



**Woolwich & Wellesley Townships Elementary Schools  
Pupil Accommodation Review  
Minutes of Accommodation Review Committee Meeting #11  
March 21, 2012, 6:30 – 8:00 PM  
Linwood Public School Library**

The eleventh meeting of the Woolwich & Wellesley Townships Elementary Schools Pupil Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) was held at Linwood Public School on Wednesday, March 21, 2012.

**Committee Members Present:**

Paul Milne, Principal St. Jacobs 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., 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., Susan Martin Community Representative, Ron Dallan, Manager of Capital Projects, Facility Services, 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:**

Ian Gaudet, Controller, Facility Services  
Mel Lavoie, Project Coordinator, Facility Services

**Regrets:**

Vlad Kovac, Principal Floradale P.S., Geoff Suderman-Gladwell, Principal Linwood P.S., John Krupicz, Parent Representative St. Jacobs P.S., Diane DeCoene, Superintendent of Education, Nick Landry, Manager of Enrolment, John Scarfone, Manager of Planning, Township of Woolwich, Sarah Peck, Planner, Township of Wellesley.

**1. Welcome:**

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 introduced ARC member Ron Dallan, Manager of Capital Projects, Ian Gaudet, Controller of Facility Services and Mel Lavoie, Project Coordinator, Facility Services.

**2. ARC Meeting #10 – Draft Minutes Approval**

Mr. Hercanuck asked members if there were any errors or omissions in the draft minutes from ARC meeting #10 (March 6, 2012). None were raised.

Minutes approved without change.

Moved by: Cindy Weber

Seconded by: Elmer Horst

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. Scenario Discussion:**

At the last meeting Mr. Hercanuck noted that the 10 scenarios could be considered as falling into 1 of the following 3 categories:

1. Status Quo
2. Three Bridges P.S. remains open (scenarios 1, 8 and 9)
3. Three Bridges P.S. is closed (scenarios 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7)

The ARC agreed to present one scenario from each of the 3 categories at public meeting #2. They also decided that any scenarios taken off the table for Public Meeting #2 could be brought back again if there was merit to do so.

At the last meeting the ARC agreed:

1. To take the following scenarios to Public Meeting #2:
  - [Status Quo](#)
  - [Scenario 1](#)
2. To remove from consideration:
  - Scenario 5

The ARC resumed discussion of the scenarios for Public Meeting #2 to decide on which of the remaining 4 scenarios (2, 3, 6 and 7) that would close Three Bridges P.S. to present to the community. Mr. Hercanuck reviewed the scenarios for consideration with ARC:

#### Scenario 2

- Closes Three Bridges P.S with its population attending St. Jacobs P.S. (both schools presently share the same boundary)
- All other boundaries remain the same.
- Floradale P.S. running below capacity.
- St. Jacobs P.S. 2 or 3 classrooms over capacity with new development and FDK addition. (if retains the entire Three Bridge P.S. community)

#### Scenario 3

- Closes Three Bridges P.S. with students directed to St. Jacobs P.S. and Floradale P.S.
- This scenario attempts to direct the more urban areas to St. Jacobs P.S. and the more rural areas to Floradale P.S.
- Better utilizes Floradale P.S.'s capacity.
- No real change for Linwood P.S.
- Better matches St. Jacobs P.S. enrolment to capacity for 2020.
- Assumes retaining all Three Bridges P.S. population.

Mr. Hercanuck advised that the boundaries could be modified in the Steffler Road area to make the boundary easier to understand.

#### Scenario 6

- Closes Three Bridges P.S.
- Projection area I to St. Jacobs P.S., area J to Floradale P.S., area G to Linwood P.S.
- St. Jacobs P.S. would then get the remainder of the Three Bridges boundary.
- Floradale P.S. is a little better utilized.
- Linwood P.S. gets an enrolment boost to bring it a little over capacity by 2020.
- St. Jacobs P.S. would be well matched to its capacity.
- Assumes retaining all Three Bridges P.S. population.

#### Scenario 7

- Very similar to Scenario 6
- Closes Three Bridges P.S.
- Projection areas I and J would go to St. Jacobs P.S.
- Projection area G to Linwood P.S.
- Floradale P.S. would remain status quo and under capacity.
- St. Jacobs P.S. would be better utilized.
- Linwood P.S. enrolment boost.
- Assumes retaining all Three Bridges P.S. population.

Q: Steve Snyder asked if students could be bussed to the new school which is being proposed for Elmira.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that there is potential for a new school to be constructed in Elmira in the new Lunor subdivision (1400 residential unit development) which would be able to support the new school on its own. The School would service an entirely walk-in population from Elmira. The Board anticipates that Floradale P.S. would continue to serve the rural population.

C: Dennis Cuomo noted that the ground work for servicing for this subdivision has just begun; however, the Ministry has not granted the Board funding for this facility yet.

Q: Susan Martin asked if that is why the Board will be doing the Elmira Accommodation Review.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that we have not yet asked for permission from the Trustees to do an Accommodation Review in Elmira, but there is potential one will be completed.

C: Susan Martin commented that in the past there had been some discussion around busing students from Floradale into Elmira but it was decided not to do so because the community had concerns with the rural students attending school in an urban setting. She noted that was the consensus in the past, but perhaps that may be different now.

Q: Elmer Horst asked if the Board wants to keep the rural/urban divide why the rural students are sent to an urban secondary school (Elmira District Secondary School).

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that high schools, because of the necessity of the programs they deliver, have to be that much larger with a lot more needs in terms of the facility. The Board also maintains a walk-in population for high schools. Waterloo Oxford District Secondary School is the only rural high school in the Board but because of its proximity to Baden may not be considered truly rural.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that when taking scenarios to a public meeting it is beneficial to include scenarios that best illustrate the point and would be relatively straight forward to understand without a lot of moving pieces (i.e., boundary changes) and asked the ARC what scenarios that wish to include with those scenarios selected at the last meeting.

C: Christine Shantz suggested that it might be interesting to bring 2 scenarios from this group (Three Bridges closed). One where St. Jacobs would receive all the Three Bridges population and the other where the population is divided between St. Jacobs and Floradale. Just to get feedback.

C: Cindy Weber suggested bring Scenario 6 as it would be using all the area schools more effectively with the Three Bridges population shared among the three remaining schools.

C: Susan Martin expressed concern with Scenario 2 as it would put a lot of stress on the St. Jacobs P.S. site and noted that the community from Three Bridges P.S. is very different from the community that attends St. Jacobs currently and that may be stressful for the students coming in, noting the rural/urban divide.

C: Krista Edwards commented that rural kids are changing; rural kids are not necessarily Mennonite kids. She also noted that in most of the scenarios discussed so far, Linwood P.S. has not seen any benefits of increased enrolment and commented that she is not sure why Linwood P.S. was included in this process if it will be unchanged. That was why she developed Scenario 6 to add more enrolment to Linwood (projection area G).

C: Cindy Weber commented that from her understanding of the school communities, the Three Bridges P.S. population would be more comfortable with at Linwood or Floradale than with St. Jacobs P.S.

C: John Krupicz commented that if they would be more comfortable at Linwood or Floradale as opposed to St. Jacobs than he would not consider that a rural/urban divide but rather more of a cultural divide.

Q: John Krupicz asked if the 19 students in projection area G which would be redirected to Linwood P.S. under Scenario 6, are arguably culturally different as they currently attend St. Jacobs and Three Bridges.

R: Ms. Manske responded that in projection area J there are currently 8 students attending St. Jacobs and 20 attending Three Bridges; in area G there are 9 attending St. Jacobs and 19 attending Three Bridges.

C: John Krupicz commented that he would like to have Scenario 2 presented at the public meeting for the purpose of eliciting discussion. He noted that one of his challenges as a parent representative is how to engage those families that may be affected. I need that feedback so I will know how to represent families based on their feedback.

Q: Elmer Horst referring to Scenario 1 which would keep Three Bridge P.S. open but with a defined boundary and asked if Three Bridges would be able to handle the additional students it would receive or would the school require an addition to accommodate them.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that Scenario 1 would likely require at least a Full Day Kindergarten addition to be able to offer the equitable programs for those students that would be redirected from St. Jacobs P.S.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that with Scenario 1, while it keeps Three Bridges P.S. open, it will greatly change the character and population of Three Bridges P.S. Will the Three Bridges community be comfortable with that? That is an issue to be debated for all the scenarios being discussed.

The ARC agreed to take the following 2 remaining scenarios to Public Meeting #2:

- Scenario 2
- Scenario 6

The ARC agreed to present the following 4 scenarios at Public Meeting #2:

- [Status Quo](#)
- [Scenario 1](#)
- [Scenario 2](#)
- [Scenario 6](#)

Mr. Hercanuck noted that these scenarios would be presented as variations of what the ARC has been looking at and it will be noted that these scenarios are not final and may change based on feedback.

Q: Cindy Weber asked if Status Quo is presented as a reference to the current situation; and not as an option.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that Status Quo is a good reference but all options are still on the table and as such Status Quo is still an option at this point but then you would have to ask why we are doing the review. Primarily it will be used as a reference but if we had a real good reason to stay with Status Quo I cannot say we would say no to it. We have never had a review that resulted in Status Quo.

Q: Keith Trask asked if the 10 year facility condition index would be a driving factor why we would not be able to accept Status Quo.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that while it is a factor he would not say it is the driving factor; we have the other issues as well such as: declining enrolment, small school organizations, facility condition and surplus capacity. We want to make efficient use of the resources we have.

C: John Krupicz commented that in light of the new development information for St. Jacobs, the issue of declining enrolments now seems to only affect Floradale P.S.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that we do have new information which indicates a slight projected enrolment increase for St. Jacobs P.S.

**Action Item:**

Mr. Hercanuck asked if the ARC would be okay if he made a modification to Scenario 6 adding the Steffler Road / Hemlock Hill Drive area to projection area J so that the entire road will attend the same school (taking the purple all the way across). The ARC agreed.

**4. Additional Requested Information:**

**Facility Condition Assessment – 10 year maintenance needs for review area schools**

School	OTG	Cost to build new	5 year Renewal Needs	10 year Renewal Needs	Facility Condition Index (FCI)
Floradale	322	\$6,732,321	\$ 0	\$ 726,000	0.00
Linwood	510	\$9,648,541	\$2,383,000	\$3,164,000	0.25
St. Jacobs	348	\$7,117,351	\$1,812,000	\$2,114,000	0.25
Three Bridges	92	\$2,358,798	\$ 508,000	\$ 542,000	0.22

- Facility Condition Index (FCI) = Renewal Needs/Cost to build new
- Previous Ministry of Education Prohibitive to Repair (PTR) funding threshold FCI = 0.65

Referring to Slide 8 of the online presentation, Mr. Hercanuck noted that the projected 10 year maintenance needs (year 2022) for the review area are as follows:

Floradale P.S.

An increase from 0 to \$726,000 driven primarily by maintenance of sports fields and interior finishes of the school.

Linwood P.S.

An increase of approximately \$800,000 mostly due to HVAC heating and air conditioning maintenance

St. Jacobs P.S.

An increase of approximately \$300,000 for mostly stormwater and lighting maintenance

Three Bridges P.S.

An increase of approximately \$35,000 for roofing maintenance

Mr. Hercanuck reminded the ARC that these maintenance costs are for the theoretical useful life of major component for maintaining the schools as they exist now and do not include any costs required for upgrades.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that over the past few meetings the ARC has been discussing St. Jacobs Public School, its site, accessibility, Full Day Kindergarten (FDK) addition, library and gym and their benchmarks and questions were raised about how we might address these issues and how looking at all these things together would it make sense to rebuild St. Jacobs on or off its site. He noted that the Facility Services staff is here tonight to answer some of these questions and explain how the Board prioritizes school maintenance issues as well as to discuss the challenges of rebuilding a school on its current site.

Q: John Krupicz asked why a new school would have twice the cost of renewal maintenance in years 5-10 compared to other older, comparable sized schools.

- R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that older schools may have had more recent replacement of some major components and the costs would depend on where the schools are currently with major component lifecycles. He noted that Floradale P.S. is starting at year zero whereas the other schools have had additions at various times and multiple different building components and some of those have been replaced with the Board's ongoing maintenance of facilities.
- C: Ms. Manske noted that \$500,000 of the cost for Floradale P.S. is for site work and maintenance of its sports fields.
- Q: Steve Snyder asked if the information is available for the ten years previous to see what work has been done and the money spent on the review area schools.
- R: Ian Gaudet, Controller of Facility Services, advised the ARC to keep in mind that the projected 5 and 10 year renewal costs are theoretical and are based on lifecycle and ideal conditions. He also noted the importance to keep in mind that although we are projecting in 10 years we would need to spend \$6 million in the review area schools; in actuality we are not budgeted to that amount; but in theory that is the amount needed to keep the schools in a no deficiencies condition. He noted that the Board is not funded to that amount by the Ministry of Education; and in fact funded much less. He noted that to apply this backwards, we would actually only fund capital at those sites at a significantly reduced value because the Ministry does not fund us to the full level which is one of the reasons we are doing this ARC process right now and why facility condition is one of the factors in the Accommodation Review process.
- Q: John Krupicz commented that he is aware that these projected costs are not the entire costs for maintenance for the review area schools; there are a lot of other costs associated that are not covered here and those costs may or may not be covered by the Board's maintenance budget. He asked how the projected costs are representative of the actual total maintenance costs.
- R: Mr. Gaudet responded that Mr. Krupicz is correct that there are other maintenance costs that are not included in the total renewal maintenance costs. He advised that some of the questions are difficult to answer because there are also operating costs that are outside the maintenance budget. He noted that if a boiler were to fail during the winter that expense could come out of our operating budget and not our capital budget depending on the dollar value on the repair needed. He noted that there is a lot of minor maintenance that would not be captured in this forecast as theoretical lifecycle. He noted that if there was a rip in a classroom carpet, this would be covered under the operational budget, however if the lifecycle was up all at once through the entire school that would be a significant investment which would come out of the capital budget.
- C: John Krupicz commented that he would assume that the operational maintenance costs for the new Floradale P.S. would be considerably lower than the three other area schools and the 5 and 10 year renewal costs are not a true reflection of the Board's overall maintenance costs for these facilities.
- R: Mr. Gaudet confirmed that Mr. Krupicz's assumption to be correct.

- C: Mr. Hercanuck commented that the projected costs are to maintain the facility as it is currently and do not include FDK renovations or changes for any other needs at the school.
- C: Mr. Gaudet advised that the accessibility component is also an area that facility services are looking at capturing. He noted that for the schools that do not have an elevator, the cost of renewing an elevator would not be included in the assessments: the renewal costs do not contemplate an improvement that does not exist.
- Q: Wayne Dunham asked if the Board has an internal process that tracks the lifecycles of facility components and triggers the replacement of components once the lifecycle has been met; or does a concern have to be expressed?
- R: Mr. Gaudet responded that the Facility Services' organization structure was reorganized and went from a structure that did plan maintenance based on age of components and replace them in priority order as assessed by the Facilities team. This process did not please the users at the site who might feel that there are other areas in the school that are a bigger priority to be replaced. Facility Services as changed to be more customer service focused by working with the school principals to determine the top five maintenance needs for each facility with Facility services staff helping to point out some items that may not be noticeable to administration. Facility Services also maintains a routine work order and preventative maintenance processes that look after maintenance issues that occur at school facilities. He noted that the current process it not that a component has reached its lifecycle and now it needs to be replaced but takes into account what the facility priorities at the school are and where it where it is located in the school's top five issues list.
- Q: Mr. Hercanuck noted that at the last meeting the ARC had questions about the Full Day Kindergarten addition for St. Jacobs P.S. and the combined issues of the undersized gym and library and the schools requirements for accessibility and asked Mr. Gaudet to speak to the ARC about the Board's process for determining that a school's need requires the facility to be rebuilt and how these larger projects (to reconstruct a gym, library etc.) get identified and prioritized by the Board.
- R: Mr. Gaudet responded that the Board has internal accommodation committees: Elementary Accommodation Committee (EAC), Secondary Accommodation Committee (SAC) and an overall Accommodation Steering Committee (ASC). The ASC systematically reviews the Board's risks and exposures; for example, the Ministry of Labour, as part of a Province-wide review of secondary schools (occurring as a direct result of a student fatality at an Ottawa school last year) is actively inspecting the Board's secondary schools. When we look at system risks the ASC considers the economic climate, system pressures, and the direction the Board's strategic direction and where we would like to invest money to position ourselves well for the upcoming year. The ASC sets the tone to as to what some of the expectations might be for facility projects. The membership of the ASC sits on the EAC and SAC and imparts high level and strategic knowledge into each of these committees as a representation of the Board.

Because the ARC undergoing an Elementary Accommodation Review, Mr. Gaudet chose to speak about the EAC whose membership is made up of 4 Principals, 1 from each area aligned with the 4 Superintendents of Education, Facility Services Managers for each



area, Planning Staff, Finance Staff, Learning Services, ITS – Library Services and Communication Services staff. The EAC receives requests for projects that require a significant investment and are program related. The EAC does not suggest items like a new roof which would be something Facility Services would help prioritize based on engineering reports and condition surveys; but if there is a library or gymnasium that maybe subpar and does not meet the needs of the users and there is not anything that can be done as a school organization to upgrade it or nothing that can be done from an operating maintenance perspective to make improvements and would require an addition or significant renovation then it would be brought forward to the EAC and would go through a vetting process to ensure that the principal agrees that it would work with the organization of the school and it goes through the area representative to make sure that it fits with the what the Board is doing at other facilities. Each project is discussed and given priority ranking within the other projects the Board is trying to achieve (examples include: sight-lines and security from the main offices, libraries, gymnasiums, music rooms and change rooms). While there is a wide range in projects, they needs are all filtered from a program perspective that is site based and site specific.

Q: John Krupicz asked who would bring the program needs to the EAC?

R: Mr. Gaudet responded that the needs would usually originate at the site and might be identified by the principal, teaching staff that would have a recommendation come forward that would be vetted at the site and would be brought forward to the EAC by a principal representative for the area family of schools. The EAC which includes approximately 20 members would then discuss the merits of the proposal and then if would either be approved, we may ask for more information or it may be rejected if it does not meet our system standards.

Q: John Krupicz asked if there are any projects in the works for any of the 4 review area schools.

R: Mr. Gaudet responded that there have not been any requests brought forward through the EAC about the library or gymnasiums issues or any other significant program concerns at the sites. He noted that because they have not been brought forward to the EAC it means that while they might not be the ideal, they are being dealt with effectively at the site and it has not become an organizational problem.

Q: Does that mean they are not complaining?

R: Mr. Gaudet responded that Facility Services staff actively solicits information and our families of schools superintendents are very involved. The Board also has a very active library resource group. In terms of issues in the system, St. Jacobs P.S. for example, does not rise to the top in terms of issues at the site.

R: Mr. Gaudet noted that when projects are brought forward to the EAC and SAC the Board has a capital budget allocated each year for program enhancements. If we get a lot of requests in the \$50,000 - \$100,000 range the committee can generally handle those, approve them and move them forward; but for projects in the \$500,000 range, the committee would only be able to complete a few projects a year. These higher costing projects may get approved in theory but because we do not have the capital funding to make those projects a reality it would instead be brought to our Capital Plan Working

Group which looks at some of the pressure points within the system and the higher cost projects that will require a business case to the Ministry of Education for funding, and determine how the project ranks against the competing priorities at the other 119 schools in our system. There is a good clean process that gets well vetted internally from a program perspective and if it cannot be dealt with at one level it does escalate and fall to a greater list which is a higher dollar value and requires Ministry approval.

- C: Mr. Hercanuck noted that once a project is approved it does not mean it is approved for funding it means we agree that it is a good idea that is in line with our system goals but it may not be the highest priority. We may keep the project on the list and it may sit there for some time before the money becomes available, it may get pushed to the next year. Also, if for example the school is in line to receive an addition for a special program like Full Day Kindergarten, the projects can be bundled, that may bump the other project up the list if it could achieve cost efficiencies.
- Q: Mr. Hercanuck noted that while we do not have all the information available to determine if a new school would be an option; at the last meeting the ARC inquired if would be better to build a whole new school for St. Jacobs as opposed to doing additions. He reminded the ARC that St. Jacobs P.S. sits on a tight site and a rebuild would take place on the field while the existing school is in operation; once the new school is completed, the existing school would be demolished.

Mr. Hercanuck introduced Mel Lavoie, Facility Services Project Coordinator who can answer questions about the challenges and opportunities of rebuilding an existing school on site. Mr. Lavoie served as project coordinator on the Floradale P.S. and Grand View P.S. rebuilds which were schools that were reconstructed on site while the existing schools were operating.

- R: Mr. Lavoie commented that the site rebuilds he has done so far have been a positive experience; the site would require construction fencing to separate the usable school space from the construction areas. He noted that construction is quite noisy and may be an issue depending on the proximity to the existing school. He noted that the students are generally really excited to be getting a new school and do not mind the noise.
- C: Ron Dallan commented that the rebuild process takes a full year from the time the ground is broken until you can move into the new school.
- Q: Paul Milne commented that both the instances spoken of would be building an entirely separate facility; and asked if there is a precedent for making upgrades to the existing facility to rebuild a portion of the building (i.e., new library or gymnasium) while the students are still in the building and what those challenges might be.
- C: John Krupicz commented that the 1929 portion of the building provide the largest challenges for St. Jacobs P.S. in terms of accessibility, library and gym spaces. He also noted that if a rebuild were to occur on the field it would result in the new field area being at the higher elevated portion of the site, which would not be ideal from a teacher supervision point of view.
- R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that the Board has had success with building school into a hill and having a “walk-out basement” to make both fields accessible/useable.

- R: Mr. Dallan commented that these schools allow us to use both the upper and lower fields on elevated school sites and noted that the new Grand View P.S. in Cambridge is a good example of this type of site design as is the new Moffat Creek P.S. also in Cambridge.
- R: Mel Lavoie responded that Wilson Avenue P.S. had an addition to its facility while the school was still in operation, which turned out quite well and it looks like a new school. He noted that it is difficult to make existing individual rooms larger; but we have been successful with partial rebuilds to the existing school. He noted that a recent partial rebuild at Sandowne P.S. required construction to take place further inside the existing building than done at schools previously; the project was a great success with a lot of positive feedback from parents and staff.
- Q: Paul Milne asked what would be the accommodation requirements for partial rebuild construction; does it require all the students to be housed in portables?
- R: Mr. Lavoie responded that the majority of construction takes place in the summer months but sometimes (as was the case at Wilson Avenue P.S.) the students are housed in portables until the construction is complete. Renovations to the interior of the existing building require a lot of planning due to inspection and safety requirements.
- C: Dennis Cuomo commented that in regard to the 1929 original St. Jacobs P.S. building, there may be some potential historical challenges involved in doing renovations or reconstruction. Though an historical designation does not necessarily mean a building cannot be torn down it would require going through a significant number of hoops.
- Q: John Krupicz asked if Three Bridges P.S. could also be considered for historical designation.
- R: Mr. Cuomo responded that would only be true if we were to consider taking down the existing structure or add to it; the Board would have to work within the parameters that we are given.
- Q: Elmer Horst asked if the Board considers the cost of building a new school and how it would be compared to the cost of doing the accessibility and additions required for St. Jacobs P.S., keeping in mind that it is expected to grow in the future to determine what would be most cost efficient for the Board. He noted his concern that the Board is using a 'Band-Aid' it may be a waste of tax money to continue doing additions when it might be more cost efficient to build a brand new school. He asked how long the FDK addition would be sufficient and another addition would be needed to house additional students.
- R: Mr. Lavoie responded that in the case of Grand View P.S. the old building had a great number of challenges with the different elevations and cost of maintenance that were in the area of fifty percent of the cost of a new building and even though you put all that money into fixing up the old school you still have an old school.
- R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that if the Board were to build St. Jacobs P.S. new as a 348 pupil place school (before Full Day Kindergarten, FDK), the expected Ministry cost would be \$7.1 million just for a new building on the current site. Two FDK classrooms would be funded at \$900,000. It would cost \$8 million to rebuild St. Jacobs P.S. with FDK included.

- Q: Elmer Horst asked if the cost of renovations to St. Jacobs P.S. is available.
- R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that it would depend on the renovations that the school needs, we have talked about the concerns with the gym and library spaces, we cannot be sure that these are the most pressing needs in the Board.
- C: Mr. Hercanuck and Mr. Cuomo had a discussion with the Planner for the Township of Woolwich over the March break about the future growth potential for the area and were told that any future growth would be in the Hawkesville Road Policy Area (25 hectares) but that is a long way off, twenty to thirty years before there would be any development in that area. Going forward the projected growth area for St. Jacobs that we can consider is the Valley View development and a few infill projects and that is all the growth projected for St. Jacobs in the next 20-30 years. The Board would expect a yield of approximately 50 students out of this 150 residential unit area based on the number of units and the Board's historical yield percentage of .3 students per unit. These numbers are phased-in to the enrolment projections beginning in 2014 and that is all we can realistically plan for growth for St. Jacobs.
- Q: Steve Snyder asked if the playground at St. Jacobs P.S. is adequate.
- R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that at 4.5 acre site is on the small side for a school the size of St. Jacobs P.S. and asked Mr. Milne whether there are significant issues with the playground.
- R: Paul Milne responded that because the school has a small tarmac area; they do have experiences with lack of space when the fields cannot be used because of wetness. The children do run into one another when they are restricted to the tarmac area. The tarmac area cannot be easily extended because of the hill. The field itself feels adequate though he is not sure how it compares to other fields within the Board.
- C: Ms. Manske noted that the spring field wetness issues are likely a concern at most schools.
- C: Wayne Dunham commented that Three Bridges P.S. also as a similar concern with a small tarmac area and keeping the students off the fields in the spring.
- Q: Steve Snyder asked if there is a certain size of tarmac or field required depending on the number of students at a facility.
- R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that when the Board purchases new sites for schools we are able to tell the developer how we want our site; for 650 students the Board likes a site size of 7 acres; we may try to locate the site next to a municipal park to allow for extra room for the students to spill over onto the parkland.

Review area school site sizes:

- St. Jacobs P.S. - 4.65 acres
- Linwood P.S.'s – 11.17 acres
- Floradale P.S.'s - 9.84 acres
- Three Bridges P.S. 2.84 acres

C: Paul Milne commented that St. Jacobs P.S. cannot have two soccer teams (boys and girls) practice at the same time because the school only has one field; whereas most other schools would have a larger field or two smaller fields and would not have the same issue.

R: Mr. Hercanuck commented that the layout of the site at St. Jacobs P.S. may not be as efficient as other sites and the field may be constrained as a result.

Q: Keith Trask asked if the gym and library assessments have been done on the existing situation and not on the projected enrolments with Full Day Kindergarten and the expected new development; should the ARC go back and redo the scenarios numbers based on the ranking on the library and gym based on those projections.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that for the gym benchmark it would change because it is based on the OTG capacity. If we are adding students or adding capacity we should revise. As we have discussed previously, there is a rough guideline at the Board for building new schools, the threshold for a double gym is 400-450 students, but that is for a new school. The same pressures would exist at an older school but there may be additional challenges to achieving those benchmarks. That is not to say that a school will get a double gym when it reaches the benchmark, but that would be the point where it would be considered.

The factors that went into the library ranking in 2006 have been anecdotally updated since then; the assessment factors did not have an enrolment component.

C: John Krupicz commented that the library assessment for St. Jacobs P.S. determined that the library was small for the population and if we add more students this would make it even smaller.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that in terms of the changing this ranking, these scores are not based entirely on an enrolment component for the library assessment whereas the gym ranking was on a capacity basis. The increased enrolment expected for St. Jacobs P.S. would put more strain on the already small library there; to have the library ranking redone would require going back to speak with the library consultant but it would be a valid point for gym size.

Q: Keith Trask commented that even with the addition of the FDK classrooms there still would not be enough space to house the expected higher enrolment.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that this would assume that the entire population of Three Bridges P.S. would be retained when directed to St. Jacobs P.S., and this may or may not happen depending on the accommodation options which will need to be discussed after Public Meeting #2.

Q: Keith Trask asked if the ARC were to recommend Scenario 2 has the Board looked at St. Jacobs' site enough to be able to know whether construction to accommodate Scenario 2 would be feasible; a renovation or rebuild on the existing site based on the projected population of approximately 150 more students than attend there today.

- R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that the scenarios have not been fully refined and have not been looked at to that level of detail which would require a lot of work on the part of the Facility Services staff. We will need to narrow down our scenarios before we would ask for this information but it will be provided for the scenario(s) we decide to recommend. That information will be included in the evaluation information we need to make a scenario work.
- C: Mr. Milne commented that if we were to consider the 2020 projected enrolment numbers for St. Jacobs P.S. the enrolment of 450 students would require the use of portables which would have to be located on the field.
- R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that when the ARC has a set of preferred scenarios, Facility Services staff will look at the feasibility and cost of construction and what we have to do accommodate those students.

**Rural Education Strategy:**

Mr. Hercanuck noted that some of the ARC members may be aware and/or have been involved with the Board's Rural Education Strategy process being conducted by Mr. Phil Sauder. There have been some discussions at the senior administration level at the Board about the Rural Education Strategy which is a program that the Board is currently working on. The Board has had had some discussions with the community in Woolwich and Wellesley that historically has not been involved with public education provided by the Waterloo Region District School Board. The Strategy is primarily focused on meeting the alternative learning needs of secondary aged (14+) youth, not currently enrolled or projected to be enrolled in the review area schools. The Rural Education Strategy would offer credit and non-credit courses similar to the Supervised Alternative Learning (SAL) program and is also looking at some adult education programs offerings tailored to the needs of this community. Board representative Phil Sauder has had some discussion with the Three Bridges Community about such programs as Fall Arrest, Chain Saw Safety, Construction, Safe Food Handling and Basic Accounting.

- C: Susan Marchiori commented that Linwood P.S. has also had some discussions with Mr. Sauder about the Rural Education Strategy, but she has not been personally involved. She noted that Linwood P.S. is a community use school and it is being well used in the evenings; on Tuesdays a Low German Group, who has just received a Trillium Grant, attends for adult education.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that the Rural Education Strategy is targeted at the 14 plus age group and is not tied to any particular facility and may consider the use of a satellite model, whether it be an existing school or community centre and programs may be offered outside of traditional school hours if that is what best meets the needs of the community.

Mr. Hercanuck advised that the reason he is bringing the Rural Education Strategy information to the ARC is because there was concern from senior administration that people would confuse the Rural Education Strategy with the work we are doing on the ARC, which is focused on specific schools offering the elementary program; we want to make a clear distinction between the two processes which are being conducted separately and independent of each other. The processes will be discussed at the upcoming Public Meeting #2 to address that the Board's Rural Education Strategy program is not dependent on any particular facility.

- C: Wayne Dunham commented that Phil Sauder is looking at how to engage rural kids that are leaving school at the age of 14; going out and asking how we can engage you; what types of programs these kids would need to further their education and help them in their lives.
- C: Susan Marchiori commented that Mr. Sauder is also working with the Low German community to help them see the importance of education beyond age 14 for the life they lead. She noted that a really exciting result of that has been that one of Linwood's Grade 8 students is part of the Minister of Education's advisory group and two weeks ago she hosted a dinner at the community centre to speak about the importance of education, and over one hundred people were there to hear her.
- C: Elmer Horst commented that the biggest challenge to the Rural Education Strategy is to convince the parents that the education is necessary.

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

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

Wednesday, April 4, 2012 from 7:30-9:00 p.m. @ Elmira District Secondary School.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that at the Public meeting he will go over the Accommodation Review Process; explaining what it is and why it is being conducted; go through the issues, draft objectives, scenarios and where we are in the process. Go through the scenarios and ask for feedback on the draft objectives and the scenarios that we have so far.

Mr. Hercanuck advised the ARC that it will not likely be able to wrap up its work in this school year; it will probably extend into the next school year because of the minimum timelines specified by the Ministry of Education.

Ms. Manske commented that once the ARC gets its report and recommendation to the Board that will be the end of the process for the ARC members and the committee can disband; if the ARC can submit its report before the end of June, the ARC will not have to meet again.

Q: Keith Trask asked how many scenarios ARC usually recommend to the Board.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that in the past, ARCs have recommended one scenario with implementation pieces explaining how everything would take place; we have also had an ARC recommend a preferred scenario but should the Board find that unacceptable also provided a backup scenario; and we had an ARC present two scenarios equally for the Board to choose from.

C: John Krupicz asked to add an action item; noting concern regarding number of students on the St. Jacobs site, asked Mr. Hercanuck to provide any Board statics on site size versus enrolment for use with scenario consideration on how other schools with similar circumstances deal. He noted that if having 450 students on a 4.5 acre site does not work well; he would like to know how this has been dealt with in the past; so we have some context for that discussion.

### **Action Item:**

**Mr. Hercanuck to bring in comparators of other schools showing site size versus enrolment to use as comparison for St. Jacobs P.S. with larger enrolment.**

- Q: Cindy Weber asked at what point we will be engaging the Three Bridges Community to ask their feedback. Noting that the feedback would be really useful to the committee to having for working with the scenarios going forward as it could have a very significant impact on what we are doing.
- R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that he would like to wait until after Public Meeting #2 giving them some time to consider the scenarios we are looking at and how it will affect them. He asked the Three Bridges Representatives if it would be appropriate to meet with the Three Bridges community at the school after the public meeting.
- R: The Three Bridges Representatives agreed that after the public meeting would be best to give the community some time to digest the scenarios presented at the public meeting. They felt that the Three Bridges Coffee Hour would be an appropriate venue for this discussion.
- R: Mr. Hercanuck noted that this discussion may also need to involve Learning Services staff to help us determine (in the event of closing Three Bridges P.S.) what we can do at the other sites to help accommodate this community in what is possible in a curriculum direction to best meet the needs of those students. He noted that it might be a longer process to have that separate sub-discussion therefore the next ARC meeting could be scheduled a little further out to allow time for this consultation period.

**Action Items:**

- **Mr. Hercanuck and Mr. Dunham to arrange a meeting with the Three Bridges Community to discuss accommodation options should Three Bridges P.S. be closed.**
- **Mr. Hercanuck to discuss outcome of consultation with Learning Services staff to determine curriculum accommodation options.**

**ARC Meetings:**

Tentative ARC Meeting #12 – Wed., April 18, 2012 from 6:30-8:00 pm at Floradale P.S.

Mr. Hercanuck thanked the Facility Services staff and the ARC members for attending and adjourned the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

---

**FUTURE MEETING DATES:**

**PUBLIC MEETINGS:**

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

**ARC MEETINGS:**

*Tentative* - ARC Meeting #12: April 18, 2012, 6:30-8:00 p.m. @Floradale P.S., Library