

To: Janet Fraser, VSB Trustee  
Suzanne Hoffman, Superintendent VSB

Cc: David Eby  
George Heyman  
Spencer Chandra Herbert  
Sam Sullivan  
Ian Cannon  
Hudson PAC Seismic Committee

From: Robert Ford  
Henry Hudson Elementary PAC Chair  
604-644-6796  
robert@quokkasystems.com

Date: November 1, 2018

Re: Seismic Upgrade Project Definition Report, Henry Hudson Elementary

---

Dear Suzanne and Janet,

I hope this document finds you both well and having had too many peanut butter cups on Halloween! Also, I don't think I've properly congratulated you, Janet, for your recent victory at the polls.

I'm writing on behalf of the Henry Hudson Elementary PAC Seismic Committee. We have a couple of requests and wanted to update you on our advocacy work for Henry Hudson Elementary.

We have been following the controversy at Edith Cavell Elementary over what seems to be the missing consultation piece in the Project Definition Report. We want to work with the Ministry of Education and the VSB to avoid this kind of controversy for Hudson.

We've communicated in the past with the Project Office (see the attached "Hudson-Project-definition-letter\_Hudson-copy.pdf" and the response "Hudson-PAC-Letter-July-12-2018-.pdf") and have had no substantial consultation.

After Janet, Joy Alexander and Judy Zaichkowsky's site visit on September 21 – and subsequent follow up chats – I am left with the impression that the Trustees are somehow blocked or made unwelcome to do consultation on seismic projects during the Project Definition Report phase.

Realizing that more advocacy was needed, I and other committee members have met personally with three of the four MLAs whose ridings overlap with the Hudson catchment area: David Eby, George Heyman and (by phone) Spencer Chandra Herbert. (I still have to connect with Sam Sullivan.) We presented them with a one-pager ("Hudson MLA one-pager.pdf"), which covers the key concerns that we have about the Project Definition Report.

As I considered the current Edith Cavell controversy, it seems to me that consultation during the Project Definition Report phase should not put the project offside or behind schedule. Quite the opposite, actually.

Just today a Hudson teacher mailed me the document "SeismicRecommendations.pdf" which goes into serious detail about the need for non-enrolling space, which is not covered by the Area Standards. As you may recall the Hudson PAC also put forth the current BCCPAC resolutions to ask the Ministry of Education for changes to the standards. We would like to work with the VSB to encourage the Ministry of Education to revise the Area Standards, but with Hudson's PDR scheduled for January, we are concerned such change won't happen in time. How can we help?

Therefore, we request immediate consultation with those members of the Project Office that are currently working on the Hudson Project Definition Report. We believe that it would reduce future controversy were community concerns (raised in the attached documents) discussed in person *in advance* of the PDR being released. This would also reduce project risk.

An ideal meeting would include a Trustee, members of the Project Office (who are VSB staff and Ministry of Education staff), as well as representation from the Hudson PAC Seismic Committee, Hudson Principal, Mr. Cannon, Hudson teachers and the Hudson Out of School Care Society.

How can we set this up? This doesn't have to be fancy! We don't have to do anything but talk. My not-so-inner Project Manager voice is telling me that creating the scope of a project without consulting all stakeholders **in advance** is a recipe for cost overruns and delays. Well-informed stakeholders whose concerns have been acknowledged and who understand the rationales for decisions are more likely to be able to help create outcomes that come closest to meeting community needs.

As always, thanks for listening! Please let us know next steps.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Robert Ford", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.