



**West Galt Elementary Schools
Pupil Accommodation Review
Minutes of Accommodation Review Committee Meeting #9
March 20, 2012, 5:30-7:30 PM
St. Andrew's Public School Library**

The ninth meeting of the West Galt Elementary Schools Pupil Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) was held at St. Andrew's Public School on Tuesday, March 20, 2012.

Committee Members Present:

Karen Tomlin, Principal, St. Andrew's P.S., Wendy Bowker, Principal Highland P.S., Jodie Meyer, Principal, Blair Road P.S., Michelle Schmid, Vice Principal, St. Andrew's P.S., Roy Roethel, Parent Rep., St. Andrew's P.S., Trevor McWilliams, City of Cambridge Representative, Barry Frame, Principal Dickson P.S., Karen Destun, Parent Rep., Tait Street P.S., Maura Fuller, Parent Rep., Tait Street P.S., Kelly Deml, Parent Rep., Blair Road P.S., Bev Fox, Parent Rep., St. Andrew's P.S., Al Potma, Parent Rep., Dickson P.S., Dianne Ray, Parent Rep., Dickson P.S., Dennis Cuomo, Manager of Planning, Andrea Kean, Recording Secretary, Nathan Hercanuck, Senior Planner and Lauren Manske Senior Planner, for the Waterloo Region District School Board.

Other WRDSB Staff Present:

None

Regrets:

Marcia Lubert, Principal Tait Street P.S., Nick Chiarelli, Vice Principal, Highland P.S., Paula Ouellet, Parent Rep., Highland P.S., Hayley Orman, Parent Rep., Highland P.S., Lynn Robb, Parent Rep., Blair Road P.S., Ron Dallan, Manager Capital Projects and Lila Read, Superintendent of Education for the Waterloo Region District School Board.

1. Welcome/Introductions

Ms. Manske, Senior Planner opened the meeting at 5:30 pm and welcomed the ARC members and introduced new ARC member Dianne Ray who replaces Rebecca Raineault as parent representative for Dickson Public School.

2. ARC Meeting #8 – Draft Minutes Approval

Ms. Manske asked the ARC if there were any corrections/concerns with the minutes from the March 7, 2012 ARC meeting. No corrections or concerns were noted.

Minutes from ARC Meeting #8 approved without changes.

Moved by: Wendy Bowker

Seconded by: Barry Frame

Ms. Manske noted 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/west-galt-elementary-schools>

Ms. Manske led the ARC through the presentation, available on-line at:

<http://www.wrdsb.ca/planning/accommodation-reviews/west-galt-elementary-schools>

3. Review Objectives

Ms. Manske noted that she had made a few changes to the draft objectives as a result of discussions at the last meeting and advised that the changes are noted in red, on slide 3 of tonight's presentation. The following are the revised three draft objectives: *(please see slide 3 for the complete list of draft objectives)*

- To **reorganize** the JK-5, **6-8** school organizations in favour of **JK-6, JK-8 or 7-8**.
- **To reduce the reliance on portable classrooms for long-term student accommodation.**
- **To reduce the cost to achieve legislated accessibility requirements by 2025.**

There were no concerns raised about the above noted changes.

4. Scenario Discussion

• New/revised scenarios

Ms. Manske noted that she had sent out the revised projections for Status Quo and four new scenarios (Scenarios 11, 12, 13 and 14) to the ARC members via email. Revised projections reflect the following:

- Grand Ridge Estates – all phases (includes future plan Phase 2, projections starting in year 2016). *Projection area E is updated with an impact on numbers for Highland P.S. in the Status Quo Scenario. (Slides 5 & 6)*
- Revised estimates based on September 2012 JK/SK pre-registration enrolment from March 9, 2012. *Ms. Manske noted that she has taken the pre-registration numbers and applied the Board's general calculation used to get the September enrolment numbers and modified all projection areas to reflect these updated numbers for September 2012.*
- Future development in Area C has **NOT** been included. *Ms. Manske noted that this area has not been revised because there is no way of knowing when this development will happen or how many units. She noted that the Board knows that it is definitely a possibility and something to be kept in mind for the future.*

Ms. Manske advised that the scenarios and projections have also been revised to include the following assumption:

- 2 classes per grade of French Immersion (FI) at Highland P.S. (starting at Grade 1 with historic attrition factors applied to grades 2-8). *Ms. Manske noted she included 46 students for Grade 1 FI including home school and out-of-boundary students based on historic yields with an applied attrition factor (to grades 2-8) as the program often loses a few students each year in the higher grades.*

Status Quo: (slides 5 & 6)

Q: Wendy Bowker noted that Status Quo Scenario lists Highland's on-the-ground (OTG) capacity at 464 and asked if that included the porta-pak.

- R: Ms. Manske responded that the 464 OTG for Highland P.S. does not include the porta-pak. It includes the Full-Day Kindergarten (FDK) addition which will be completed for September 2012. The 4 new FDK rooms would be loaded at 26 pupil places (the OTG also includes an increase to existing Kindergarten rooms which are currently loaded at 20 and bumps them up to 26).

Action Item:

Ms. Manske to update the School Information Profile for Highland P.S. to include the FDK addition OTG capacity of 464 for September 2012.

Scenario 11: (slides 7 & 8)

- All schools remain open.
 - Minor Boundary change moves Beechwood Road Townhouse complex population from Highland P.S. to Dickson P.S.
- C: Maura Fuller commented that Scenario 11 does not keep the schools Status Quo in regard to their program offering (i.e., Highland P.S. is offering JK-6 and not remaining JK-5)
- R: Ms. Manske responded that we do not currently have a scenario with that option but it is something that we can talk about if the ARC would like to consider it.
- C: Barry Frame commented that the minor boundary change (Beechwood Road Townhouses) would bring Dickson P.S. over capacity; and asked if that could be modified to give some of that population to Tait Street P.S. and send the Highland P.S. Grade 6s to St. Andrew's with a boundary change.
- C: Ms. Manske commented that this scenario does not take enough of the pressure off at Highland P.S. and will need to be refined with that in mind. She noted that the boundary could be changed to direct some of Highland P.S. boundary to Tait Street P.S.; or, as Maura suggested, another scenario could be to keep Highland P.S. and Dickson P.S. as JK-5 facilities and continue to send the Grade 6s to St. Andrew's P.S. which may result in a better balance of projected enrolment numbers to the OTG capacity for each of the review area schools; however, would not meet our first objective.
- Q: Would those being directed to Tait Street P.S. from Highland's boundary be within walking distance to Tait Street P.S.?
- R: Yes, they would be within walking distance to Tait Street P.S.
- C: Ms. Manske noted that she has updated the maps outlining walking distances for each school to add more detail and noted it includes the properties included in the boundary area being redirected. These maps were handed out to ARC members in attendance.

Outcome:

The ARC decided to remove Scenario 11 from further consideration.

Scenario 12: (slide 9 & 10)

- Builds a new JK-6 school (300 pupil place school) on Beechwood Road Site.
- Closes Dickson P.S.
- Modification to boundaries (moves area south of Tait Street P.S. that currently attends Blair Road P.S. to Tait Street P.S.'s boundary)
- Includes a portion of the new development area to the new school and a portion to Highland P.S.
- Change to boundary area of Blair Road P.S. and former Dickson P.S. (projection areas K and G)

Ms. Manske apologized for not including the projection areas on this scenario and noted that she had revised the scenarios which she had sent out to the ARC via email to remove the French Immersion (FI) at Blair Road P.S. which had been included in error.

The new school would offer JK-6 based on an enrolment of 300. The Ministry of Education would potentially fund approximately \$5.5 million of the cost for a new school facility based on an enrolment of that size.

Scenario 12 would likely achieve some cost savings to the Board by not having to provide upgrades, maintenance or accessibility at Dickson P.S. The Board owns the proposed new school site; therefore it would not be an added expense to the Board.

C: Barry Frame commented that with this scenario all remaining review area schools would be under-utilized.

C: Jodie Meyer commented that preferably, a new school should offer a JK-8 program.

Outcome:

The ARC decided to remove Scenario 12 from further consideration.

Scenario 13: (Slides 11 & 12)

- Closes Dickson P.S. and moves its students to St. Andrew's P.S.
- St. Andrew's P.S. becomes JK-8
- Boundary change to move a few students from Highland P.S. to St. Andrew's P.S.
- Changes to boundaries for Blair Road P.S. and Tait Street P.S.

C: Ms. Manske commented that in order to offer the JK-8 program at St. Andrew's P.S. the school would require an additional 176 pupil places at an approximate cost of \$3.3 million based on the Ministry of Education funding calculation. She noted that the allocation for an addition is slightly different than the allocation for a new school based on the area benchmark used by the Ministry: 10.13m^2 x pupil places for an addition versus 10.02m^2 x pupil places for a new school.

C: Barry Frame commented that Scenario 13 still leaves Blair Road P.S. under-utilized.

C: Ms. Manske advised the ARC that earlier she had discussed with Facility Services staff the potential for adding onto St. Andrew's P.S. and they have advised that while a program of

600 students at St. Andrew's P.S. is possible; it would really compromise the play area of the site.

Q: Would separate lunch breaks be used for the junior and elementary programs in a JK-8 school?

R: Ms. Manske responded that every school schedules their breaks differently and would depend on scheduling that works best at the individual school.

Q: Would an addition at St. Andrew's be one or two storey?

R: Ms. Manske responded that an addition for St. Andrew's P.S. would include purpose-built Kindergarten rooms and could be built 2 or 3 stories to match the existing building and would likely include an elevator to achieve accessibility which could achieve some economies of scale by including the accessibility feature into the addition as well as addressing any other issues the building might have at the same time.

C: When you compare the cost for a 176 pupil place addition (\$3.3 million) versus a brand new school (\$5.5 million) and the lack of playground space at the St. Andrew's site, plus adding more students and taking away a portion of the site to house these students. The addition of the Kindergarten program would require the need for a creative play area as well which would put further pressure on the site.

R: Ms. Manske responded that these are all issues for this scenario and added that St. Andrew's P.S., in this scenario, would be heavily loaded with grades 7 and 8 and be running a smaller junior elementary program.

Outcome:

The ARC decided to remove Scenario 13 from further consideration.

Scenario 14: (slides 13 & 14)

- Construction of a new JK-8 school (Beechwood Road Site)
- Closes St. Andrew's P.S. and Dickson P.S.
- Attempts to achieve walk-in boundaries for area schools
- All of Dickson's population redirected to Tait Street P.S. would be within walking distance (at least for Grades 1-6) JK-SK distance (800m) is a little more challenging to achieve.
- New development area split between new school and Highland P.S.

Ms. Manske noted that the two most recent schools built by the Board received \$12 million funding for 650 pupil places x 10.02m² based on the Ministry of Education funding calculation.

C: Barry Frame asked if the new Cambridge West development area would have an impact on enrolment once it is fully developed.

R: Ms. Manske responded that there are currently 50 students coming from the Blair Road area that are in grades 7 and 8; considering that this area would go to Galt Collegiate Institute (GCI) for the secondary program, they could be redirected to a GCI feeder school

that has unused capacity. She noted that Avenue Road P.S. feeds to GCI and is adding the 7-8 program but may not have room for an additional 50 students.

It was noted that Salisbury Avenue and Main Street is the dividing line determining which secondary school the review area students would attend; either Southwood Secondary (SSS) or GCI.

Q: In this scenario, where would the students go for grades 7 and 8 that would have attended St. Andrew's P.S?

R: Ms. Manske responded that they would attend the proposed new school on Beechwood Road.

Q: Barry Frame asked if it would be appropriate to ask the ARC to consider that the review area would remain Status Quo for the next 5 years and then look at Scenario 14; as it may be premature to go forward without knowing the extent of the new development area in Blair Road P.S.'s area. He also noted his apprehension at requesting funding for a new school when the Board is under capacity in other schools in the area. He also noted that Scenario 14 would be the more logical option if requesting to build a new school in the review area but not sure it would be required at this point.

Q: Dianne Ray asked if the Board has the funds to build a new school.

R: Ms. Manske responded that the Board does not fund capital construction, therefore, would have to apply to the Ministry of Education for the funding should the ARC recommend and the Board approve a request for the new school. Ms. Manske noted that it is her understanding that there is currently a placeholder for capital funds for the review area on the Board's Capital Priorities List should the outcome be a construction project.

C: Barry Frame commented that the review area does not appear to be a growth area and would not likely require a new school. The higher growth area around the new Moffat Creek P.S. would likely be a more appropriate location for another school.

Q: Kelly Deml asked Trevor McWilliams if there are any further updates on the Cambridge development areas.

R: Trevor McWilliams responded that Lauren has included the Grand Ridge Estates numbers in her projection and in his opinion that is appropriate because that development will happen first and the Cambridge West development area will come much later. He noted that he does not disagree with Mr. Frame and noted the timing of the new development areas area often tied to the economy.

C: Maura Fuller commented that in her opinion the ARC should wait.

C: Dianne Ray commented that the accessibility requirement is 13 years away and can be dealt with 5 years from now.

- C: Wendy Bowker commented that she understands all the points of view but noted that Highland P.S. is busting at the seams with 7 portables and the possibility of having more. The ARC has to do something; Highland P.S. cannot wait another 5 years.
- C: Barry Frame commented that perhaps the ARC could look at an addition for Highland P.S.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that even if that could be considered a solution, we would still be 2-3 years out for that to happen and would be very expensive.
- C: Barry Frame commented that the ARC could look at a boundary change for Highland P.S.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that yes, Highland P.S. will require a boundary change, regardless of what happens here.
- Q: Michelle Schmid asked if the ARC were to postpone a decision; what would be the process the Board would take assuming that these reviews are scheduled and if the area would be even be eligible for another accommodation review 5 years from now.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that it would be dependent on the priorities the Board would be facing at that time. The East Kitchener-Waterloo Accommodation Review as one of its recommendations requested that the Board schedule another accommodation review of the area prior to a set date. That could also be a possibility for this ARC as well.
- C: Dennis Cuomo commented that the results of an ARC can initiate a recommendation (for addition/new construction) being included into the Board's Capital Priorities Plan; which is where it has to go to be considered by the Ministry for funding. The sooner you can get it included the better as it can take a few years to actually get the funding.
- Q: Al Potma asked how long the process takes from the time the Board request funding and a shovel actually hits the ground.
- R: Mr. Cuomo responded that the Ministry has changed how it funds school board capital construction from a certain overall amount on an as-needed basis, to a project-by-project basis; until a new funding model is developed. The last time the Board received funding for capital projects was in June of 2011. He noted that at some point in the year (hopefully) the Ministry will ask the Boards to resubmit their Capital Priorities Plan for consideration. After receiving funding it could be 2-3 years before construction begins and we are opening a school.
- C: Al Potma asked if it would be safe to assume that any item recommended by the ARC could take 5 years to come to realization anyway.
- R: Mr. Cuomo commented that would be a safe assumption if everything were to go ahead as planned without any delays. He noted that an ARC's recommendation is not guaranteed immediate results.
- Q: Karen Tomlin asked if the ARC were to recommend Scenario 14, assuming that it would take 5 years, could we establish boundary changes and other interim solutions.

- R: Ms. Manske responded that absolutely the ARC can make these recommendations.
- Q: Dianne Ray asked if the ARC was to make this recommendation and we find that 5 years from now, it was not the best recommendation.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that it could be revisited.
- Q: Jodie Meyer asked if the ARC has to provide all the details in its recommendation to build a new school as to whether the Board has to close schools and boundaries have to be changed a certain way or can we provide a recommendation that provides those details at a later date.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that for the Board to make a business case to the Ministry, it is best to provide our overall vision.
- Q: Barry Frame asked if the subdivision located behind Blair Road P.S. starts to grow, and the Board applies for another school; would there be another ARC involved in that process.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that it would not necessarily mean an ARC; the Board could just do a Boundary Study to set a boundary for that school.
- R: Mr. Cuomo responded that there could be a boundary study to set the boundary for the proposed new school on the Beechwood site if in 5 years we determine that it needs to be a different configuration. It could be a new ARC or it could simply be a boundary adjustment at that time. If the ARC were to recommend Scenario 14 it may want to establish the general concept that 2 schools would be replaced by 1 new school and that there are some boundary changes and grade configuration changes that could work to make that happen.
- Q: Barry Frame asked if the ARC has to recommend that now or if we recommend that it would take place in a certain amount of time if we see the need for it at that point.
- Q: Trevor McWilliams asked if the ARC were to recommend a new school; how quickly it could be available.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that the earliest the ARC could get a decision from the Board would be September or October 2012 and the earliest the Ministry may be giving out funding would be in the spring of 2013. The Board would have to go through the long process of getting a cost consultant, hiring an architect, design work etc., it could take 5 years.
- C: Barry Frame commented that if it could take 5 years it could be a totally different scenario in this area; we might be worth letting this area evolve a little more.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that if we do not get that place holder in it could be at least 10 years before we get anything happening here.

- Q: Al Potma asked if the ARC could recommend revisiting this in a shorter amount of time, say 1-2 years depending on what applications for development have been received.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that the ARC process itself is at least a year. She noted that this ARC could be deferred but would not recommend this strategy because it would not resolve the other review area issues.
- Q: Dianne Ray asked if the costing amount for Scenario 14 includes bussing costs because most of the Dickson P.S. area and Tait Street P.S. being redirected to the new school would have to be bussed.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that the \$12 million figure is the cost for the new school building only. She noted that there would not be a big difference between the numbers currently being bussed to St. Andrew's P.S. and the number to be bussed to the proposed new school because some students currently transported could walk to the new school and vice versa.
- Q: Dianne Ray commented that this scenario closes Dickson P.S. and those students would have to be bussed.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that the Dickson population would be shared between Highland P.S. and Tait Street P.S. so that they would be within walking distance to the school they would attend. The only busing would be for JK/SK students.
- C: Mr. Cuomo responded that the cost of transportation is something that the ARC does need to have a concept of to identify how the transportation costs compares to status quo.
- C: Dianne Ray commented that the ARC should consider students being able to walk to school as a priority.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that she had based this scenario on the Board's walking distances policy and noted that all these schools JK-6 should be almost 100 percent walkable other than the rural areas; and had even eliminated some of the current busing at one school because of safety hazard areas by redirecting these students to another school where they have a safe route they can walk. Scenario 14 decreases the proportionate amount of JK-6 students being bussed to the area schools.
- Q: Michelle Schmid commented that it was her understanding from past meeting discussions, that the Board could request a school site in the Blair Road new development area because the population is expected to be large enough to support a JK-8 a school of its own; is that still an option and could the Board close Blair Road P.S. and reopen a new Blair Road P.S. in that area; and this development area a factor under this accommodation review process?
- Q: Ms. Manske responded that is an option the Board has and can be resolved completely outside of this West Galt ARC. The only reason it might have to be a factor would be if the area south of the railway tracks might have better transportation connections to the review area.

Q: Karen Tomlin asked if that means that the Blair Road development area we have been discussing does not affect anything else and as an ARC we do not have to be considering it in our recommendations?

R: Trevor McWilliams indicated that no connections are proposed at this time.

R: Ms. Manske responded that she does not consider it a factor in this review.

The ARC discussed possible scenarios with boundary changes to offset enrolment pressures at Highland P.S.

Q: Dianne Ray asked how the enrolment projection numbers are determined; if they are determined by census numbers.

R: Ms. Manske responded that they are these numbers are the actually students that are in our system right now and we project the number of JK enrolments based on a set of factors including but not limited to the number of births over the past 4 years and historical enrolment.

Q: Barry Frame asked for numbers for an area that had once attended Tait Street P.S. but were now attending Highland P.S. and commented that Tait Street might be able to handle 2 more classes based on its OTG.

R: Ms. Manske responded that would depend on whether they would be able to walk to Tait Street P.S. to be mindful of Tait's transportation issues. She noted that the area that had formerly attended Tait Street P.S. now has 169 students attending JK-6 in all of area J. The townhouse complexes being redirect to Dickson P.S. in Scenario 11 has 71 students that currently attend Highland P.S.

C: Barry Frame commented that if both Dickson P.S. and Highland P.S. were to remain a JK-5 and then do the boundary change it would give a better balance because it would take 2 groups of approximately 70 students out of Highland and send them to Tait Street; The students from both Highland and Dickson would going to St. Andrew's for Grade 6.

C: Wendy Bowker commented that Highland P.S. currently has 7 portables and this scenario might only achieve a 2 portable reduction.

C: Ms. Manske commented that Highland P.S.'s JK enrolment numbers are down for 2012-13 school year.

Q: Dianne Ray asked if the Board takes into consideration that the September JK enrolment numbers could be much higher than the numbers reported in March.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that the Board bases the September enrolment projections on the March registrations using historical factors to determine September registrations; which vary for each school dependent the transiency of the boundary area and historically the proportion of registrants in March versus September.

- C: Ms. Manske responded that these are the numbers the Board uses to determine staffing every year and as such tends to be very accurate.
- C: Ms. Manske commented that from this evening's discussion it seems that the ARC would like to see a modification to Status Quo with boundary changes that better match the projected enrolment numbers to the OTG capacities for each school.

Action Item:

Ms. Manske to provide new scenarios, modifications of Status Quo with boundary changes that better match the projected enrolment numbers to the OTG capacities for each school and send out to the ARC via email to decide which scenarios to bring to Public Meeting #3 on March 27, 2012.

- Q: Al Potma asked if the ARC had considered if Southwood Secondary School had any surplus space available and if so if the Board would consider sending Grade 7 and 8 to Southwood; this might help with the over enrollment at Highland P.S. by allowing St. Andrew's P.S. to offer the JK-6 program, and having all the 7 and 8 go to Southwood.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that at this time Southwood does not have sufficient space to offer this scenario.
- Q: Mr. Potma asked if the ARC could recommend an addition at Southwood to house the 7-8 program.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that she believes that the Board would only consider such a scenario if Southwood had existing surplus space available and this would likely only be done out of necessity; Southwood does not have any surplus capacity available.
- C: Kelly Deml responded that the problem with this option would be that while the majority of the area 7-8s would go to Southwood, the 7-8s that come from Blair Road P.S. go to Galt Collegiate for the secondary program.

5. Public Meeting #3:

Public Meeting #3: Tuesday, March 7, 2012, 7:00-8:30 pm @ St. Andrew's P.S. Gym.

The ARC discussed which scenarios it would like to share with the community for Public Meeting #3.

- C: Barry Frame commented that Scenario 14 may be the best option so far for the area considering the uncertainty around the development areas.
- Q: Kelly Deml asked if the proposed new school is to address the accessibility issues at Dickson and St. Andrew's and not to deal with development in the Cambridge West MESP area of Blair Road's boundary which will resolve itself.

- R: Ms. Manske responded what the new school would be achieving is fewer 'right sized' facilities in this area and noted that it is easier for the Board to operate fewer appropriate facilities that can offer equitable programs to achieve an equality of student opportunity across the Board.
- Q: Dianne Ray asked if the Beechwood site is large enough to accommodate a 650 pupil place school, or larger, should future development require it.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that the Board does not build schools any larger than 650 pupil places for elementary schools and noted that the Beechwood site is adjacent to city park space. She also noted that the building could be built multiple stories to better maximize the use of the site.
- Q: Dianne Ray asked how many stories the new school would be and how much it would cost.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that the proposed school size has not been determined yet and the Ministry's funding calculation would be \$12 million for a 650 pupil place school with the Board having to fund anything above that amount.
- R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that on a site of 5 acres, a new JK-8 school would have to be a minimum of 2 stories.

Action Items:

- **Ms. Manske to confirm size of Beechwood Road Site and include information on useable park and include footprint of Edna Staebler P.S. on Beechwood site to aid as an example of school on the site.**
- **Ms. Manske to add more costing information to scenarios.**

The ARC decided to bring Scenario 14 to Public Meeting #3 as a more long term solution. The meeting will begin with a presentation and include display boards of the scenarios and to include more information on costing but noted that a dollar figure for transportation will not be included but will determine if it would be an increase or decrease compared to status quo. Include note that there may be revenue from sale of surplus lands but with no specific dollar figure as we are not able to determine the cost at this point.

- Q: Dianne Ray asked at what point a new school may incur maintenance of major components.
- R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that a new school's major components also have a lifespan but are expected to have a much longer period before they need to be replaced. A new school is not expected to incur any major maintenance costs in its first 10 years.
- Q: Jodie Meyer asked what the ideal number of students that need to be moved from Highland P.S. to remove its enrolment pressure.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that approximately 100-150 students may need to be redirected from Highland P.S.

R: Mr. Cuomo responded that as an interim solution, a reduction of 65 students would bring the enrolment down to 455 and that includes the FDK rooms; in year 2020 it would hit 475 and would be just over capacity and would likely require 2 portables to house the additional students as opposed to the 6 portables that Highland P.S. has now.

C: Trevor McWilliams commented that under Scenario 14 would close 2 schools which are historically designated buildings.

Q: Mr. Cuomo asked Mr. McWilliams if it is correct that being designated does not necessarily mean the buildings cannot be demolished; there are processes to be followed for demolition?

R: Mr. McWilliams responded that heritage buildings may be demolished but a decision to do so would likely result in a lot of controversy.

Action Item:

Ms. Manske to do a variety of boundary scenario that achieve the desired numbers for Highland P.S. and send the scenarios out to the ARC via email to with the ARC to forward their top 2 preferences to Ms. Manske prior to the March 27th Public Meeting.

6. Future Meeting Dates:

- Public Meeting #3: March 27, 2012, 7-8:30 pm @ St. Andrew's PS

Ms. Manske advised the ARC that if we are comfortable with a scenario, we will need to prepare a report and noted that tonight's discussion indicates that the ARC is looking for something short term with boundary changes and possibly moving forward with a timeline for the construction of a new school (working towards Scenario 14). Ms. Manske asked the ARC if this is an accurate assumption. The ARC agreed.

Ms. Manske noted that for ARC meeting #10 she will provide a draft report for the ARC review. The report will indicate the ARC recommendations to the Board and how we arrived at those recommendations. This would be the information the ARC would bring to the community at Public Meeting #4 to gather feedback.

Ms. Manske noted that the ARC may be able to present its report to the Board on May 14, 2012 and therefore the ARC will have to schedule Public Meeting #4 prior to this date. The ARC will also need to meet after Public Meeting #4 to go over the feedback prior to the Report going to the Board.

The ARC agreed on the following dates:

- Working Group Meeting #10: April 10, 2012 from 5:30-7:30 p.m. at St. Andrew's P.S.
- Public Meeting #4: May 1, 2012 from 7:00-8:30 p.m. at St. Andrew's P.S.
- Working Group Meeting #11: May 2, 2012 from 5:30-7:30 p.m. at St. Andrew's P.S.

7. Roundtable/Wrap Up

Ms. Manske reminded the ARC to check their emails for the new scenarios and to provide their feedback. She thanked the ARC for coming and the meeting adjourned at 6:50 p.m.