



WEST WATERLOO ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS BOUNDARY STUDY

Minutes of Working Group Meeting #4

Thursday, April 9, 2015

4:45 – 6:15 PM

Edna Staebler Public School, Room 13

The fourth Working Group meeting of the West Waterloo Elementary Schools Boundary Study, involving Abraham Erb, Cedarbrae, Centennial, Edna Staebler, Laurelwood, and Mary Johnston Public Schools and the new West Waterloo (Vista Hills) elementary school, was held at Edna Staebler Public School on Thursday, April 9, 2015.

Attendees:

H. Tinnes, Principal, Mary Johnston PS, Liz Arbuckle, Principal, Laurelwood PS, Don Oberle, Principal, New West Waterloo School, Jan Hansen, Vice Principal Edna Staebler PS, Marny St. Pierre, Parent Representative, Edna Staebler PS, Tracey Nairn, Parent Representative, Centennial PS, Vivian F., Parent Representative, Centennial PS, Mairaj Naveed, Alternating Parent Representative, Cedarbrae PS, G. Sikiladha and R. Sikiladha Alternating Parent Representatives, Abraham Erb PS, Elaine Ranney, Superintendent of Education, Dennis Cuomo, Manager of Planning, Andrea Kean, Recording Secretary and Lauren Agar, Senior Planner.

Regrets:

Jeff Parliament, Principal, Edna Staebler PS, T. Stroud, Principal, Abraham Erb PS, Mark McMath, Principal, Cedarbrae PS, Ryan Barnett-Cowan, Parent Representative, Laurelwood PS, Betti Adams, Principal, Centennial PS, Brad Hughes, Vice Principal, Abraham Erb PS and Centennial PS, Shelly Reed, Parent Representative, Edna Staebler PS, C. Lovegrove, Parent Representative, Laurelwood PS, Deb Bergey, Parent Representative, Abraham Erb PS, Nathan Hercanuck, Senior Planner.

1. Welcome/Introductions

Lauren Agar, Senior Planner, welcomed members of the Working Group at 4:50 PM.

Mrs. Agar led the group through the presentation, available online at

<http://www.wrdsb.ca/planning/boundary-studies/west-waterloo-elementary-schools-boundary-study/>

2. Draft Minutes Review/Approval

Mrs. Agar asked if there are any errors or omissions in the **Minutes from Working Group Meeting #3** (March 24, 2015). A parent representative requested a change to the last comment on page 8. The minutes were approved with the requested change.

Mrs. Agar advised that the revised minutes will be posted on the Board's website at:

<http://www.wrdsb.ca/planning/boundary-studies/west-waterloo-elementary-schools-boundary-study/>

Study Goals and Objectives

Mrs. Agar noted that the Goals and Objectives are not included in tonight's presentation and advised that she has made the change requested at the [last meeting](#) to the Objectives which will be presented at Public Meeting #1.

3. Scenario Discussion

Mrs. Agar noted that she has put together five new scenarios and included where possible, the top options indicated by each school group at the last meeting. She noted that she was not able to include the top option for all of the schools in the same scenario; but hoped that she was able to put together

a few scenarios that the Working Group would feel comfortable presenting at the Public Meeting on April 23rd.

Previous Boundary Option maps and enrolments are available in [Working Group Meeting #3 presentation](#).

New Boundary Options:

Mrs. Agar noted that she has put together the following new Boundary Options based on discussions at our last meeting.

New West Waterloo (Vista Hills) (slides 3 and 4 of the online presentation)

Enrolment projections for boundary options available on slide 6

- JK-6 Boundary Option 6 (slide 3)
- JK-6 Boundary Option 7 (slide 3)
- Gr. 7-8 Boundary Option 9 (slide 4)
- Gr. 7-8 Boundary Option 10 (slide 4)
- Gr. 7-8 Boundary Option 11 (slide 4)
- Gr. 7-8 Boundary Option 12 (slide 4)

(Includes projection area N split into two areas - N1 and N2)

Edna Staebler PS (slide 3)

Enrolment projections for boundary options available on slide 8

- JK-6 Boundary Option 6
- Gr. 7-8 Boundary Option 7

(Includes projection area N split into two areas - N1 and N2)

Splitting area N into two areas does not make an impact on enrolment as area N1 has only four students.

Abraham Erb PS (slide 5)

Enrolment projections for boundary options available on slide 7

- JK-6 Boundary Option 4

Removes area D from Abraham Erb PS – to correspond with Option that includes area D at Laurelwood PS.

Mrs. Agar noted that the projected enrolment numbers are not included in the handout but are included in the presentation which will be emailed out to the Working Group after the meeting.

Scenarios 1 – 3 (slides 9-14 of the online presentation)

(Not formally discussed at tonight's meeting, included for information only; discussed at Working Group Meeting #3 – see minutes of [Meeting #3](#) for discussion details).

New Scenarios:

Mrs. Agar advised that she has put together five new scenarios (based on new and previously developed boundary options) requested by the Working Group at the last meeting.

Scenario 4 (slides 15-16 of the online presentation)

Scenario 4 boundary maps (JK-6 and 7-8) located on slide 15

Scenario 4 enrolment projections located on slide 16

Mrs. Agar noted that Scenario 4 contains the following boundary options for each school:

- Abraham Erb PS: (remaining JK-6) with JK-6 Option 1 (unchanged)
- Edna Staebler PS: (remaining JK-8) with JK-6 Option 6 and 7-8 Option 7 (preferred from last meeting – removal of projection areas F, M and N2 from boundary)
- Laurelwood PS: (remaining JK-8) with JK-6 Option 1 and 7-8 Option 3 (unchanged JK-6 and 7-8)
- Mary Johnston PS: Status Quo
- New West Waterloo: (JK-8) with JK-6 Option 7 and 7-8 Option 10 (takes areas F, M, and N2 from Edna Staebler PS)

Scenario 4 Discussion:

Mrs. Agar noted that in terms of enrolment:

- Abraham Erb PS will be under capacity.
- Edna Staebler PS over the long term will be a little under capacity; but still at 90 percent capacity which would allow flexibility for class organization; she noted that the Board aims for an 80 percent capacity.
- Laurelwood PS – enrolment similar to status quo.
- Mary Johnston PS – No change/status quo.
- New West Waterloo (Vista Hills) lower enrolment in the short term as the area is developing, but long term expected to go over 700 which not preferable.

C: Scenario 4 underutilizes the capacity at Abraham Erb PS.

C: Concern was expressed for students getting bumped from Edna Staebler PS to the new school – and for what will happen to them ten years down the road once the new school is well over capacity. Because the Vista Hills subdivision is comparable in size to the Edna Staebler PS subdivision it could have the potential for long term enrolment to be comparable as well.

Mrs. Agar pointed out that for all scenarios – she has not chosen where French Immersion (FI) students would attend. She noted that the enrolment projections for the new West Waterloo (Vista Hills) school would likely have a number of students included that would be FI kids – whether or not the Board would offer the FI program at the new school, there is the potential that some of that projected enrolment would attend school elsewhere, if they are enrolled in the FI program which would result in a fluctuation in numbers depending on how many students are enrolled in FI.

C: Perhaps the FI students could be directed to Abraham Erb PS for the program as they would have room under Scenario 4.

Mrs. Agar noted that it is very difficult to move a student once they are enrolled in the FI program, unless the new school also offers the FI program – she noted that when doing a boundary change that involves having areas F, M and N going to a different school, kids from these areas that are already established in the FI program at Edna Staebler PS would likely be allowed to stay at Edna Staebler PS to finish out. It would be the new registrants that would be affected. She reiterated that it would be a transition piece that has not yet been included in the projected enrolment numbers for any of the scenarios.

Scenario 5 (slides 17-18 of the online presentation)

Scenario 5 boundary maps (JK-6 and 7-8) located on slide 17

Scenario 5 enrolment projections located on slide 18

Mrs. Agar noted that Scenario 5 contains the following boundary options for each school:

- Abraham Erb PS: (remaining JK-6) with JK-6 Option 2 (area F added JK-6)
- Edna Staebler PS: (remaining JK-8) with JK-6 Option 6 and 7-8 Option 7

- Laurelwood PS: (remaining JK-8) with JK-6 Option 1 and 7-8 Option 4 (area F added for 7-8)
- Mary Johnston PS: Status Quo
- New West Waterloo: (JK-8) with JK-6 Option 6 and 7-8 Option 9

Scenario 5 Discussion:

- Mrs. Agar noted that adding area F adds a lot of additional enrolment to Abraham Erb PS's numbers, while not a lot over enrolment, would certainly require the use of portables
- Edna Staebler PS – same as scenario 4
- Laurelwood PS – not ideal as addition of area F to 7-8 boundary goes well above 700 students.
- Mary Johnston PS: Status Quo
- New West Waterloo – very much underutilized in the short term.

Scenario 6 (slides 19-20 of the online presentation)

Scenario 6 boundary maps (JK-6 and 7-8) located on slide 19

Scenario 6 enrolment projections located on slide 20

Mrs. Agar noted that Scenario 6 contains the following boundary options for each school:

- Abraham Erb PS: (remaining JK-6) with JK-6 Option 4 (redirects area D to Laurelwood PS)
- Edna Staebler PS: (remaining JK-8) with JK-6 Option 6 and 7-8 Option 7 (same as previous)
- Laurelwood PS: (remaining JK-8) with JK-6 Option 2 and 7-8 Option 2
- Mary Johnston PS: Status Quo
- New West Waterloo: (JK-8) with JK-6 Option 6 and 7-8 Option 11 (the new school would take in all of Abraham Erb PS's 7-8 students – expect for area D which would go to Laurelwood PS)

Scenario 6 Discussion:

Mrs. Agar noted that:

- Laurelwood PS adding area D results in Laurelwood PS going well above built capacity and above 700 what the Board prefers for a JK-8 organization.
- Abraham Erb PS no a substantial difference – eliminating area D but is replaced by area F - close to status quote numbers.
- New West Waterloo (Vista Hills) school – short term underutilized – well over enrolment in the long term.

Q: How does each of these Scenarios meet our walkability objective?

R: Mrs. Agar responded that for the 7-8 level we are not increasing bussing for students in areas A and D as students in area D would be bussed regardless of which school they attend. Some of area F is within walking distance to Abraham Erb PS and it would be dependent if it would be deemed that this area could walk along Erbsville Road.

Q: This Scenario would greatly increase the number of grade 7-8 students attending the new school. Would it be increased enough to allow for the specialized teachers and rotary classes?

R: Mrs. Agar responded that Scenario 6 does greatly increase the 7-8 program numbers (option 11) at the new school, 150 Grade 7-8 students in the opening year. However, she noted that the JK-6 level numbers are lower than we would like to see for the junior elementary program; 185 students is not a good number for grades JK-6. She noted that it is important to keep in mind that the Board's target size for a JK-6 school is between 350 and 525 students; with 100+ students for grades 7-8.

C: Is it correct to assume that it will be hard to meet those target numbers for the new school in the first year?

R: Yes.

Q: Could we have another Scenario that would have the new school open JK-6 and become a JK-8 in future?

R: Mrs. Agar responded that the problem with that Scenario is where we would be able to house those Grade 7-8 students in 2016; and we would have to move the JK-6 students out of the other study area schools to fill the space we have at the new school, which is being built to house 647 students.

Q: Could the 7-8 students continue to be accommodated at Centennial PS?

R: Mrs. Agar responded that Centennial PS is full and has a portapak.

Scenario 7 (slides 21-22 of the online presentation)

Scenario 7 boundary maps (JK-6 and 7-8) located on slide 21

Scenario 7 enrolment projections located on slide 22

Mrs. Agar noted that Scenario 7 contains the following boundary options for each school:

- Abraham Erb PS: (becomes JK-8) with JK-6 Option 2 and 7-8 Option 2
- Edna Staebler PS: (remaining JK-8) with JK-6 Option 6 and 7-8 Option 7
- Laurelwood PS: (remaining JK-8) with JK-6 Option 1 and 7-8 Option 1
- Mary Johnston PS: Status Quo
- New West Waterloo: (JK-8) with JK-6 Option 6 and 7-8 Option 9

Scenario 7 Discussion:

Mrs. Agar noted that:

- Abraham Erb PS - Scenario 7 attempts to utilize the by adding area F.
- Laurelwood PS – reduces enrolment - no longer has a feeder school as Abraham Erb PS would keep its 7-8 students.
- JK-6 boundaries match 7-8 boundaries – except for Centennial PS and Mary Johnston PS.
- Numbers for this scenario are not too bad.
- Abraham Erb PS does not have the facility available to accommodate the 7-8 program students.
- Laurelwood PS 7-8 program numbers should still be 100+ with the FI program included; to keep the FI program viable could continue to have a feed from Abraham Erb PS into Laurelwood PS's FI at the Grade 7-8 level.
- New West Waterloo school – short term numbers are not great especially with 240 students JK-8. Long term the numbers are okay.

Q: Does the Board plan to build on to Laurelwood PS or continue on with portables?

R: Mrs. Agar responded that based on the options we have looked at so far under this boundary study, we will have to recommend that we look at constructing a permanent addition at Laurelwood PS based on the long term enrolment projections. The size of an addition would be determined by the boundary chosen for the school.

Q: Would the addition be built out or up on the Laurelwood PS site?

R: Mrs. Agar responded that depending on size of the addition needed would likely be a two story addition to minimize the amount of land required.

Q: Can you build a second story addition while the students are in the building?

R: Mrs. Agar responded that we would not build a second story above the current school – rather we would likely demolish the portapak and replace it with a two story structure. In the meantime students would be housed in portables to accommodate students displaced by the construction.

C: Could we send displaced students to the new school while an addition is being constructed?

R: Mrs. Agar responded that it would all depend on timing. It would be ideal to perhaps move the grade 7-8 program out; we do not have the funds to build an addition at Laurelwood PS and it will not be done for 2016 or 2017.

Scenario 8 (slides 23-25 of the online presentation)

Scenario 8 (Phase 1 approx. 2016-2019) boundary maps (JK-6 and 7-8) located on slide 23

Scenario 8 (Phase 2 approx. 2020+) boundary maps (JK-6 and 7-8) located on slide 24

Scenario 8 (Phase 1 and 2 enrolment projections located on slide 25)

Mrs. Agar noted that Scenario 8 has two phases and contains the following boundary options for each school: She noted that the other Scenarios can be revised to make them two staged as well.

Scenario 8 – Phase 1 (approx. 2016-2019):

- Abraham Erb PS: (remaining JK-6) with JK-6 Option 1
- Edna Staebler PS: (remaining JK-8) with JK-6 Option 6 and 7-8 Option 7
- Laurelwood PS: (remaining JK-8) with JK-6 Option 1 and 7-8 Option 1
- Mary Johnston PS: Status Quo
- New West Waterloo: (JK-8) with JK-6 Option 7 and 7-8 Option 12

Scenario 8 – Phase 2 (approx. 2020+):

- Abraham Erb PS: (becomes JK-8) with JK-6 Option 2 and 7-8 Option 2
- Edna Staebler PS: (remaining JK-8) with JK-6 Option 6 and 7-8 Option 7
- Laurelwood PS: (remaining JK-8) with JK-6 Option 1 and 7-8 Option 1
- Mary Johnston PS: Status Quo
- New West Waterloo: (JK-8) with JK-6 Option 6 and 7-8 Option 9

Scenario 8 Discussion:

Mrs. Agar noted that:

- This Scenario will likely be unpopular.
- Abraham Erb PS would initially remain JK-6 with its 7-8s feeding to the New West Waterloo school. Would be underutilized initially.
- Laurelwood PS's 7-8 boundary would shrink (no feeder school)
- Edna Staebler PS same as previous scenarios
- The numbers for the New West Waterloo school work well from approximately 2016-2017. Beyond that and at which time we could get an addition (if we can secure from the Ministry of Education) at Abraham Erb PS, then we can add Grades 7-8 there and change the boundaries again to add area F (JK-8) to Abraham Erb PS to bump numbers up for a viable 7-8 program. It would also coincide with projected enrolment increases at the new school which would allow us to maintain good numbers for programs requirements at the new school.

Q: Principal Tinnes asked if Scenario 8 would require two additions – one at Abraham Erb PS and one at Laurelwood PS; requiring an additional cost to the Board?

R: Yes. This is not the cheapest option.

C: Scenario 8 seems to make sense from a numbers standpoint as we are better utilizing capacities.

Q: Does Scenario 8 meet our walkability objective?

R: Mrs. Agar responded that Scenario 8 is most likely maximizing walkability in the long term. She noted that a good portion of area F (Grades 1-8) would be able to walk to Abraham Erb PS under phase 2. Areas G and H (Grades 1-8) can all walk to Laurelwood PS as they do today; area E (except for a very small portion) and area L can walk to the new school.

C: Area F is affected twice by this Scenario - moving to the new school in 2016 and then back to Abraham Erb PS again in 2020 when it becomes JK-8.

R: Yes. This will not be a popular Scenario for area F residents.

C: Area F has been switched from Elizabeth Ziegler PS to Abraham Erb PS to Edna Staebler PS and this Scenario would send them to the New School then back to Abraham Erb PS again.

Q: How many students are currently in area F? Where are they attending school now?

R: There are quite a few families in area F. Mrs. Agar noted that by 2016 there will be very few students remaining that would have been affected by the earlier boundary changes; though it could be that individual families have been affected (by having children in different grades). She noted that those students are attending Edna Staebler PS, Abraham Erb PS or Laurelwood PS because they were given an option to stay at Abraham Erb PS.

C: Principal Tinnes suggested that we determine the number of students that have been affected by the multiple boundary changes and grandfather them.

Q: Principal Tinnes asked Mrs. Agar which three scenarios presented so far, would she recommend based on the Board's viewpoint?

Q: A parent representative asked if the Working Group should give consideration to whether a scenario would be financially feasible.

C: A parent representative commented that the Working Group should be focusing on the three best scenarios for each of the schools involved and debate on those regardless of cost.

R: Mrs. Agar responded that in terms of the financial aspect – there are two key financial items to be considered:

1. An addition at Laurelwood PS (likely required regardless of the scenario – cost differential will depend on size of the addition needed based on the boundary option chosen). She noted that discounts can be applied as the number of rooms increase.
2. If we do decide to add Grade 7-8 to Abraham Erb PS – there will be a significant cost to add an addition there as well.

Mrs. Agar noted that the Board will have to develop a business case to submit to the Ministry of Education to be considered for funding for these construction projects. She advised that we would also need to be prepared to have an alternative plan in case we do not ever receive the funding from the Province. She advised that while we can recommend the ideal solution for the community; we should also have an option that does not cost a significant amount because ultimately the decision to fund will be up to the Province and will be dependent on their priorities.

Scenario summary by individual school: (slides 26 – 30)

Includes all Scenarios (Status Quo and Scenarios 1-8), capacity and Grade structure and projected enrolments for 2016-2024 and indicates boundary option preferences by school that were communicated at Working Group Meeting #3:

- **Abraham Erb PS** – Slide 26
 - Scenario 7 incorporates the #1 boundary option preference.
- **Edna Staebler PS** – Slide 27
 - Scenarios 4-8 incorporate the # boundary option preference.
- **Laurelwood PS** – Slide 28
 - Scenario 4 incorporates the # boundary option preference.
- **Mary Johnston PS** – Slide 29
 - Scenarios 1-8 incorporate the #1 boundary option preference.
- **New West Waterloo (Vista Hills)** – Slide 30

Mrs. Agar advised asked the Working Group if they would like:

- Her opinion on the three scenarios to present at Public Meeting No 1;
- To look at each school's top three scenarios and determine the best three to present;
- Discuss changes to the scenarios

The Working Group did a review of Scenarios 4-8 to consider how schools were affected, noting the following:

- Scenario 5 would be an improvement to walkability with area F attending Abraham Erb PS for JK-6 whereas – the majority of area F are within walking distance to Laurelwood PS for grades 1-8 (today they are bussed to Edna Staebler PS for grades 7-8). Areas A and C are not within walking distance of Laurelwood PS; approximately 60 percent of area D would be within walking distance of Laurelwood PS and entirely within walking distance of Abraham Erb PS.
- Scenario 7 and 8 appear to achieve the best walkability and enrolment to capacity.
- Scenario 4, 5 and 6 enrolments are way above or below capacities.
- Mrs. Agar noted that Scenario 5 would likely require a 16 classroom addition at Laurelwood PS costing (rough estimate) \$5.6 million. (purely looking at the numbers and how the Ministry evaluates our business cases, we would not warrant that addition until 2020 -2022 – we would need to be absolutely filled at all other surrounding schools (including the new Vista Hills school) with no surplus capacity anywhere in the surrounding area.

Q: Would another option be to add area F to Laurelwood PS?

R: Mrs. Agar responded that in the boundary option that adds area F to Laurelwood PS's grade 7-8 population pushes enrolment numbers at Laurelwood PS above 700.

Q: Would the numbers at Laurelwood PS be better if we kept area D at Abraham Erb PS and had area F (JK-8) attend Laurelwood PS. Would still require area F to cross Erbsville Road but there is an adult crossing guard there now.

R: Mrs. Agar noted that we have not considered that boundary option but we could look at that. She noted that in area F today there are approximately 125 students in total - 105 JK-6 students and 20 grade 7-8 students.

She noted that for comparison, we did have Scenario 6 which shows area D going to Laurelwood PS and area D has 80 students in total (60 JK-6 and 20 grade 7-8). If we take area F to Laurelwood PS for JK-8 there would be close to 800 students at Laurelwood PS.

C: Would the numbers be better if we made that change in Scenario 7?

R: Mrs. Agar responded that under Scenario 7 the JK-6 and grade 7-8 boundaries are the same for Laurelwood PS. No additional boundary added.

Q: Can you look at if there any natural boundaries within area F or area D that would make sense to divide them further?

R: Mrs. Agar agreed to look at further splitting areas F and D.

Mrs. Agar noted that area B has been left out of all scenarios as the intent is when we present our final recommendations to Trustees we will identify area B as a Development Area and we will determine at a later date what school(s) this area will attend. She noted that hopefully it will have its own school in future. If we don't have a school ready once development begins, then this area will be assigned to a holding school (will be a school where we have room at the time i.e., Cedarbrae, N.A. MacEachern, Northlake Woods Public Schools or somewhere else).

Q: Are there any other areas that would have future new development?

R: Mrs. Agar responded that the only other area that still has development potential is within Edna Staebler PS's current boundary (small amount in areas S and Q; apartments and condo towers behind the school and we get very few kids out of those sorts of developments as they are mostly one and two bedroom units. Area P is empty nothing there today and no plans for development in near future.

C: A parent representative commented regarding the Erbsville Road Triangle, area T (attends Edna Staebler PS and crossing Ira Needles at the roundabout), the Region is planning on making the stretch of Ira Needles Blvd. four lanes and potentially 20,000 more vehicles a year going through the roundabout once the Costco goes in and we still have 120 kids trying to cross that road without a light and at the roundabout, and with 4 lanes of traffic planned and extra traffic due to Costco – it is a big concern for the safety of those students.

R: Mrs. Agar responded that she can see the safety concerns for those area T students but noted the issue is where they would go. We may need to recommend more work with the City of Waterloo to come up with a solution that we could feel comfortable with, an adult crossing guard may not be enough – what else might we be able to do for traffic calming measures or signal lights etc.

C: Can we get a map with a breakdown of enrolment by projection area to email out to the Working Group (broken down into JK-6, Grade 7-8 and including FI breakdown)

R: Mrs. Agar agreed to prepare a map with breakdown of enrolment by projection areas to email out to the Working Group (broken down into JK-6, Grade 7-8 and including FI breakdown) with 2016 numbers.

Q: What will happen to the new Vista Hills students who want the French Immersion Program if the program isn't offered at the new school?

R: Mrs. Agar responded that the way the FI program works it needs approximately 18 or more families interested at the Grade 1 level to introduce the program at the new school (if enough enrolment for both FI and regular track programs). For the higher grades already enrolled in the FI program, they would be allowed to stay as would their siblings, whether or not they are also enrolled in the FI program.

C: A parent representative commented that is one of her concerns with the new school opening with only 240 students as she is aware that there is a heavy concentration of FI students living in

projection areas M and N; those FI students will not be attending the new school, further reducing enrolment at the new school which will also have an impact on programming.

C: Scenario 8 would allow for a higher enrollment of students in the short term and should help mitigate the loss of FI program students.

C: Scenario 8 will likely make area F very upset as they will have to move to the new school and then back to Abraham Erb PS.

R: Mrs. Agar responded that we would grandfather the area F students affected by phase 2 of Scenario 8 the option to remain at the new School until they are finished. The new boundary would apply to new residents or children not yet registered. She noted that will not always be popular either as it has the potential to have siblings or neighbours attending different schools.

C: Area F residents are aware that they are split in different directions and they would like to be a unit.

Q: How many students are in area F and how many are in the FI program?

R: Mrs. Agar responded that there are 125 students in area F and she will have to look into how many of those are French Immersion students.

C: A parent representative commented that she prefers Scenario 6 or 8 because it takes a larger contingent of students from Edna Staebler PS to the new school (areas F, M and N) for better continuity for those students, keeping them together with more peers.

C: Mrs. Agar noted that it is not going to be an easy suggestion that we carve off approximately half of Edna Staebler PS's boundary. It will be difficult to decide on any of these scenarios presented tonight.

C: A parent representative commented that she has spoken with parents in areas M and N and they are very aware of the overcrowding at Edna Staebler PS and are aware that they are the logical sections to be move to the new school; if they have to move; moving to a new school is an okay option. Areas M and N are currently walking to Edna Staebler PS and a move to the new school will also likely make those parents happy that their children will not have to cross Columbia once the subdivision builds out and all traffic converges onto Columbia.

Q: Can area M and N walk to the new school?

R: Mrs. Agar responded that area N is fully within walking distance to Edna Staebler PS today; however, Columbia is going to be more of a thoroughfare as the Vista Hills area develops – it will be more of a challenge for those kids to get across Columbia. A small portion of area N (up to Zurich Dr.) and a very small portion of area F would be within walking distance to the new school.

C: Area F may have safety issues walking between the two storm water management ponds.

R: Mrs. Agar responded that the walkways that will connect to Columbia Forest and another connecting at Lady Slipper Place will be a well maintained lit path which had been a special request by the Board for the Sir John A. Macdonald Secondary School students to be able to walk from the new Vista Hills subdivision.

The Working Group agreed to present the following three Scenarios as a starting point to elicit feedback at Public Meeting #1:

- Scenario 6
- Scenario 7
- Scenario 8

Mrs. Agar advised that these are not our final scenarios; these are a sampling of what we are looking at and will be used to garner feedback from the community.

Q: Principal Tinnes asked if each of the scenarios presented will have an accompanying rationale with pros and cons.

R: Mrs. Agar responded that she would provide rationale for the scenarios for the public meeting.

C: Scenario 6 enrolments are very high by 2024 for most of the schools; can areas D and F be split for Scenario 6 as well?

R: Mrs. Agar responded that it is worthwhile to show just for that reason, but advised that she could show Scenario 6 and advise that further rejigging of the boundaries would be necessary to address 2024 enrolments.

Q: Would Scenarios 6, 7 and 8 all require construction of additions?

R: Mrs. Agar responded that Scenarios 7 and 8 requires an addition at both Laurelwood PS and Abraham Erb PS; Scenario 6 does not require an addition at Abraham Erb PS (remains JK-6 and under capacity) but would require an addition at Laurelwood PS.

C: Mr. Cuomo responded that by 2024 we will be short by almost 400 pupil places so we will have to recommend some construction.

C: Mrs. Agar noted that Laurelwood PS will require construction under all scenarios.

C: Principle Oberle noted that it is easy to measure impact on sites that already exist – but we also need to consider the impact that high enrolment (as in Scenario 6) will have on the new smaller sites.

R: Mrs. Agar agreed and noted that as with Edna Staebler PS we had anticipated the use of the field in the park site – but to date it hasn't been useable. We don't know for sure that the same won't happen at the new school.

Q: Is there a minimum number of students required to open a new school?

R: Mrs. Agar responded that we are required to be over 80 percent capacity in the first five years.

C: Mr. Cuomo commented that he would question an enrolment of 240 students as being a viable opening number for the new school and Trustees would likely not approve that recommendation.

C: Scenario 6 and 7 both have issues but could be worth showing with possible tweaking; Scenario 8 seems to work best but will have political consequences.

C: Principal Tinnes noted that Scenario 8 demonstrates a phased-in approach and we are cognizant of area F. The most important number in his opinion is the 2024 number because it's the number the Board will have to present to the Ministry to show why we need funding for construction.

Q: Is Scenario 8 the least disruptive to students?

R: No. Scenario 8 is most disruptive, specifically to area F because of the phasing. Mrs. Agar advised that we might be able to alleviate some of the disruption with transitioning and grandfathering.

Mrs. Agar noted that we could look at a future Scenario that is similar in phasing to Scenario 8 but does not add the Grade 7-8 program to Abraham Erb PS instead in phase 2 (in 2020) we could move the Grade 7-8 program back Laurelwood PS; this could buy us time to build the business case to build an addition at Laurelwood PS and get funding and construct it and then move the kids back into that space and would eliminate the need for construction at two facilities.

4. Public Meeting #1

Thursday, April 23, 2015 from 7:00 – 8:30 PM at Abraham Erb PS, Gymnasium

Mrs. Agar advised that she would present and provide:

- Display boards for Scenario 6, 7 and 8 with pros and cons, walkability, safety concerns.
Mrs. Agar noted that we are not married to these scenarios and that changes can be made and new scenarios can be developed going forward. Presenting these scenarios will give us the opportunity to get feedback from the community.
- Boundary Study Objectives and Goals.
- Display Boards with the new school design from the Vista Hills engagement night will also be displayed showing the site plan, floor plan, facade and 3D rendering.

Public Meeting Advertising

Printed flyers were given to the school principals for distribution

All schools received the digital copy via email

Arrangements have been made to have flyer posted at the City of Waterloo

Notice will be posted on the Board's website and twitter feeds

Schools are asked to advertise on their reader boards

Laurelwood Neighborhood Association newsletter has been notified

Vista Hills subdivision builders to be provided with an electronic copy

Public Meetings

- **Public Meeting #1:** April 23, 2015, 7:00-8:30 PM at Abraham Erb Public School.
- **Public Meeting #2:** TBD

5. Roundtable

Mrs. Agar thanked the Working Group for attending and adjourned the meeting at 6:20 PM.

Action Items:

- **Presentation to be emailed out to the Working Group for further consideration.**
- **Mrs. Agar to determine the number of students in area F that have been affected by the multiple boundary changes.**
- **Mrs. Agar to look at further splitting areas F and D for Scenarios 7 and 8.**
- **Mrs. Agar to prepare a map with breakdown of enrolment by projection area to email out to the Working Group (broken down into JK-6, Grade 7-8 and including FI breakdown) with 2016 numbers.**
- **Mrs. Agar to create new boundary option with area D at Abraham Erb PS and area F (JK-8) at Laurelwood PS.**
- **Mrs. Agar to develop a new Scenario with phasing to (similar to Scenario 8) but does not add the Grade 7-8 program to Abraham Erb PS; instead takes 7-8 students back to Laurelwood PS after an addition has been constructed.**
- **Principals to advertise Public Meeting #1 on school reader boards**

Future Meetings:

Working Group Meetings:

- **Working Group #5: Thursday, May 14, 2015, 4:45 – 6:15 PM at Abraham Erb PS, Library**

Public Meetings:

- **Public Meeting #1: Thurs., April 23, 2015, 7:00 – 8:30 PM at Abraham Erb Public School**
- **Public Meeting #2: TBD**