Fin2	Frame	Struct	Oper & Maint Funding (\$1,000)	Total Direct Facility Cost (\$1,000)	Cost/M2	Total Deferred Maint (\$1,000)	Projected Capital Cost (\$1,000)	A.I. Re-Ev Maint & Upg (\$1000)	% Reduc	Mech Cond	Elect Cond	Struc Cond	Total Cond Index	
Brentwood	E				1963	Original	Bri		WF	Conc	\$286	\$218	\$ 41.17	\$2,530				40	10	30	80	
Brentwood	E				1960	Addition	Bri		Ste	Conc												
Captain John Palliser	E				1964	Original	Bri	Stu	Ste	Str	\$100	\$184	\$ 39.66	\$1,665				40	20	30	90	
Captain John Palliser	E				1967	Addition	Bri	Stu	Ste	Str												
Dalhousie	E				1971	Original	Bri	MS	Ste	Str	\$292	\$248	\$ 58.41	\$931				20	10	10	40	
Dr. E.W. Coffin	E				1975	Original					\$127	\$113	\$ 59.35	\$1,155				20	30	20	70	
Edgemont	E				1990	Original	Stu	MS	Ste	Str	\$392	\$337	\$ 64.93	\$184				10	10		20	
Edgemont	E				1991	Portable(s)	MS		WF													
H.D. Cartwright		J			1971	Original	Bri	Stu	Ste	Str	\$290	\$235	\$ 48.15	\$597				30	10	10	50	
H.D. Cartwright		J			1995	Addition	Bri	Stu	Ste	Str												
Hawkwood	E				1992	Original	Blk	Stu	Ste	Str	\$330	\$383	\$ 79.09	\$309				10				10
Hawkwood	E				1994	Addition	Blk	Stu	Ste	Str												
Ranchlands	E				1966	Portable(s)	MS		WF													
Ranchlands	E				1970	Portable(s)	MS		WF													
Ranchlands	E				1980	Original	Bri		Ste	Str	\$257	\$204	\$ 45.07	\$841				30	20	20	70	
Ranchlands	E				1981	Portable(s)	MS		WF													
Simon Fraser		J			1964	Original	Bri	PC	Ste	Conc	\$338	\$234	\$ 38.76	\$2,958		\$487	83.5%	40	20	30	90	
Simon Fraser		J			1982	Addition	Bri	PC	Ste	Conc												
Simon Fraser		J			1984	Addition	Bri	PC	Ste	Conc												
Simon Fraser		J			1992	Portable(s)	MS		WF													
Sir Winston Churchill			S		1970	Original	Bri	PC	Ste	Conc	\$1,302	\$1,273	\$ 63.84	\$2,331				40		20		60
Sir Winston Churchill			S		1983	Addition	Bri	PC	Ste	Conc												
Sir Winston Churchill			S		1999	Addition																
The Hamptons	E				1999	Original	Stu		WF		\$148	\$81	\$ 41.38	\$52				30				30
Tom Baines		J			1996	Original	Blk	Stu	Ste	Str	\$454	\$279	\$ 43.77	\$44								
West Dalhousie	E				1976	Original	Bri	MS	Ste	Str	\$162	\$160	\$ 49.80	\$1,621				30	10	10	50	
West Dalhousie	E				1979	Portable(s)	MS		WF													
TOTALS:											\$4,478	\$3,950		\$15,219		\$487						

School	E	J	S	O	Year	Building	Fin1	Fin2	Frame	Struct	Oper & Maint Funding (\$1,000)	Total Direct Facility Cost (\$1,000)	Cost Per M2	Total Deferred Maint (\$1,000)	Projected Capital Cost (\$1,000)	A.I. Re-Ev Maint & Upg (\$1000)	% Reduc	Mech Cond	Elect Cond	Struct Cond	Total Cond Index	
Altadore	E				1952	Original	Bri	Stu	WF	Str	\$140	\$105	\$ 38.39	\$1,659				40	10	10	60	
Altadore	E				1954	Addition	Bri	Stu	WF	Str												
Alternative High (Clinton Ford)			S		1956	Original	Blk	Stu	WF	Str	\$148	\$104	\$ 48.39	\$1,689				40	30	20	90	
Banting and Best	E				1980	Original	Bri	MS	Ste	Str	\$79	\$114	\$ 47.63	\$1,297				20	20	30	70	
Central Memorial			S		1968	Original	PC		Ste	Conc	\$1,091	\$857	\$ 43.38	\$5,374				40	20	30	90	
Colonel Walker (Piitoayis)	E				1912	Original	Sto		WF		\$73	\$196	\$ 32.57	\$4,044	\$1,690	\$1,927	52.4%	60	10	40	110	
Colonel Walker (Piitoayis)	E				1952	Addition																
Colonel Walker (Piitoayis)	E				1965	Addition	Bri	Stu	Ste	Str												
Colonel Walker (Piitoayis)	E				1982	Addition	Bri		Ste	Str												
Connaught	E				1911	Original	Sto		WF		\$77	\$146	\$ 31.93	\$4,064	\$2,600	\$1,556	61.7%	50	30	20	100	
Connaught	E				1952	Addition	Blk		WF	Str												
Dr. Oakley	E	J			1960	Original	Stu	WS	WF	Str	\$103	\$216	\$ 36.59	\$2,218				40	20	30	90	
Dr. Oakley	E	J			1969	Addition	Stu	WS	WF	Str												
Dr. Oakley	E	J			1991	Modernization																
Earl Grey	E				1953	Original	MS		Ste	Str	\$109	\$112	\$ 47.21	\$726				20	20		40	
Earl Grey	E				1969	Addition	Bri	MS	Ste	Str												
Elbow Park	E				1919	Original	Bri		WF	Conc	\$135	\$117	\$ 52.25	\$569				40	10	20	70	
Elbow Park	E				1964	Portable(s)																
Elbow Park	E				1966	Portable(s)																
Elbow Park	E				1971	Addition	Bri	MS		Str												
Elbow Park	E				1978	Portable(s)	MS		WF	Str												
Elboya	E	J			1953	Original	Stu	WS	WF	Str	\$371	\$264	\$ 67.69	\$2,333	\$800			40	20	10	70	
Elboya	E	J			1956	Addition	Stu	WS	WF	Str												
Elboya	E	J			1958	Addition	Stu	WS	WF	Str												
Emily Follensbee Centre				O	1964	Original	Bri	MS	WF	Str	\$112	\$239	\$ 65.89	\$632				40	20	10	70	
Emily Follensbee Centre				O	1982	Addition	Bri	MS	Ste	Str												
Lord Shaughnessy			S	O	1966	Original	Bri	PC	Ste	Conc	\$440	\$373	\$ 37.66	\$3,801				40	20		60	
Lord Shaughnessy			S	O	1975	Addition	Bri	PC	Ste	Conc												
Lord Shaughnessy			S	O	1983	Addition	Bri	PC	Ste	Conc												
Mount Royal		J			1952	Original	Bri	PC	Ste	Conc	\$199	\$151	\$ 35.63	\$1,532				40	30		70	
Mount Royal		J			1966	Addition	Bri	PC	Ste	Conc												
Ramsay	E				1913	Original	Sto		WF		\$92	\$95	\$ 37.48	\$1,646	\$1,040			50	20	10	80	
Richmond	E				1950	Original	Stu		WF	Str	\$141	\$116	\$ 42.09	\$1,907		\$1,184	37.9%	40	50	30	120	
Richmond	E				1954	Addition	Stu		WF	Str												
Rideau Park	E				1930	Original	Bri	Sto	WF		\$240	\$165	\$ 41.25	\$2,336	\$2,730			30	20	20	70	
Rideau Park	E				1962	Addition	Bri	PC	Ste	Str												
Riverbend	E				1995	Original	Blk	Stu	Ste	Str	\$288	\$194	\$ 43.56	\$188								
Riverbend	E				1999	Portable(s)	MS		WF													
Sherwood		J			1956	Original	Stu	MS	WF	Str	\$265	\$320	\$ 39.01	\$3,134				40	20	40	100	
Sherwood		J			1958	Addition	Stu	MS	WF	Str												
Sherwood		J			1965	Addition	Stu	MS	Ste	Str												
Sherwood		J			1980	Addition	Bri	MS	Ste	Str												
Sunalta	E				1912	Original	Sto		WF	Str	\$214	\$162	\$ 35.13	\$2,266				50	30	40	120	
Sunalta	E				1957		Blk		WF	Str												
W.H. Cushing (Workplace Sch.)	E				N/A	N/A					\$44	\$43	\$ 56.08	\$103				30			30	

School	E	J	S	O	Year	#	Building	Fin1	Fin2	Frame	Struc	Oper & Maint Funding (\$1,000)	Total Direct Facility Cost (\$1,000)	Cost Per M2	Total Deferred Maint (\$1,000)	Projected Capital Cost (\$1,000)	A.I. Re-Ev Maint & Upg (\$1000)	% Reduc	Mech Cond	Elect Cond	Struc Cond	Total Cond Index	
LEASED SITES:																							
Acadia (new Andrew Davison)	E				1961	L	Original	Bri	Stu	WF	Str	\$	\$12	\$ 2.78	\$2,764				40	50	20	110	
Acadia (new Andrew Davison)	E				1968	L	Addition	Bri	Stu	WF	Str												
Acadia (new Andrew Davison)	E				1991	L	Portable(s)																
Alice M. Curtis	E				1964	L	Original	Bri	Blk	Ste	Str	\$	\$1	\$ 0.42	\$2,521				30	60	20	110	
Alice M. Curtis	E				1967	L	Addition	Bri	Blk	Ste	Str												
Clem Gardner	E				1965	L	Original	Bri		Ste	Conc	\$	\$5	\$ 0.77	\$3,585				50	40	30	120	
Clem Gardner	E				1967	L	Addition	Bri		Ste	Conc												
Dr. Norman Bethune	E				1971	L	Original	MS	Bri	Ste	Str	\$	\$2	\$ 0.64	\$400				30	30		60	
Glenmeadows	E				1959		Original	Stu	WS	WF	Str	\$	\$24	\$ 8.47	\$462				40	40	20	100	
Lakeview (All Girls School)				O	1961	L	Original	Stu	WS	WF	Str	\$	\$124	\$ 34.43	\$1,959				40	70	20	130	
Lakeview (All Girls School)				O	1966	L	Addition	Bri	PC	Ste	Str												
Lakeview (All Girls School)				O	198?	L	Portable(s)	MS		WF													
Mountain View	E				1958	V	Original	Stu		WF	Str	\$	\$94	\$ 23.33	\$1,903	\$1,560			30	60	30	120	
Mountain View	E				1962	V	Portable(s)	MS		WF													
Renfrew	E				1954	L	Original	Stu		WF	Str	\$	\$152	\$ 55.83	\$1,214				40	90	10	140	
Renfrew	E				1999	L	Portable(s)																
Southwood	E				1962	V	Original	Bri		Ste	Str	\$	\$16	\$ 3.73	\$1,083	\$1,300			40	30	30	100	
Southwood	E				1971	V	Addition	Stu	WS	WF	Str												
Spruce Cliff	E				1963	V	Original	Bri		Ste	Str	\$	\$2	\$ 0.92	\$1,255	\$1,560			50	30	20	100	
Spruce Cliff	E				1971	V	Addition	Bri		Ste	Str												
Viscount Bennett				O	1954	L	Original	Stu	Bri	WF	Str	\$1,292	\$1,009	\$ 52.59	\$11,271	\$548	\$2,176	80.7%	50	30	50	130	
Viscount Bennett				O	1957	L	Addition	Stu	Bri	WF	Str												
Viscount Bennett				O	1965	L	Addition	Stu	Bri	WF	Str												
Viscount Bennett				O	1973	L	Addition	Bri		Ste	Str												
LEASED SITES:																							
											TOTAL:												
												\$1,292	\$1,442		\$28,417	\$4,968	\$2,176						
<p>For CBE leased sites, the lessee is responsible for the operational and maintenance costs for the facility. The CBE does not incur any direct facility operating expenses for these sites.</p>																							

School	E	J	S	O	Year	#	Building	Fin1	Fin2	Frame	Struc	Oper & Maint Funding (\$1,000)	Total Direct Facility Cost (\$1,000)	Cost Per M2	Total Deferred Maint (\$1,000)	Projected Capital Cost (\$1,000)	A.I. Re-Ev Maint & Upg (\$1000)	% Reduc	Mech Cond	Elect Cond	Struc Cond	Total Cond Index
ADMINISTRATIVE SITES:																						
Education Centre								PC	Conc	Ste	Conc	\$	\$780	\$ 92.58	\$4,394				50			50
Highfield Building								Bri	Conc	WF	Conc	\$	\$547	\$ 38.69	\$693				20		20	40
Bowness Depot												\$	\$28	\$ 50.06	\$							
Glenmeadows Depot								MS		Ste	Str	\$	\$4	\$ 37.68	\$							
Midnapore Depot								MS		Ste	Str	\$	\$17	\$ 62.96	\$							
N.E. Depot								MS		Ste	Str	\$	\$12	\$ 31.49	\$							
Parkdale	E			O	1952	V	Original	Stu		WF	Str	\$	\$131	\$ 22.64	\$2,461	\$1,300			40	30	30	100
Parkdale	E			O	1960	V	Addition	Stu		WF	Str											
Riverside Bungalow				O	1913		Original					\$	\$21	\$ 39.71	\$683				80	40	30	150
ADMINISTRATIVE SITES:																						
											TOTAL:	\$	\$1,540		\$8,230	\$1,300						
UNIQUE / CLOSED SITES:																						
Bel-Aire	E				1965	L	Original	Bri	Blk	WF		\$	\$3	\$ 2.35	\$1,142				30	50	10	90
Dr. Carl Safran Center				O	1908	L	Original	Sto	Blk	WF		\$	\$19	\$ 4.03	\$4,709				60	70	70	200
Dr. Carl Safran Center				O	1911	L	Addition	Sto	Blk	WF												
Dr. Carl Safran Center				O	1940	L	Addition	Conc	Blk	WF	Str											
Erlton (Unique)				O	1961		Original					\$	\$34	\$ 51.68	\$567				60	30	10	100
King Edward				O	1912	L	Original	Sto		WF		\$	\$44	\$ 5.94	\$3,924				50	70	50	170
King Edward				O	1956	L	Addition	Bri		WF												
King Edward				O	1968	L	Addition	Bri		Ste	Str											
Knob Hill												\$	\$25	\$ 11.19	\$1,362				40	30	30	100
Melville Scott				O	1954		Original	Stu	WS	WF	Str	\$	\$48	\$ 17.77	\$2,535				40	20	30	90
Melville Scott				O	1962		Addition	Stu	WS	WF	Str											
Ogden	E				1960		Original	Stu	Bri	WF	Str	\$112	\$144	\$ 29.41	\$1,877				40	40	30	110
Ogden	E				1972		Addition	Blk	Stu	Ste	Str											
R.B. Bennett	E				1952		Original	Bri	Stu	WF	Str	\$	\$28	\$ 11.55	\$1,154				50	60	10	120
R.B. Bennett	E				1960		Addition	Bri	Stu	WF	Str											
R.B. Bennett	E				1961		Addition	Bri	Stu	WF	Str											
Tuxedo Park (Chinook Learning Srv)	E				1912	V	Original	Stu		WF	Str	\$	\$16	\$ 4.02	\$2,739	\$1,820			50	40	70	160
Tuxedo Park (Chinook Learning Srv)	E				1956	V	Addition															
UNIQUE / CLOSED SITES:																						
											TOTAL:	\$112	\$362		\$20,010	\$1,820						
											GRAND:	\$1,404	\$3,344		\$56,656	\$8,088	\$2,176					

ATTACHMENT II

Alberta Infrastructure and Transportation Rating System
(SEFP – School Facility Evaluation Project)

Rating	Condition	Condition Description	Time Frame	Point Score
1	Emergency/Critical	Component represents an unacceptable, unhealthy or unsafe condition requiring immediate attention in order to ensure continued access, use and safety to staff, students and public.	Work must be done within 1 year	30
2	Poor/Unsatisfactory	Component has general to extensive deficiencies that impact on operational functions and/or may lead to health or safety concerns. Condition has deteriorated to the point where repair or replacement is recommended; otherwise very high levels of ongoing maintenance and/or repairs will be required. Condition may lead to a Level 1 rating if not addressed.	Work must be done within 1-3 years	20
3	Marginal	Component is marginally acceptable for intended use but has deteriorating conditions that will need to be addressed within the next 3 to 5 years. It may have minor deficiencies, which if corrected would result in improved conditions, comfort and/or ease of operations. Average level of ongoing maintenance will be required.	Work should be done within the next 3 – 5 years.	10
4	Good	Present condition of component has minor or no deficiencies, is performing well and will require only routine/average maintenance over the next 5 to 10 years.	Present condition should allow 5 – 10 years of continued services	0
5	Excellent	Component meets all current	Present Condition should allow 10-20 years of continued service	0

ATTACHMENT III

Facility Components with One Point Factor Ratings

School	Equipment/Structure	Rationale for Rating
Operating schools - electrical safety systems:		
Briar Hill Elementary	Electrical safety systems	Fire alarm and emergency lighting systems do not meet current code requirements but are operational and will be replaced utilizing I.M.P. funding on a prioritized basis. Current plan will address all sites within 4 years. Should a failure occur, the system will be repaired with P.O. & M. funds to ensure the continued operation of the site.
Buchanan Elementary	Electrical safety systems	
Cambrian Heights Elementary	Electrical safety systems	
Capitol Hill Elementary	Electrical safety systems	
Mount View Elementary	Electrical safety systems	
R B Bennett Elementary	Electrical safety systems	
Richmond Road Elementary	Electrical safety systems	
Leased schools - electrical safety systems:		
Dr Carl Safran	Electrical safety systems	Fire alarm and emergency lighting systems do not meet current code requirements but are operational and will be replaced utilizing lease revenue funding. Will be prioritized in the 5-year plan.
King Edward Elementary	Electrical safety systems	
Lakeview Elementary	Electrical safety systems	
Renfrew Elementary	Electrical safety systems	
Operating schools - other components:		
David D Oughton	Boilers	Boilers down draft when ventilation system exhaust is run on high speed. Alternative plans are being considered for this site. The remedied work has been deferred. Current building operational procedures compensate for the deficiency.
Mountain View Elementary	Main electrical service	Water seeping in through conduits. Follow up review indicates no immediate risk. School is currently closed. Work deferred.
Riverside Bungalow	Furnaces, Ventilation Systems	1960 vintage furnaces with minimal fresh air. Work has been deferred until the long-range plans for this facility are complete.
Terrace Road Elementary	Ventilation system	No ventilation air in west wing. Currently operates as designed using exhaust systems and infiltration.
Tuxedo Park	Roof	Roof is in need of replacement. School program is currently closed. Chinook Learning Services is occupying school for one year. Work has been deferred since facility may be liquidated in the near future.
Leased schools - other components:		
Renfrew Elementary	Main electrical service	Service is obsolete but still functional for current occupancy. To be integrated into 5-year plan.