



**Woolwich & Wellesley Townships Elementary Schools  
Pupil Accommodation Review  
Minutes of Accommodation Review Committee Meeting #9  
February 22, 2012, 6:30 – 8:00 PM  
St. Jacobs Public School Library**

The ninth meeting of the Woolwich & Wellesley Townships Elementary Schools Pupil Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) was held at Floradale Public School on Wednesday, February 22, 2012.

**Committee Members Present:**

Paul Milne, Principal St. Jacobs P.S., Vlad Kovac, Principal Floradale P.S., Geoff Suderman-Gladwell, Principal Linwood P.S., Wayne Dunham, Principal Three Bridges P.S., Krista Edwards, Parent Representative Linwood P.S., Brenda Martin, Parent Representative Floradale P.S., Susan Marchiori, Vice Principal Linwood P.S., John Krupicz, Parent Representative St. Jacobs P.S., Cindy Weber, Parent Representative Linwood P.S., Christine Shantz, Parent Representative Floradale P.S., Steve Snyder, Parent Representative Three Bridges P.S., Elmer Horst, Parent Representative Three Bridges P.S., Keith Trask, Parent Representative St. Jacobs P.S., Dennis Cuomo, Manager of Planning, Andrea Kean, Recording Secretary, Lauren Manske, Senior Planner and Nathan Hercanuck, Senior Planner for the Waterloo Region District School Board.

**Additional WRDSB staff present:**

Barry Easter, Manager, Facility Services

**Regrets:**

Susan Martin Community Representative, Diane DeCoene, Superintendent of Education, Ron Dallan, Manager of Capital Projects, Facility Services, Nick Landry, Manager of Enrolment, John Scarfone, Manager of Planning, Township of Woolwich, Sarah Peck, Planner, Township of Wellesley.

**1. Welcome/Introductions**

Mr. Hercanuck, Senior Planner for the Waterloo Region District School Board opened the meeting at 6:30 pm and welcomed members of the ARC and Barry Easter, Facilities Manager who will answer any questions regarding facility for schools in the area. Mr. Hercanuck advised the ARC that Ron Dallan, Manager of Capital Projects was unable to attend tonight's meeting.

**2. ARC Meeting #8 – Draft Minutes Approval**

Mr. Hercanuck asked members if there were any errors or omissions in the draft minutes from ARC meeting #8 (February 2, 2012). Paul Milne pointed out an error on page 6 of the minutes under Scenario 2 and noted that Floradale P.S. does not get Areas I and J from St. Jacobs P.S. Mr. Milne also noted an error on page 9 to Vlad Kovac's comment should read "younger" as opposed to "older". Mr. Kovac further amended his comment (via email) to

read “there is a provision in place for students to register in a younger grade than is the normal protocol in order to guarantee that they do not go to Grade 9.”

Minutes approved with noted changes.

Moved by: John Krupicz

Seconded by: Krista Edwards

Mr. Hercanuck advised that hardcopies of the minutes will be sent out to the schools for the school binder and the minutes will also be posted on the Board website at:

<http://www.wrdsb.ca/planning/accommodation-reviews/woolwich-and-wellesley-townships-elementary-schools>

Mr. Hercanuck led the ARC through tonight’s presentation, available online at:

<http://www.wrdsb.ca/planning/accommodation-reviews/woolwich-and-wellesley-townships-elementary-schools>

### **3. Draft Issues/Objectives:**

1. Ensure equitable student access to a community school by having defined attendance area boundaries that relate geographically to the community it is located in.
2. Where possible organize school attendance boundaries to minimize distance to school (time on bus).
3. Address student transitions where changes proposed.
4. Have regard for Board policy 3002; Elementary School Size and Configuration, recognizing the challenges of rural areas.
5. Support the efficient use of capital and operating resources through the consideration of facility condition, accessibility, and equitable access to educational amenities.
6. Maximize the number of students accommodated in permanent capacity
7. Maximize the use of existing capacity within facilities
8. Recognize the unique needs of communities served by different schools through the reasonable accommodation of cultural differences.

Mr. Hercanuck did a quick review of the draft issues/objectives and noted that at the last meeting the ARC had discussed bus ride times and questioned whether pockets of high density could be picked up to fill a bus and be transported directly to a school to reduce ride times (noting that it may be a case where students were located further from a school but they would get there faster because they could fill-up the bus and go directly to the school). Mr. Hercanuck noted that he had contacted Student Transportation Services of Waterloo Region (STSWR) who are responsible for the busing for both the Public and the Catholic boards and they advised that in order to achieve efficiencies with busing they try to coordinate runs between schools with staggered bus times which may involve the same bus being used to service both Boards trying to use the one bus as many times as possible. Mr. Hercanuck noted that STSWR advised that it is possible that you could be closer to a school and actually spend more time on the bus because of the run or you could be further away from the school but actually get to school faster than someone living closer.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that the concern from the last meeting was around if the ARC would be able to give an indication to the families in the higher density areas of the amount of time their children would spend on the bus in the event that a boundary change might result in their children having to attend a different school. The STSWR cannot guarantee bus times year-over-year because the distribution of students changes (students leaving and new students coming in) resulting in the bus routes changing every year, so even if they made the changes they could not guarantee it would be the same the following year.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that given the STSWR's inability to guarantee the bus routes, and minimizing the distance to school does not necessarily guarantee minimizing the times on the bus (which is determined by STSWR's routing) and asked the ARC if they would like make a decision on draft objective number 2 to either rewrite or remove as this statement, while possible, is not guaranteed.

C: Paul Milne suggested deleting the (time on bus) part of the objective.

C: Elmer Horst commented that if the ARC cannot guarantee than it should be removed.

C: Geoff Suderman-Gladwell commented that draft objective 2 revised to remove time on bus is essentially covered in draft objective number 1 "attendance area boundaries that relate geographically to the community it is located in."

Mr. Hercanuck commented that draft objectives 1 and 2 could be rolled into one objective.

Mr. Hercanuck asked the ARC to take some time to consider and to let him know their thoughts via email and the ARC will make a decision on the draft objectives at the next meeting.

**Action Item:**

**Add Decision on Draft Objectives No. 2 to agenda for ARC Meeting #10**

**4. Additional Requested Information**

• **Projection Areas - Student Distribution by School:**

Mr. Hercanuck, referring to the projection areas student distribution by school map (slide 5 of the online presentation) noting that each coloured dot represents a student with the colour determined by the school they attend. He also noted that there may be more students than dots shown because the dots for children in the same household may be stacked on top of each other.

Mr. Hercanuck advised that he created two new projection areas (E1 and F1) and provided revised projection area projections (see slide 6) and noted that areas E1 (Hawesville) and F1 (St. Clements) are subsets of areas E and F and advised the ARC to subtract these new areas from their parent areas when coming up with their own scenarios.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that the settlement areas have a higher concentration of students whereas the rural student concentration is more spread out.

- **Facility Reports for each school:**

**Gym Benchmarks:**

Mr. Hercanuck noted that a gym is basically a square room with a special floor and may also have sound attenuation panels but from a program perspective the space is what actually matters.

Mr. Hercanuck referring to slide 7 of the online presentation noted that the Gym Space Benchmarking is based on a 2010 analysis which ranks schools according to floor area based on enrolment and by school capacity. In order to give perspective he has provided the Board's best and worst ranked schools to show where the review area schools' gyms rank within the Board and noted that a ranking of 1 (lowest) and 100 (highest) square footage per student/pupil place.

Keeping in mind that the way the ranking system works is based on a ratio of gym size to on-the-ground capacity (OTG) and noting that where a school has a porta-pak, enrolment is taken into consideration as well.

**Overall Board Gym Rankings 2010 based on OTG:**

- Ranking 1 - Wilson Avenue Public School
- Ranking 100 - Cedar Creek Public School

**Overall Board Gym Rankings 2010 based on Enrolment:**

- Ranking 1 - Empire Public School
- Ranking 100 - Three Bridges Public School

**Review Area Gym Rankings 2010 based on OTG:**

- Ranking 14 – St. Jacobs Public School
- Ranking 17 – Linwood Public School
- Ranking 33 – Floradale Public School
- Ranking 96 –Three Bridges Public School.

**Review Area Gym Rankings 2010 based on Enrolment:**

- Ranking 29 – St. Jacobs Public School
- Ranking 33 – Linwood Public School
- Ranking 68 – Floradale Public School
- Ranking 100 –Three Bridges Public School.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that when ranked by enrolment Three Bridges P.S. has the best amount of gym space based on its student enrolment because of its low enrolment it has 18.03 square feet of gym space per student. Mr. Hercanuck noted that Floradale P.S. ranks better than average whereas Linwood and St. Jacobs P.S. are needier than average. When considering equitable access to amenities the ARC may want to consider how the area school rank to determine if additions may be needed to address inequities.

C: Geoff Suderman-Gladwell noted that the benchmark does not take into account the difference between a single gym and a double gym and noted that when you have a double gym access to program is higher in a double gym than in a single gym. With a

double gym you have the option for two classes to run at the same time which you cannot do with a single gym unless you share the gym, which is not ideal.

- R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that the benchmark does, to some degree, take that into account in the square footage with a double gym having more square footage.
- C: Mr. Suderman-Gladwell noted that where Floradale has one large 2800 square foot gym, Linwood has two smaller gyms and noted that every school would like a large double gym.
- C: John Krupicz asked if there are other metrics the Board uses for gym benchmarks.
- R: Mr. Hercanuck noted that this is the metric that the Board's Manager of Capital Projects has put together to highlight the needs of the schools and noted that he would ask him about the double versus single gym and invite him to our next meeting.
- C: Ms. Manske advised that the idea behind sharing this information is so the ARC can see that for the system as a whole, the review area schools do not necessarily have as great a need as some other schools in the Board and noted that there are some schools with high enrolment that only have a single gym and are asking for a curtain so it can be split so they can run two gym classes at the same time.
- Q: Paul Milne asked if the ARC could be provided with the gym rankings for schools with grades 7 and 8 to see how they rank against each other noting that from what he has seen of the list, the schools ranking higher in terms of need do not have grades 7 or 8 and that might introduce a different level of need in terms of gym use.
- C: Mr. Suderman-Gladwell commented that if you had a Physical Education teacher go around to rate all the gyms in the Board they would probably come up with a ranking system vastly different than the one the Board is using. He noted that square footage is just a small part of the equation and the height of the gym is also important.
- C: Vlad Kovac commented that for grades 7 and 8 students involved in team sports, playoff games cannot be played at certain schools because they do not have a ceiling high enough; and you cannot or host the playoffs even if you are in the playoffs. He noted that there are considerations in that regard plus you have teams who cannot play any of their home games at home. Mr. Kovac noted that all these are restrictions to building community and team spirit which can be a big part of the senior/intermediate experience.
- R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that while this might not be something we can address under this review it might be something to discuss with the Physical Education Program Association to get their thoughts. He noted that the gym benchmark information was provided to show the relative need in the system.
- Q: John Krupicz asked where the schools in the review area rank on the Board's capital priorities list.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that the review area schools are not listed on the Board's current capital priorities list based on the current system needs. The list does change if warranted.

Q: Steve Snyder asked if Floradale P.S's gym was too small to be considered a double gym.

R: Vlad Kovac responded that Floradale Public School's gym is not a double gym and cannot be split to run two classes at the same time.

C: Mr. Hercanuck commented that Floradale's gym is fairly representative of a single gym space that the capital funding model supports based on enrolment for new schools being built today in terms of gym space.

### **Action Items:**

- **Planning to ask Manager of Capital Projects and ARC member, Ron Dallan more about the gym benchmarks (single verses double) (grades 7 and 8) and invite him to attend the next ARC meeting to discuss.**
- **Planning to contact Physical Education Program Association for thoughts on gym benchmarks.**

### **Library Assessments: (Slides 8-12)**

Mr. Hercanuck noted that the Library Assessment information was provided by Anita Brooks Kirkland, Library Consultant for Information Technology Services for the Board who visited each library in the review area and assessed each library using the criteria from The 2003 Standards for School Library Programs in Canada Study by the Canadian Association for School Libraries. The ARC members were given Ms. Brooks Kirkland's report and Mr. Hercanuck went over the summaries for each school.

Each library was assessed on the basis of:

- Overall space
- Instructional Areas
- Instructional Computers
- Staff Work Areas
- Seminar Rooms
- Shelving
- Summary

### **Floradale P.S. Library Assessment Results:**

- Purpose built library space.
- Excellent space for three classes to be working at the same time.
- Staff work area is well laid out, with space for storage and a workspace for the clerk.
- Shelving suits the type of resources, but still short on space.
- A/V storage room unavailable.
- Computer lab in open concept library a challenge (noise).
- Overall a bright, clean well-functioning library and it would be able to accommodate an increase in population.

#### Linwood P.S. Library Assessment Results:

- Old gym converted to library space.
- Instructional area with white board available for whole class. Carpet with story time space. Computer area with five computers.
- Dedicated librarian office space, room for visiting library staff.
- Two seminar rooms.
- Variety of shelving purchased over last three years to accommodate collection. Modular pieces can be used to define spaces.
- This is a bright open space that has been reorganized to suit the school needs.

#### St. Jacobs P.S. Library Assessment Results:

- **Small for population.**
- Large heating unit takes up space.
- **Challenging to accommodate whole class.**
- Small separate area for three computers.
- New shelving works well, but not enough of it.
- **No space in library for teacher resources.**
- **Too small for the school and number of resources** but is bright and clean and has maximized use of space.
- High usage.
- **Would not accommodate large population increase.**
- **Not accessible.**

#### Three Bridges P.S. Library Assessment Results:

- Classroom changed to a library space.
- Carpeted area can fit one whole class.
- Only two rectangular tables for students to work.
- Storage, workspace very limited.
- Shelving in good condition although not enough for school. Considering small population, high circulation school.
- Excellent facility for small population. Clean, bright, well kept. High circulation for small enrolment.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that in summary, the library assessments define all schools in the review area with the exception of St. Jacobs P.S.'s have reasonably functioning, useable libraries. St. Jacobs P.S. library was deemed too small for the school and the number of resources it has to accommodate.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that if the ARC is considering the implications of benchmarking when looking at scenarios, we may want to consider ways to improve the library at St. Jacobs P.S.

#### **School Accessibility information/requirements for each school under review:**

Mr. Hercanuck referring to slides 13-16, which have floor plans for each school with inaccessible areas that still need to be made accessible in purple and maintenance/service areas in red (which are not required to be accessible) and noted that the school accessibility information is important for the schools as we move into the future towards January 2025 when all public building must be accessible noting that there is no specific funding or

budget dedicated to making the schools accessible. He also noted that the percentages are based on gross floor area.

School	% Accessible	% inaccessible
Floradale P.S.	100%	n/a
Linwood P.S.	96.2%	1% - stage area 2.8% - maintenance/service areas
St. Jacobs P.S.	66.1%	15.7% - stage, office, library, Kindergarten classroom, art room, computers, resource, withdrawal room 0.7% - maintenance/service areas
Three Bridges P.S.	81 %	9.1% - computers, resource, seminar 8.8% - maintenance/service areas

Q: Does Floradale P.S. have a stage?

R: No. The Board does not get funding to include a stage in new school construction. These schools can purchase a moveable platform to be used as a stage, and they can then share this moveable platform with other schools which would involve some special coordination for seasonal events. Mr. Hercanuck noted that at one time the Board would purchase stages that would fold up into the wall but because of safety/maintenance concerns that type of stage is no longer put into our schools.

C: Barry Easter commented that some of the schools that have the fold down stages cannot use them until safety repairs have been made and noted that they have to be inspected annually to make sure they are functioning safely and they cannot be used if they do not pass inspection.

C: Are these new portable stages accessible?

R: No. They may not be required to be accessible as they are not a permanent structure or part of the building. They could be made accessible with an appropriate ramp.

C: Geoff Suderman-Gladwell commented that Linwood P.S.'s stage was built as a lunch room and was most likely funded as such.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that St. Jacobs P.S.'s inaccessible areas could be considered if the ARC is considering scenarios with any capital improvements for St. Jacobs Public School. He also noted that the only way to make St. Jacobs accessible is with the addition of an elevating device to join first and second floors and possibly a stair lift to join the older and newer parts of the building.

C: Paul Milne commented that Facility Services had advised that accessibility was not achievable at St. Jacobs P.S. because of the space here.

C: Barry Easter responded that accessibility is very difficult to achieve with an older building because you do not have the space necessary for an elevator and would require using additional spaces to make the space needed to accommodate an elevator; it would also require the same amount of space on each floor and mechanical space beside it as well.

**Facility Condition Assessments:**

Mr. Hercanuck, referring to slides 17-20 of the online presentation noted that Ron Dallan, ARC member and Manager of Capital Projects could not attend this evening but passed along the Facility Condition Report information for the review area schools (slides 17-20 of the online presentation). Advising that the Board hired Anderson Building Science to conduct the assessments and John Pogacar, a professional engineer for the firm spent approximately one-half day at each school walking through and visually assessing each school under accommodation review by the Board.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that the assessment was based on visual observation and the theoretical useful life of a particular building component based on the industry knowledge of component replacement.

In 2002-2003 the Ministry of Education undertook a province-wide audit to inspect every school in the province to assess the needs and priorities of repairs and to allocate funding to meet these demands. The results of these audits were captured in the facilities management database ReCAPP which was designed to help boards identify renewal needs for the capital planning cycle to provide province-wide consistency of reporting on school condition. The Ministry also required that boards update their ReCAPP databases to reflect current renewal projects and to aid in the planning process. Mr. Pogacar used the 2003 Ministry audit results for each school as a baseline for the condition assessment data and provided Mr. Dallan with the updated information.

The Board has an annual school renewal capital budget which it uses to do school renewal type upgrades and noted that this money is allocated to the schools with the highest priority needs determined by Board committees with representation from various Board departments as well as representation from school principals and vice principals from each geographical area of the Board.

The School Renewal Funding Budgets consist of several categories of funding as outlined on slide 18 of the online presentation and includes the following categories:

- Instructional Computer Infrastructure
- Environmental (*Asbestos removal*)
- Program Related Projects (*library renovations and upgrades to main office site lines*)
- School Communication Systems
- Interior Finishes (*flooring, millwork, ceilings*)
- Mechanical/Electrical (*\$1.5 million for air conditioning, heating*)
- Building Envelope/Structure (*bricks and mortar, roofs*)
- Accessibility (*all schools to be accessible by Jan 2025 – no specific provincial funding currently allocated – Board responsibility to achieve and has started with secondary schools*)
- Site Improvements (*driveways, fields, parking lots*)

Slide 19 of the online presentation outlines the condition assessment cost information for each school in the review area, broken down by the budget categories noted above, with the combined totals determining the **5 year renewal needs assessment** for each school, as follows:

- Floradale P.S.           \$0 (new school)
- Linwood P.S.            \$2.383M
- St. Jacobs P.S.        \$1.812M
- Three Bridges P.S.    \$508K

Mr. Pogacar’s report looked at the areas in each school that would need to be addressed in the next 5-7 years as well as the issues that need to be looked at further out in 15-20 years which the Board will prioritize on the basis of a high, medium or low needs basis.

Slide 20 outlines how the Facility Condition Index (FCI) is determined by using the school’s total 5 year renewal needs assessment and is defined by a measure of building condition based on estimated costs of necessary upgrades and repairs in a school and the school’s replacement value of permanent built based on the schools on the ground capacity and the Ministry of Education benchmark funding.

The following **Facility Condition Indexes (FCI)** have been determined for the review area schools:

School	On the ground capacity (OTG)	5 year maintenance cost	Cost to rebuild	Facility Condition Index (FCI)
Floradale P.S.	322	\$ 0	\$6,734,321	0.00
Linwood P.S.	510	\$2,383,000	\$9,648,541	0.25
St. Jacobs P.S.	348	\$1,812,000	\$7,117,351	0.25
Three Bridges P.S.	92	\$ 508,000	\$2,358,798	0.22

In short, the FCI is a ratio of the deferred 5 year maintenance costs divided by the cost to rebuild.

In 2006 the Ministry of Education [Prohibitive to Repair](#) (PTR) initiative defined the PTR schools as those having an FCI equal to or greater than 65% of the cost to build the school new. Mr. Hercanuck noted that this was why the funding was given to the Board to rebuild Floradale P.S.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that despite Linwood P.S. having 5 times the renewal needs of Three Bridges P.S. the FCI is relatively the same because it is averaged out by the OTG capacity the school is built for.

Q: Does the FCI include accessibility costs?

R: No.

Q: John Krupicz asked if the numbers are available for 10 years or longer.

R: Yes they are available.

C: Barry Easter commented that the chart on slide 19 is based on approximately half of the components of a school that are surveyed and the only components included are the ones ranked in fair or poor condition and likely to need complete replacement in the next 5 years. He also noted that there are other components of the schools which are in good condition that have an expected lifespan of 10-20 years so effectively they are not a cost concern to us at this point so they were not included in the figures presented here.

Q: Full Day Kindergarten (FDK) is not included in these numbers either?

R: No, FDK is not included. These numbers are just to maintain the existing components of the building in a usable condition – it is not to upgrade the school or to expand its capabilities for FDK or to bring the school up to comparable standards to a new school. It also does not take into account any heritage features that might exist in a school that would require extra money to repair to a standard of heritage features.

C: Mr. Hercanuck noted that the Board's annual renewal budget (roughly \$7.8M) which it gets from the Ministry of Education (based on the Board's enrolment) and it uses to maintain all of its schools.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that when developing scenarios the ARC should take into account the maintenance needs and other work that also needs to be done at the review area schools.

Q: Elmer Horst noted that Floradale P.S. because it is new has now expected maintenance costs for the next 5 years; and asked what the expected lifespan of a new school is before it begins to incur maintenance costs.

R: Barry Easter responded that the building its self if built as a 50-75 year building. The Board maintains them longer than that. The roof top units that supply the heating and cooling in the school generally come with a 15 year lifespan and are maintained to try to get 30 years out of them, roofs can be expected to last 30 years but it varies depending on site conditions and how they are maintained when problems arise. He also noted that as technology improves, and using windows as an example, while older windows may be in good shape, they do not perform the way modern designed and installed windows do especially in their capacity for energy efficiency. Sometimes it is more fiscally responsible to replace rather than to maintain them. Mr. Easter also noted that the areas that take the most day-to-day abuse is what has to be replaced first; items such as flooring and door hardware.

## **5. Scenario Discussion**

Mr. Hercanuck handed out updated scenario projections 1-5 with revised FDK capacity for Linwood P.S. Based on room allocations Linwood will go from a built capacity of 510 to a capacity of 519. He also noted that at the last meeting he had handed out some homework sheets to the ARC members so they could try their hand at scenario development and provided the ARC with new Scenarios 6 and 7 based on suggestions Krista Edwards had emailed to him.

### **Scenario 6 (slide 21 of the online presentation)**

Attempts to address vacant space by balancing enrolments to school capacities.

- Three Bridges P.S. is closed with its students directed to St. Jacobs P.S except for area J which would be directed to Floradale P.S.
- Steffler Road area (area below A and J) directed to Floradale P.S. (this area represents 15 students all but 1 attend Three Bridges P.S. currently).
- Area G would be directed to Linwood P.S. (current Three Bridges and St. Jacobs)

Mr. Hercanuck noted that Scenario 6 is similar to Scenario 2 and looking at the numbers St. Jacobs P.S. may require a portable to accommodate the projected enrolment. Area G is a bit further from Linwood than St. Jacobs which may affect bus ride times. Also some areas of J are closer to St. Jacobs than to Floradale.

C: Krista Edwards noted that for these scenarios she took the entire population of Three Bridges P.S. and looking at the current number of students at the other schools in the review area, divided the Three Bridges' students into the other schools relative to their proportional population size and attempted to fill each school to capacity. Her scenarios are based on numbers.

Q: Are the Steffler Road numbers included in the projection numbers for Floradale P.S.

R: Yes. Mr. Hercanuck apologized that he did not show the area on the map but the area is included in the projection numbers. (15 taken out of the total for St. Jacobs and added them to the total for Floradale.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that these projection numbers are based on the assumption that the entire population of Three Bridges P.S. continues at the Board's schools.

### **Scenario 7 (slide 22 of the online presentation)**

Attempts to address vacant space by balancing enrolments to school capacities.

- Three Bridges P.S. is closed with its students directed to St. Jacobs P.S except for area G which would be directed to Linwood P.S.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that Scenario 7 is also similar to Scenario 2 except it has area G attending Linwood P.S; the numbers for Floradale are not as strong because it does not get area J and Steffler Road area. St. Jacobs has stronger enrolment and may need up to 3 portables.

C: Paul Milne commented that the FDK proposal for St. Jacobs P.S. is asking for a 2 room addition and noted that it the proposal as yet to be approved by the Ministry of Education; if the 2 room addition is granted it may not reduce the number of portables needed under this scenario.

C: Mr. Hercanuck noted that St. Jacobs P.S. is a year 5 FDK school and stated that the Board has requested in its FDK proposal to the Ministry of Education for at least a two room addition but the Board has not received confirmation of what we will be granted.

Q: John Krupicz asked if the Ministry allocates the FDK funding to the Board with specific amounts specified for each school as requested by the Board or is the Board given a lump sum to be shared out to each of the school requiring FDK additions.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that the Ministry of Education calculated the funding amount by school; with a specific amount allocated per renovation or addition on a by-room, by-school basis. The Board has the flexibility to spend that total amount on the FDK implementation at the schools identified for that specific year. In other words the Board is given a lump sum but it is not necessary to spend the entire amount at the school that generated it via the calculation.

C: Elmer Horst commented that after looking at the Scenarios and the projected enrolments it is his opinion that the Board will retain the David Martin Mennonite population but will likely lose the Old Order Mennonites and perhaps the Old Colony Mennonites because they can attend the parochial schools. Mr. Horst commented that these numbers will likely not be accurate because there will be some who fall out of the system.

R: Mr. Hercanuck noted that all scenario assume that the Board will retain all of the current student population at Three Bridges P.S. and the ARC has had conversation around that issue and has decided to approach the community once we have developed some options to be able to ask them what we can do to accommodate and make them feel welcome at another school should Three Bridges P.S. be recommended for closure and also to ask how many, if any, we can expected to retain.

Q: Wayne Dunham asked if the enrolment projections take into account families from Elmira that attend Three Bridges P.S.

C: Mr. Hercanuck noted that there are historic numbers for out-of-boundary students factored into the calculations to take into account students who attend other schools for various reasons such as accessibility. He noted that the Three Bridges population that attends from Elmira is factored into the scenario enrolment projections for whatever school the Three Bridges population is directed to in those scenarios in which it is closed.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that the online presentation also includes the rest of the Scenarios being considered by the ARC and noted that they are also included in the presentation from our last meeting as well.

## **6. Future Meeting Dates/Times**

### **Public Meeting #2:**

Public meeting #2 will bring the community up to speed on what the ARC has been doing to this point; provide information on the facility maintenance, school information profiles, scenarios we have discussed so far which should be limited to three or four scenarios so at the next ARC meeting we can narrow down the scenarios by using the draft objectives and what we want to take forward.

Mr. Hercanuck asked if the ARC felt they have enough information to bring forward to public meeting #2 or is there other information you would like to see for the next ARC meeting.

Q: Paul Milne asked if it would be possible to get some information on the costs for renovations to gyms and libraries.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that he could provide that information but cannot promise it for the next meeting.

- Q: John Krupicz asked if the School Information Profiles have been completed.
- R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that he has to add the facility condition information but for the most part they are complete.
- Q: John Krupicz commented that in the School Information Profiles for the St. Jacobs' site suggests that it is not sufficient to accommodate expansion or rebuilding; how did they come up with this conclusion and what is the criterion it is based on?
- Q: Paul Milne questioned how the Board can be proposing a FDK addition at St. Jacobs if there is no room to accommodate?
- R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that Planning will have to take a look and noted while he can see some challenges to the property, he would not say it is impossible but it would make an already small site smaller.
- C: Wayne Dunham asked whether Mr. Hercanuck had received some scenarios from Three Bridges P.S. families.
- R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that he had not received the scenarios and asked Mr. Dunham to please resend them to him and he will prepare and present them at the next ARC meeting.
- Q: Geoff Suderman-Gladwell asked if the ARC could get information on rebuilds
- C: Ms. Manske commented that for her West Galt ARC they looked at what was possible in terms of additional construction on the review area sites before looking at scenarios that recommend additions.
- Q: Keith Trask asked if it is possible to for the ARC to reach an agreement before the end of the current school year and be able to meet the timelines for the review.
- R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that it is still possible for the ARC to reach a decision by the end of the school year; but based on the minimum timeline set out by the Ministry it is looking like the Board will not be able to make a decision by the end of the school year because we have to have four public meetings before we can present our report to the Trustees who then must have 60 days to consider the report before they make a decision keeping in mind that the 60 days cannot include any of the major breaks in the school calendar.
- Q: Keith Trask asked when any decision on funding required for any scenarios the ARC may recommend would be made.
- R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that the ARC should consider what is best for students in the review area (including school size/organization and facility) based on the criteria it has been given. Because of the Ministry's current Capital Funding model the ARC does this without a clear indication of when or if the Ministry will fund the project(s). If the Board approves the recommendations any capital construction will go onto the Board's capital priorities list and will be submitted to the Ministry of Education for funding.

- Q: Keith Trask asked if the scenarios should be ranked on the risk associated with receiving funding for capital construction.
- R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that it is not something that an ARC usually looks at; an ARC is more focused on solutions that make the most sense for the students; and not focusing on the scenarios that may have the best chance of being funded based on cost alone. He noted that it could be something we consider in the case of rebuilding a space that already exists because it would be unlikely to have that approved by the Ministry.
- C: Ms. Manske noted that the Board prepares a business case for all its capital priorities which it submits to the Ministry and noted that it is hard for the Ministry to say no when the recommendation has been recommended by the ARC and approved by the Trustees and the Board.
- C: Mr. Hercanuck noted that the Board would hold off on any boundary changes until the funding has been received for any construction/renovations needed.

Mr. Hercanuck asked the ARC again if they felt prepared for Public Meeting #2 and noted the Planning Department would be comfortable to go forward with the meeting.

- Q: Steve Snyder asked if the information on whether the review area school sites were suitable for construction would be available to the ARC before the public meeting.
- R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that he would provide that information at the March 6 ARC meeting.
- C: We also do not have an indication of how much it would cost for accessibility.
- C: Geoff Suderman-Gladwell commented that perhaps the ARC should let the Board deal with the funding issues and the ARC can focus on what makes sense for the kids; noting that (historically) ARC recommendations do get funded.
- C: Mr. Hercanuck noted that he would provide information whether library or gym renovations could be made at St. Jacobs P.S. and noted that they may or may not be pieces that can be added to particular scenarios depending on what happens with enrolment and competing priorities at the Board. He noted that he would have some discussion with Facility Services to get an idea of what might be possible.

The ARC agreed to consider March 29, 2012 as a tentative date for Public Meeting #2.

Due to community events Planning is holding April 4, 2012 from 7:30-9:00 p.m. as the tentative date for Public Meeting #2 at Elmira District Secondary School.

**Action Items:**

- **Planning to provide renovation cost information for gym and library.**
- **Planning to update School Information Reports to add facility condition information.**
- **Planning to determine if St. Jacobs P.S. as well as the other review area sites can accommodate additions or rebuild and get information from Facility Services on possible additions to S. Jacobs.**
- **Mr. Dunham to forward Three Bridges Parent's scenarios to Mr. Hercanuck.**

**Public Meeting #2:**

*Tentative* – Wed., April 4, 2012 from 7:30-9:00 p.m. @ Elmira District Secondary School

**ARC Meetings:**

ARC Meeting #10 - Tues., March 6, 2012 from 6:30-8:00 p.m. @ Three Bridges P.S.

*Tentative* ARC Meeting #11- Wed., March 21, 2012 from 6:30-8:00 p.m. @ Linwood P.S.

Mr. Hercanuck thanked the ARC members and Mr. Easter for attending and adjourned the meeting at 8:35 p.m.

---

**FUTURE MEETING DATES:**

**PUBLIC MEETINGS:**

*Tentative* Public Meeting #2 – April 4, 2012, 7:30-9:00 p.m. @ Elmira District Secondary School

**ARC MEETINGS:**

ARC Meeting #10: March 6, 2012, 6:30-8:00 p.m @ Three Bridges P.S., Library

*Tentative* ARC Meeting #11: March 21, 2012, 6:30-8:00 p.m. @ Linwood P.S., Library