



ELMIRA BOUNDARY STUDY
Minutes of Working Group Meeting #5
June 4, 2013
From 1:00 pm – 2:30 pm
Riverside Public School

The fifth Meeting of the Elmira Boundary Study Working Group, involving [John Mahood](#), [Park Manor](#) and [Riverside](#) Public Schools, was held at Riverside Public School on Tuesday, June 4, 2013.

Attendees:

Brent Hatcher, Principal, Riverside PS, James Bond, Principal, Park Manor PS, R. Playford, Parent Representative, Riverside PS, Tracey Williams, Parent Representative, Riverside PS, Sabrina Windatt, Parent Representative, Park Manor PS, D. Sinclair, Parent Representative, John Mahood PS, Liz Robinson, Parent Representative, John Mahood PS, Lauren Manske, Senior Planner, Nathan Hercanuck, Senior Planner, and Andrea Kean, Recording Secretary.

Regrets:

Dennis Cuomo, Manager of Planning WRDSB, Tracy Tait, Principal, John Mahood PS, John Scarfone, Manager of Planning, Township of Woolwich, Becky Ribble, Parent Representative, Park Manor PS, Ron Dallan, Manager of Capital Projects and Diane DeCoene, Area Superintendent of Education.

1. Welcome/Introductions

Nathan Hercanuck, Senior Planner, welcomed members of the Working Group, and Board staff present at 1:05 PM.

Mr. Hercanuck led the group through the presentation (available online at <http://www.wrdsb.ca/planning/boundary-studies/elmira-boundary-study>)

2. Draft Minutes Review

Mr. Hercanuck asked members if there were any errors or omissions in the draft minutes from **Working Group Meeting #4 (May 21, 2013)**. No errors or omissions were reported.

Minutes approved without change.

Moved by: S. Windatt Seconded by: R. Playford

Mr. Hercanuck advised that the minutes will be posted on the Board's website at: <http://www.wrdsb.ca/planning/boundary-studies/elmira-boundary-study>

3. Draft Objectives:

Draft Objectives

- *To determine the size and program configuration of the replacement Riverside PS, having regard for [Board Policy 3002: Elementary School Size and Configuration](#).*
- *To develop a transitional accommodation plan for elementary school enrolment in the Town of Elmira while awaiting the completion of the replacement Riverside PS.*

- *To establish boundaries that are long-term (approx. 10 years) that consider:*
 - *Walking distances (community/neighbourhood-level schools)*
 - *Efficiency of transportation*
 - *Capacity of schools*
 - *Current and future population density and demographics*
 - *Proximity to other schools*
 - *Impact on feeder and surrounding schools*
- *To minimize the impact on students where changes are proposed (consideration for grandparenting, phasing, transitions, etc.)*

4. Requested Information:

a. Township response to pedestrian infrastructure

Mr. Hercanuck advised that he had contacted Mr. Scarfone; Manager of Planning for Woolwich Township to inquire as to if there is any requirement for the Lunor Subdivision Developers to provide traffic lights and/or pedestrian infrastructure. Mr. Scarfone put him in touch with Mr. Randy Miller at the Township; Mr. Miller was not aware of any specific signalized intersections but it is a Regional Road and the Region is looking at reconstructing the road in the next few years and suggested that Mr. Hercanuck contact the project manager at the Region. Mr. Hercanuck has contacted the Region and is waiting to get a response and will share with the Working Group once received.

b. Chart with Pros, Cons for JK-6, JK-8 and 7-8 schools

Mr. Hercanuck advised that the Board, while maintaining current senior elementary schools, is no longer building any new senior elementary schools and builds new schools as either JK-8 or JK-6 facilities.

Ms. Manske, referring to the chart on slide 6 of the online presentation, noted that the information provided was collated from reports prepared by Senior Board Administration as well as from the Elementary Principals' Association. While there are pros and cons to each school model; current academic research related to the models suggests that JK-8 schools (with fewer transitions for students) are better for student achievement.

The Senior Elementary (7-8) schools were popular pre 1980s and were developed around the social development aspect which, according to current research, does not necessarily translate into academic achievement.

Ms. Manske noted that a one-size-fits-all school model does not exist and the Board is more focused on academic achievement and success and perhaps less focused on the social aspect and noted that there is certainly a place for both models as students can benefit from either model depending on where they are emotionally and academically, which may be the reason the Board has not given strong support to just one particular model.

Q: Liz Robinson asked if there have been any new schools built JK-6.

R: Yes. Ms. Manske noted that the JK-6 school is typically paired with a sister JK-8 school to attend the 7-8 program there; having the larger cohort of 7-8 students still allows for the specialized 7-8 aspects (rotary and specialized staff) to be achieved.

- Q: Liz Robinson asked if there have been any new JK-6 schools built feeding to a 7-8; noting that the Working Group should be considering solutions that the Board is more likely to accept.
- R: Yes. Ms. Manske noted that J.W. Gerth PS (built 2008) in Kitchener is a JK-6 which feeds to Doon PS for grades 7-8.
- C: Mr. Hercanuck noted that the continued operation of a senior elementary school can come down to how much the community values and wants to maintain the program; he advised that J.W. Gerth PS will be going through another boundary study because the Board is building a new school in the area, noting that JK-8 will certainly be part of that discussion as well.
- Q: Principal Hatcher asked if the current age and condition of Park Manor PS would influence the decision to maintain the school as a senior elementary and should that impact our decision on whether the new Riverside PS should be a JK-8.
- R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that as with the current Riverside PS (where we have determined that we do not want to spend more money on that facility) it would be a good idea to look at the other boundary study area schools as well. He noted that John Mahood PS has already been looked at for the Full Day Kindergarten (FDK) addition. When the Board does large construction projects we like to determine what other work needs to be done at the school so we can bundle the work together in the same contract to get a better price.

The Board does have metrics on each school which quantifies what work needs to be done and when we receive funding from the Ministry for special projects (like FDK) we can move other work needed at a school up the priority list and bundle with the current construction project. Mr. Hercanuck advised that through his participation on the Elementary Accommodation Committee (EAC) he is not aware of any serious deficiencies or structure concerns at Park Manor PS and noted that we will certainly consider any other work needed at the schools when putting together a budget for the recommended scenario.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that the Pros and Cons (as listed on the chart in the presentation) for each school model could be considered opposites for some depending on individual points of view.

- C: S. Windatt commented that some may prefer the JK-8 model because it allows siblings to be at the same school longer; however some may not like JK-8 schools because of the larger number of students at one school (super school).
- R: Mr. Hercanuck noted that the Board generally does not build 300 pupil place schools anymore; we like to build 450-650 pupil place schools.
- C: Ms. Manske advised that new greenfield development areas, within walking distance to where the Board is building new schools have densities that warrant these larger schools. The required residential densities are that much greater today than they were in the past according to current planning policies.
- C: Mr. Hercanuck noted that these new residential densities are in place in Elmira and will have to meet the same requirements as new development areas in other part of the Region and advised that the community will likely be concerned about what sort of development will take place at the current Riverside PS site once it is declared surplus to the Board, noting that even this property will be subject to the increased density requirements if it is to be redeveloped as residential.

5. Draft Scenarios:

Mr. Hercanuck reviewed the status of current draft scenarios being considered (see chart on slide 7 of the online presentation) and noted that at the last meeting the Working Group had decided to discard Scenarios 3 and 5 from further consideration.

The following Scenarios are still under consideration: Scenarios 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7 (former Status Quo).

New Scenarios: 8 and 9 are included today for consideration.

All Scenarios were forwarded to the Working Group for review prior to today's meeting and the Working Group were asked to come to the meeting with an idea of which 3 scenarios should be presented at Public Meeting #1 on June 11th.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that Scenario Status Quo and its associated projections have been revised to now include the new Riverside PS rebuild as Scenario 7.

Scenario Status Quo (slides 8 and 9 of the online presentation)

- Boundaries and organizations remain the same (JK-5, 6-8)
- New development in the north end (Lunor subdivision) places further enrolment pressure on Riverside PS and Park Manor PS.
- Development in south end (Birdland) increases enrolment at John Mahood PS and Park Manor PS.

Status Quo is not an option for consideration; it is being presented to illustrate why the new Riverside PS is needed.

a. New Scenarios:

i. Scenario 8 (slides 25-27 of the online presentation)

Mr. Hercanuck advised that (as requested at the last meeting) he put together Scenario 8 by revising Scenario 4 to substitute *area C* with *area N*; will be discussed in detail later in the meeting.

ii. Scenario 9 (slides 28-30 of the online presentation)

Mr. Hercanuck advised that (as requested at the last meeting) he put together Scenario 9 by revising Scenario 6 by better adjusting boundaries between the schools (to take *area G1* to Park Manor PS and maybe and some of *areas E* and *D*); discussed in detail later in the meeting.

b. Scenario 7:

Scenario 7 (slides 22-23 of the online presentation)

Mr. Hercanuck advised that Scenario Status Quo was revised to Scenario 7 as requested at the last meeting and will be discussed in detail later in the meeting.

6. Scenario/Objective Comparison:

Mr. Hercanuck advised that he had put together comments related to the objectives and how each scenario may have challenges or opportunities with respect to meeting the draft objectives; the Working Group are welcome to add their thoughts on these comments.

Scenario 1 (slides 10 - 12 of the online presentation)

- Boundaries remain the same.
- School organizations change to JK-6 and 7-8.
- New Riverside PS constructed in Lunor subdivision.
- Development in south end (Birdland) and addition of Gr. 6 increases enrolment at John Mahood PS.
- Removal of Gr. 6 at Park Manor PS reduces enrolment at facility, better matching its capacity.

Scenario 1 – Objective Comparison	
Objective	Comments
To determine the size and program configuration of the replacement Riverside PS, having regard for Board Policy 3002: Elementary School Size and Configuration	New Riverside PS constructed as JK-6 for approx. 550 students. John Mahood PS reaches similar size. JK-6, 7-8 in line with Policy 3002. All schools meet recommended number of classes per grade.
To develop a transitional accommodation plan for elementary school enrolment in the Town of Elmira while awaiting the completion of the replacement Riverside PS.	To be determined
To establish boundaries that are long-term (approx. 10 years) that consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Walking distances (community/neighbourhood-level schools) o Efficiency of transportation o Capacity of schools o Current and future population density and demographics o Proximity to other schools o Impact on feeder and surrounding schools 	Reduction of enrolment at Park Manor PS due to reorganization to 7-8. Better matched to capacity (no addition/portables necessary). John Mahood PS requires 4-5 classroom addition or portables in long term to accommodate enrolment. Splits the new development areas between 2 schools (prevents spikes in primary numbers at one school) Transportation – slight decrease in transportation as Grade 6s are spread across 2 sites.
To minimize the impact on students where changes are proposed (consideration for grandparenting, phasing, transitions, etc.)	To be determined

Discussion Scenario 1:

- C: R. Playford noted that Scenario 1 is less disruptive to the community and needs to be presented as an option at Public Meeting #1; it does not require any boundary changes and with the only change being that Grade 6 students would remain at their home school and Park Manor PS would offer the 7-8 program, which parents will likely see as a positive.
- Q: S. Windatt asked if John Mahood PS would be unviable in 2023 with a population of 514.
- R: No; Mr. Hercanuck responded that it would require an addition to accommodate the increased enrolment.
- C: Liz Robinson commented that John Mahood PS does not have a gym large enough to accommodate its current population; the Kindergarten students do not get any gym time and students currently housed in the 6 portables do not have enough break time supervision and have to eat lunch sitting on the gym floor for that reason.
- C: Principal Hatcher commented that he had administered at school with 23 portables where they rotated supervision through the portables (every two minutes a teacher would be in the portable).
- R: Liz Robinson noted that John Mahood PS does not allow the rotating of portable supervision for safety reasons.
- Q: Tracey Williams asked if the John Mahood PS site would be large enough to accommodate an addition if it is warranted.
- R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that the site is large enough and the expected numbers would support a business case to the Ministry to request the needed funding. He noted that this scenario does not require an addition to Park Manor PS.
- Q: Liz Robinson asked how the Grade 6 students would be housed at the current Riverside PS in the interim, while waiting for the new Riverside PS to open.

R: Any proposed changes would take effect when the new Riverside PS begins operation; Mr. Hercanuck noted that we may have to consider if we should keep the current Riverside PS JK-6 but change John Mahood PS to JK-6 in the interim recognizing that it will reduce the number of Grade 6s at Park Manor PS and any issues that might bring. We have a serious lack of capacity at the current Riverside PS. Mr. Hercanuck noted that will be our major discussion when the Working Group reconvenes in the Fall; along with costing and logistics of the narrowed down scenarios.

The Working Group agreed to bring Scenario 1 to Public Meeting #1.

Scenario 2 (slides 13 -15 of the online presentation)

- *Areas G, H* move from John Mahood PS to new Riverside PS.
- John Mahood PS Enrolment better matched to capacity
- School organizations change to JK-6 and 7-8.
- New Riverside PS constructed in Lunor subdivision.
- Removal of Gr. 6 at Park Manor reduces enrolment at facility, better matching its capacity

Scenario 2 – Objective Comparison	
Objective	Comments
To determine the size and program configuration of the replacement Riverside PS, having regard for Board Policy 3002: Elementary School Size and Configuration	New Riverside PS constructed as a JK-6 for approx. 650 students. John Mahood PS enrolment at 420 (> 2 classes/grade). JK-6 & 7-8 in line with Policy 3002. Park Manor PS approx. 4 classes/grade.
To develop a transitional accommodation plan for elementary school enrolment in the Town of Elmira while awaiting the completion of the replacement Riverside PS.	To be determined
To establish boundaries that are long-term (approx. 10 years) that consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Walking distances (community/neighbourhood-level schools) ○ Efficiency of transportation ○ Capacity of schools ○ Current and future population density and demographics ○ Proximity to other schools ○ Impact on feeder and surrounding schools 	<p>Reduction of enrolment at Park Manor PS due to reorganization to 7-8. Better matched to capacity (no addition/portables necessary)</p> <p>John Mahood PS requires 2-3 portables in long term to accommodate enrolment.</p> <p>Transportation – increase, students who could walk to John Mahood PS being bussed to new Riverside PS.</p>
To minimize the impact on students where changes are proposed (consideration for grandparenting, phasing, transitions, etc.)	To be determined

Discussion Scenario 2:

C: S. Windatt noted that the boundary in Scenario 2 would have students across the street from John Mahood PS attending the new Riverside PS and asked if this scenario could be removed from consideration for that reason.

The Working Group agreed to remove Scenario 2 from further consideration.

Scenario 4: (slides 16-18 of the online presentation)

- New Riverside PS constructed as JK-6 and receives *areas G1, I and N* from John Mahood PS.
- Long term transportation required for *areas I and N*).
- All new development concentrated at Riverside PS.
- John Mahood PS receives *areas C and F* from Riverside PS.
- Loss of Grade 6 reduces enrolment at Park Manor PS.

Scenario 4 – Objective Comparison	
Objective	Comments
To determine the size and program configuration of the replacement Riverside PS, having regard for Board Policy 3002: Elementary School Size and Configuration	New Riverside PS constructed as JK-6 for approx. 620 students. John Mahood PS reaches approx. 450 enrolment (>2 classes/grade). JK-6, 7-8 in line with Policy 3002. Park Manor PS approx. 4 classes/grade.
To develop a transitional accommodation plan for elementary school enrolment in the Town of Elmira while awaiting the completion of the replacement Riverside PS.	To be determined
To establish boundaries that are long-term (approx. 10 years) that consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Walking distances (community/neighbourhood-level schools) Efficiency of transportation Capacity of schools Current and future population density and demographics Proximity to other schools Impact on feeder and surrounding schools 	<p>Reduction of enrolment at Park Manor PS due to reorganization to 7-8. Better matched to capacity (no addition/portables necessary)</p> <p>John Mahood PS requires 3-4 portables in long term to accommodate enrolment.</p> <p>Transportation – increase in transportation <i>areas I and N</i> can walk to John Mahood PS but are transported to new Riverside PS. Concentrates all new residential development at new Riverside PS.</p>
To minimize the impact on students where changes are proposed (consideration for grandparenting, phasing, transitions, etc.)	To be determined

Discussion – Scenario 4:

- C: S. Windatt recommended removing Scenario 4 from further consideration given that Scenario 8 is a better version of this scenario.

The Working Group agreed to remove Scenario 4 from further consideration.

Scenario 6: (slides 19-21 of the online presentation)

- New Riverside PS constructed as JK-8. Gives up *areas C and F* to John Mahood PS.
- John Mahood PS becomes JK-6, gives up *areas I, J, L and N* to Park Manor PS.
- Park Manor PS becomes JK-8 receiving Gr. 6 feed from John Mahood PS.

Scenario 6 – Objective Comparison	
Objective	Comments
To determine the size and program configuration of the replacement Riverside PS, having regard for Board Policy 3002: Elementary School Size and Configuration	New Riverside PS and Park Manor PS become JK-8 organizations. John Mahood PS feeds Park Manor PS. JK-6, JK-8 in line with Policy 3002. New Riverside PS constructed as 600 pupil place facility. John Mahood PS enrolment approx. 390 (2 classes/grade). Park Manor PS > 2 classes/grade 7-8
To develop a transitional accommodation plan for elementary school enrolment in the Town of Elmira while awaiting the completion of the replacement Riverside PS.	To be determined
To establish boundaries that are long-term (approx. 10 years) that consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Walking distances (community/neighbourhood-level schools) Efficiency of transportation Capacity of schools Current and future population density and demographics Proximity to other schools Impact on feeder and surrounding schools 	<p>More KJ-6 and 7-8 program locations.</p> <p>Less transportation.</p> <p>Neighbourhood schools.</p> <p>Park Manor PS requires addition to add Kindergarten/Primary infrastructure.</p> <p>Significant change for community (program model)</p>
To minimize the impact on students where changes are proposed (consideration for grandparenting, phasing, transitions, etc.)	To be determined

Discussion – Scenario 6

See Discussion of Scenario 9 for details.

The Working Group agreed to remove Scenario 6 from further consideration – based on preference for Scenario 9 which is a variation of 6.

Scenario 7: (former status quo) (slides 22-24 of the online presentation)

- New Riverside PS constructed on new site as JK-5
- No boundary changes or organization changes

Scenario 7 – Objective Comparison	
Objective	Comments
To determine the size and program configuration of the replacement Riverside PS, having regard for Board Policy 3002: Elementary School Size and Configuration	New Riverside PS constructed at approx. 480 pupil places. No program or boundary change. JK-5, 6-8 does not align with direction in Policy 3002. All schools meet recommended # classes/grade.
To develop a transitional accommodation plan for elementary school enrolment in the Town of Elmira while awaiting the completion of the replacement Riverside PS.	To be determined
To establish boundaries that are long-term (approx. 10 years) that consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Walking distances (community/neighbourhood-level schools)○ Efficiency of transportation○ Capacity of schools○ Current and future population density and demographics○ Proximity to other schools○ Impact on feeder and surrounding schools	Transportation – stays the same, except for <i>area F</i> which requires transport to new Riverside PS. Park Manor PS and John Mahood PS require additions/portables to accommodate long term enrolment.
To minimize the impact on students where changes are proposed (consideration for grandparenting, phasing, transitions, etc.)	To be determined

Discussion- Scenario 7

- C: R. Playford commented that the Board will not like this scenario because the only change is the building of the new Riverside PS in the Lunor Subdivision all else remains the same.
- C: Mr. Hercanuck noted that Scenario 7 reduces the need for an addition at John Mahood PS but increases the need for an addition at Park Manor PS and asked if everyone was comfortable with the idea that going forward the Board would like to see JK-6 and 7-8.
- C: Principal Bond commented that in terms of the 6-8 school model; it is nice to have the students for the extra year and he understands that there are concerns that when they come to the senior school in Grade 6 they are young and do grow up a lot in that year; but it allows teaching staff the opportunity to get to know them which helps for programming for their 7-8 years; the change between Grade 5 and Grade 6 is not as much as between Grade 6 and Grade 7. If Park Manor PS moves to a 7-8 it will still be a viable senior school. It will be dependent on whether the community wants to have a senior school or not. Park Manor PS's achievement data shows that it works for us, but we are just one school.
- C: R. Playford noted that the Board is moving away from the 6-8 model, which might make Scenario 7 more difficult to present to the public and let them think that it could be possible when it might not be given the Board's policy.

The Working Group agreed to not take Scenario 7 to Public Meeting #1.

Scenario 8: (slides 25-27 of the online presentation)

- Modified from Scenario 4
- New Riverside PS constructed as JK-6. Receives *areas G1* and *I* from John Mahood PS. Long term transportation required for *area I*.
- John Mahood PS receives *area F* from Riverside PS.
- Loss of Grade 6 reduces enrolment at Park Manor PS.

Scenario 8 – Objective Comparison	
Objective	Comments
To determine the size and program configuration of the replacement Riverside PS, having regard for Board Policy 3002: Elementary School Size and Configuration	New Riverside PS constructed as JK-6 for approx. 570 students. John Mahood PS reaches approx. 500 enrolment (>2 classes/grade). JK-6, 7-8 in line with Policy 3002. Park Manor PS approx. 4 classes/grade.
To develop a transitional accommodation plan for elementary school enrolment in the Town of Elmira while awaiting the completion of the replacement Riverside PS.	To be determined
To establish boundaries that are long-term (approx. 10 years) that consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Walking distances (community/neighbourhood-level schools)○ Efficiency of transportation○ Capacity of schools○ Current and future population density and demographics○ Proximity to other schools○ Impact on feeder and surrounding schools	Reduction of enrolment at Park Manor PS due to reorganization to 7-8. Better matched to capacity (no addition/portables necessary) John Mahood PS requires 4-5 portables/addition in long term to accommodate enrolment. Transportation – increase in transportation (<i>area I</i>) can walk to John Mahood PS but transported to new Riverside PS. Grade 6's spread across 2 schools (improvement?). New residential development spread across all schools)
To minimize the impact on students where changes are proposed (consideration for grandparenting, phasing, transitions, etc.)	To be determined

Discussion – Scenario 8

- C: Principal Bond noted that by year 2017 the population at new Riverside PS starts to become stable with the largest spike in enrolment coming in the first few years. He noted that we are already increasing in 2013.
- R: Mr. Hercanuck noted that in terms of filling up the school that we just built; that is great, we don't want to build a big school and then wait 10 years for it to fill up.
- C: R. Playford commented that Scenario 8 makes more sense than Scenario 4.

The Working Group agreed to keep Scenario 8 for further consideration and to bring it to Public Meeting #1.

Scenario 9: (slides 28-30 of the online presentation)

- Modified from Scenario 6 (Park Manor receives *area G1* from John Mahood, portions of *areas D & E* move from Riverside PS to John Mahood PS; 3 year average of 40 students JK-6; and 12 students 7-8)
- New Riverside PS constructed as JK-8. Provides *areas C* and *F* to John Mahood PS.
- John Mahood PS becomes JK-6 provides *areas G1, I, J, L* and *N* to Park Manor PS.
- Park Manor PS becomes JK-8 receiving Gr. 6 feed from John Mahood PS.

Scenario 9 – Objective Comparison	
Objective	Comments
To determine the size and program configuration of the replacement Riverside PS, having regard for Board Policy 3002: Elementary School Size and Configuration	New Riverside PS and Park Manor PS become JK-8 organizations. JK-6, JK-8 in line with Policy 3002. John Mahood PS feeds Park Manor PS. New Riverside PS constructed at 550 pupil places. John Mahood PS enrolment approx. 400 (2 classes/grade). Park Manor PS < 2 classes/grade JK-6, > 2 classes/grade 7-8.
To develop a transitional accommodation plan for elementary school enrolment in the Town of Elmira while awaiting the completion of the replacement Riverside PS.	To be determined
To establish boundaries that are long-term (approx. 10 years) that consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Walking distances (community/neighbourhood-level schools) Efficiency of transportation Capacity of schools Current and future population density and demographics Proximity to other schools Impact on feeder and surrounding schools 	<p>More JK-6 and 7-8 program locations.</p> <p>Less transportation.</p> <p>Neighbourhood schools.</p> <p>John Mahood PS matched to capacity (1 portable possible) Park Manor PS requires addition (lacking Kindergarten/Primary infrastructure).</p> <p>Significant change for the community (program model)</p>
To minimize the impact on students where changes are proposed (consideration for grandparenting, phasing, transitions, etc.)	To be determined

Scenario 9 – Discussion

- C: Liz Robinson commented that this scenario would be expensive with Park Manor PS having to be converted to a JK-8.
- C: R. Playford asked if we need to consider that this scenario may have the opportunity for a partnership with the Region on its childcare.
- R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that it could be considered and noted that the Board has not approached the Region about it; but noted that it would likely be a positive for the Region's participation on that site given the addition of younger students now being on the site who might benefit from the Region's childcare.
- C: Ms. Manske noted that there might be some cost savings; but if compared in terms of cost with Scenario 1 which would require an addition at John Mahood PS, which other than a gymnasium may not be necessary under Scenario 9.
- Q: Liz Robinson asked if there would be potential for partnerships under any of the scenarios.
- R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that that there would be potential for partnerships whenever the Board is undertaking a capital project such as an addition or a new build; with approved community partners such as childcare operator but that would be dependent on demand in the area. A lot of times we have an expression of interest in partnerships until they find out they are required to pay for their portion of the building's space. The Region has informed us that they have no interest in any of our other Elmira sites (save for Park Manor PS) for their childcare facility expansion. Right now they are located on the Township's property adjacent to Park Manor PS site and have expressed interest in expanding onto the Park Manor PS site.
- C: R. Playford commented that Scenario 9 is better than Scenario 6 and the boundaries are more logical.

- C: Mr. Hercanuck noted that he could revise Scenario 9 boundaries further to adjust numbers noting that it has some positives and some challenges.
- C: Tracey Williams commented that one of the downsides to Scenario 9 is that Park Manor PS is not achieving the 2 classes/grade the way the boundaries are set at this point. The idea of this Scenario is different and depending on its reception by the community perhaps we can look at adjusting the numbers later if warranted.

The Working Group agreed to remove Scenario 6 from further consideration and to keep Scenario 9 for further consideration and to bring Scenario 9 to Public Meeting #1.

7. Future Meetings:

a. Public Meeting #1 – Tuesday, June 11, 2013 from 7:00-8:30 pm at Park Manor PS

Public Meeting #1 is scheduled for Tuesday, June 11 from 7:00 – 8:30 pm at Park Manor PS. [Flyers](#) will be sent home through the schools and the meeting notice will be advertised in the Elmira Independent and the Woolwich Observer.

i. Scenarios for presentation at Public Meeting #1

- o [Scenario 1](#)
- o [Scenario 8](#)
- o [Scenario 9](#)
- o [Status Quo](#) (for comparison purposes only)

Mr. Hercanuck noted that Public Meeting #1 will be an accelerated version of what the Working Group has done so far:

- o Why we are doing the Boundary Study
- o What our plan is for Riverside PS
- o Options we've looked at for reorganizing
- o Go through the objectives and what we want to accomplish
- o How we came up with Scenarios to meet the objectives
- o Get the community's thoughts on what we are doing

The presentation will take approximately 20 minutes and will be followed by a Question and Answer period and move into an Open House format where display boards with objectives, Status Quo and scenarios (1, 8 and 9) will be on display and Planning staff and Principals will be available to answer questions one-on-one.

Q: R. Playford asked how we will be able to determine the community's response.

R: Mr. Hercanuck advised that comment sheets will be provided for the community and they will be asked to provide their comments and information will be provided on how they can submit electronic feedback as well. We also provide the contact information for the Board's Trustees (who decide the outcome of the Boundary Study).

C: Ms. Manske noted that we tend to stay away asking the community to rank the scenarios as it may look like a vote and would only be representative of the views of the community that were in attendance at that time.

R: Mr. Hercanuck advised that written comments are much more useful to us as they allow us to see what the community's concerns are; or they can be used to alert us to a specific concern in relation to a scenario that we haven't taken into consideration yet. We are more interested in the comments rather than I like or don't like this scenario, we like to know why, that's more useful.

Mr. Hercanuck advised that the Working Group will be able to review and discuss any comments or feedback received at the meeting or through the [boundaryfeedback](#) email (personal/identifying information or offensive comments will be redacted before sharing); the feedback received will not be made public but can be requested.

C: Liz Robinson advised that from a community perspective, one of the concerns is the timeline for changes.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that he will talk about the Ministry's new funding process; and how we can now use the Boundary Study process recommendations to develop a business case for the new Riverside PS which will move it up our Capital Priorities list for funding from the Ministry.

C: Ms. Manske noted that the Lunor Subdivision is starting to develop which will also add credibility to our request for funding.

Q: Principal Hatcher asked if the Board is keeping tabs on the development areas.

R: Mr. Hercanuck advised that as soon as the Lunor Subdivision registers the Board will execute the agreement of Purchase and Sale for the school block site which is in the first phase of development in the subdivision.

Q: S. Windatt asked if there is any chance that the agreement would fall through.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that the agreement (for land and compensation) is already in place and once the plan of subdivision registers at the Land Registry Office, the agreement can be executed.

C: Ms. Manske advised that in cases where an agreement can't be reached, the Board does have the authority to expropriate – but this will not be required for the Lunor Site.

b. Working Group Meeting #6

The Working Group requested to meet after Public Meeting #1 to discuss the feedback received from the community.

Mr. Hercanuck advised that Working Group Meeting #6 will be the last meeting for this school year; the Working Group will meet again in the Fall.

- **Working Group #6 – Tuesday, June 18, 2013 from 1:00-2:30 pm at TBD.**

8. Roundtable

Q: D. Sinclair asked when the Working Group would be able to make a recommendation.

R: Mr. Hercanuck responded that based on past studies; we may be able to get a report to the Board of Trustees between November 2013 and January 2014.

Mr. Hercanuck advised that over the summer months, Planning staff will gather costing information on the scenarios remaining after Public Meeting #1 and work out some transitional plans and strategies to be prepared for when we meet again in September.

We will need to have one more Public Meeting (#2) once we have it down to 2 scenarios and really be able to explain how each will affect families individually. Then we will write a report with your input to present to the Board with recommendations that Trustees will vote on.

- Q: Principal Hatcher asked if transition plans will be available for Public Meeting #2.
- R: Yes; transitions will be included as part of the information for Public Meeting #2 and we will be available to answer questions based on how families will be affected by the recommended scenarios based on the anticipated year of implementation.
- C: Ms. Manske advised that we may not have a date of implementation because the funding for the new Riverside PS is dependent on receiving funding from the Ministry of Education; the expectation right now is that we will be submitting our list of Capital Priorities to the Ministry in the Fall and anticipating that we may get a response in January 2014. She advised that once funding is confirmed the Board can begin the process of engaging an architect and it typically takes 2 years from that engagement until a school is ready; at the very earliest September 2016 for the new Riverside PS to be in operation; if the school is ready earlier it may be possible to move the students in earlier.
- C: Tracey Williams commented that the community is expecting a new school by 2015.
- R: Ms. Manske noted that the Board is working on schools that currently have funding right now that will be opening in 2015.
- Mr. Hercanuck advised that over the summer, staff will be looking at options for the interim for accommodating the expected enrolment increase for Riverside PS until the new school is operational.
- C: R. Playford noted that 2013-15 enrolment is projected to jump by approximately 60 students for Riverside PS and we cannot expect the school to handle this enrolment until 2016.
- C: Principal Hatcher noted that Riverside PS only has one washroom.
- R: Mr. Hercanuck noted that those numbers include the Grade 6 class which would not be part of the enrolment at the current Riverside PS; they would be attending Park Manor PS for the 6-8. The Grade 6 program would not be taken out of Park Manor PS until the New Riverside PS is built.
- C: S. Windatt commented that if the school is not built until 2016; we are only considering a 6 year plan and not a 10 year plan.
- Mr. Hercanuck advised the Working Group that they are welcomed to attend the Public Meeting but are not required to do so; however, Administrators are encouraged to attend.
- Mr. Hercanuck thanked the Working Group for attending and adjourned the meeting at 2:25 PM.

Action Items:

- **Mr. Hercanuck to further develop the Scenario/Objective charts for scenarios chosen for Public Meeting #1 (Scenarios 1, 8 and 9).**

Future Meetings:

Working Group Meetings:

- **Working Group #6: Tuesday, June 18, 2013, from 1:00-2:30 pm at TBD**
- **Working Group #7: TBD**

Public Meetings:

- **Public Meeting #1: Tuesday, June 11, 2013 from 7:00 – 8:30 pm at Park Manor PS**
- **Public Meeting #2: TBD**