Multi-Year Capital Planning for Schools

Presentation to ASD-S District Education Council

Josh Nowlan, Acting Director

Educational Facilities & Pupil Transportation Department of EECD

November 18, 2020



Capital Planning Brief

Summary of Presentation:

- Current state of school infrastructure
- Capital Planning strategy and budget process
- QBL Tool
 - o What it is
 - Development history
 - How it is used
 - o Updates



Current State of Infrastructure

- $_{\odot}$ 294 schools as of Sept 2020
- \circ Avg age 44.9 yrs
- Approx \$270 M identified deferred maintenance
- Assessed realty replacement cost (RRC) of assets is \$6.74 B



Current State of Infrastructure

Number of Schools per Age Category





Current State of Infrastructure



EECD Capital Planning Strategy

<u>Goals</u>

- Having sufficient facilities at a common standard
- Optimal use of space
- Objective decision making process



EECD Capital Planning Strategy

Challenges

- Demographics increasing: + approx 1,190 students between 2017-2019
- Const. costs increasing: approx 21% over 4 yrs
- Capital budget pressures



EECD Capital Budget Process

Typical Timelines

- May 31: DE
- June-July:
- July:
- August:
- Sept Oct:
- November:

- DECs submit Capital requests
- Project scoping
- QBL evaluations
 - 10-15 year Capital Plan
 - Prelim presentations to EECD, FTB
 - Capital Budget request submission

Capital Budget Announced



EECD Capital Budget Process

End State:

- One year confirmed budget
- 3-5 year GNB plan
- 10-15 yr long term EECD Capital Plan



Quadruple Bottom Line Multi-Criteria Analysis



What it is:

- Methodology used to assess the impact of a potential project against key objectives
- Tool to help assess potential projects against a common set of criteria with a weighted scoring system



History:

- Developed in 2014 with the assistance of Ernst and Young
- Workshop with all 7 school districts
- Started using for 2015-16 project assessments



How it is used:

- Project requests scored annually
 - Same staff review for consistency
 - o Fresh data inputs every year
 - Demographics, utilization levels, bldg conditions, etc.
- Provides un-biased, data-driven analysis which is used to assist EECD in making recommendations to government



Quadruple Bottom Line Multi-Criteria Analysis



| Economy | | Environment |
|--|---|---|
| Infrastructure capacity Conformance to EECD Planning Guidelines Alignment with development plans / demographics Complements multi-year development plans and demographic forecasts | Facility rationalization Improved school utilization levels Operational Efficiency Facility condition / deferred maintenance (FCI) | Environment impact PNB high performance green building goals Operations and maintenance costs (utilities consumption) Impact on conveyance - (travel time and costs) |
| Socio-economic impact on the community • Economic situation of community • Urgency of implementation Health and safety • Compliance orders | Inclusiveness Conformance to accessibility standards Quality of educational space Optimized learning environment Siting of school | Access to education for minorities Educational program availability in preferred language / at acceptable distance First Nations First Nations educational program availability in the classroom |
| Social | | Cultural |

QBL MCA matrix

Summary outcomes of all district workshops merged into one QBL MCA matrix – with ranking / voting results translated into 100 point scale

| Departn | Department of Education and Early Childhood Development | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---|--|--|
| Quadruple Bottom Line Multi-Criteria Analysis | | | | | |
| Druhswick | | | | | |
| QBL | Criteria | Indicator Weight | Indicators | | |
| | Infrastructure capacity to meet | 15 | Space / site conformance to EECD Planning | | |
| i my tor 1 = 40 | educational program needs | 15 | Guidelines | | |
| | Alignment with regional / local | 5 | Complements multi-year development plans / | | |
| dica | development plans and demographics | v | demographic forecasts | | |
| eigh | Facility rationalization | 7 | Improved school utilization levels | | |
| - 3 | Operational efficiency | 13 | Facility condition / deferred maintenance (FCI) | | |
| r r 16 | Environment impact | 7 | PNB high performance green building goals | | |
| rironm ndicato ghting = | | 5 | Operations and maintenance costs (utilities consumption) | | |
| Env | | 4 | Impact on conveyance - (travel time and costs) | | |
| | Socio-economic impact on the community | 5 | Community access to facilities (considering joint use partnerships) | | |
| 36 | | 5 | Urgency of implementation | | |
| ocial licator ting = 3 | Health and safety | 10 | Compliance orders from WorkSafe NB, Fire Marshall, Public Health, Elevator, etc. | | |
| Inc S | Inclusiveness | 5 | Conformance to accessibility standards | | |
| N N | Quality of educational space | 5 | Optimized learning environment | | |
| | | 6 | Siting of school (considering outdoor air | | |
| | | U | quality, neighbouring uses, traffic, etc.) | | |
| 0 | Access to education for minorities | | Educational program availability in preferred | | |
| ultural dicator hting = | | 6 | language / at acceptable distance (in support | | |
| | | | of cultural diversity) | | |
| Veig | First Nations | 2 | First Nations educational program | | |
| 1 | | - | availability in the classroom | | |
| | | 100 | | | |

MCA Matrix - Project Scoring

 Projects scored against 15 indicators

| Score | Impact |
|-------|---------------------|
| -5 | Very negative |
| -3 | Moderately negative |
| 0 | No impact |
| +3 | Moderate positive |
| +5 | Very positive |



Evolution:

 2018 – Tiering approach developed. Tier 1 projects take top priority

Address rapid population growth

 Applies to projects with excessive teaching platform deficiencies, increasing enrolment, site manageability challenges



Evolution (cont.)

- Top Tier project examples:
 - O 21 modular classes for impacted schools, ≈ 3% pop. growth/yr, loss of playfields, parking lots, playgrounds
 - 19 modular classes for impacted schools, adding avg. 200 students annually, loss of parking lots, playgrounds
 - 5 modular classes for impacted schools, ≈ 3% pop. growth/yr, loss of parking lots, playgrounds
- No opportunities for boundary re-alignments, int. spaces are maxed
- Additional modular classrooms not possible, or not possible without significant impact on site



Moving forward:

2020 - Formal Change Management Process
 Started May 2020

\circ Re-engage with districts to review/update QBL



Discussion

