

Disadvantages of Option 22

- It is almost identical to option 32
- Presentation from the board says that this proposal is balanced in terms of physical school geometry: symmetries are not what we are looking for: this may look good on a map but it is not practical nor does it meet the basic criteria of the board
- This closes the largest school that already meets the criteria of the board: Armstrong has Jk-8 facilities that are already being utilized by three communities, Eastmount and Queensdale already attend Armstrong for schooling
- This impacts the largest student body in one community as possible, over 300 students from one single community will be asked to divide up when this school already performs the functions needed by the board
- Armstrong is the most centrally located school in this scenario, yet it asks the children of this community to separate and go to schools to the East and West of it
- Breaks up the partnerships that are established at Armstrong: the partnerships with the four higher learning facilities of Mohawk College, Brock University, Redeemer College, Devry and the Nurses all of whom now attend Armstrong to learn and share their knowledge with students
- Important and unique programs offered at Armstrong will be lost, after school care and pick up of students, all sporting activities, the nutrition program, the early years program and a unique program to help build the confidence of the girls in the school
- Heading East and West, to either Queensdale or Eastmount to schools that are NOT easily accessible by public transit as Armstrong is, Queensdale has only one bus that drives by their doors and in most cases it would require two buses to access this school, Eastmount situation with regards to public access is no better, Armstrong is fully accessible by public transit with 3-4 buses outside its doors, not only does this make it more accessible it also makes school trips easier as the bus may be utilized by the students also as opposed to hiring buses for trips
- Also by sending the students of Armstrong to these two schools that are not fully accessible by public transit puts more private tires on the pavement, meaning more private citizens will drive their children to school, this will create much heavier traffic flows in these two neighbourhoods whose streets were not designed for such density of traffic, this creates a Safety problem with regards to traffic
- The community of Armstrong and the two neighbouring communities, Queensdale and Eastmount will lose out on facilities and extra-curricular activities, since these two schools have significantly smaller facilities than that of Armstrong,(it has ample green space, two gyms etc.), the other communities will not be able to sustain the types or sizes of after school and weekend venues, Especially not Eastmount. This will negatively affect the Quality of Learning Environment that the board and parents are looking for.
- Eastmount and its property of only 1.7 acres is far too small to accommodate this proposal, this school would not be able to add one simple parking space if required, therefore any type of expansion needed now or in the future will be impossible, you couldn't even set a portable on the property if it was necessary to do so

- Eastmount relies solely on the Public property that is adjacent to it. There is no written or verbal agreement between the city and the board that implies any type of agreement of use between the two parties.
- This public property beside Eastmount is not even fully fenced in like the majority of the Board properties are
- Anyone from the public may access and use these public grounds as long as they are conforming within the law and the city by-laws. The students, staff and the public citizen are merely guests on this property. The Staff at neither Eastmount nor the Board of Education have the right to confront, or engage, or challenge any law abiding citizen that is legally using the public property. This means any member of the public can use the property legally to have a baseball game, a picnic, walk their leashed dog through a group of students at any time during even schools hours. The school wouldn't even have the right to ask the private public citizen that is legally using the park, to even keep the noise level down
- The use of public lands invites the comingling of our students with members of the public that we are not aware of. The term Stranger Danger comes to mind. Exposing children to this is not right. In a typical school the property is fenced in with entrances and exits that can be monitored by staff for children leaving the grounds or unknown people entering the grounds, and the Staff and Board DO have the right to engage and challenge any individual as they deem necessary. EASTMOUNT CANNOT OFFER THIS COMFORT OR ASSURANCE TO THE STUDENTS OR PARENTS
- The publically owned property that is adjacent to Eastmount could be gone next year, next week or tomorrow for that matter. The city may do as it wishes with it when they want. This means that there are no assurances at all that the heavy reliance of this property by EASTMOUNT will even be available for use in the future. There is no consideration of this mentioned at all in this proposal. What would the Board and Eastmount do at this point to accommodate students and promote a positive Learning Environment? There is nothing they could do Eastmount is landlocked. All this students are to be accommodated in "x" amount of square footage for recreation in a school that can offer already little to none independently
- It is not right to ask students of any community to give up something that they already have plenty of in Armstrong,(green space both front and back, two gyms etc.) to go to a school that can offer no green space, undersized facilities with absolutely no chance for this school to expand if necessary. This is not to anyone's advantage to lose more than what is being gained by keeping Eastmount open
- Eastmount site size doesn't even come close to meeting the boards criteria of approx. 5 acres, nor does it meet the jk-8 500 student criteria that is being sought after by the board
- Eastmount does not support any local businesses, there is no walk to amenities for the student to enjoy or to encourage exercise, it is not easily accessible to the public via public transit, (a major consideration for the public and the board). Armstrong currently accomplishes all of this, it does support a large community based local economy, it does have many walk to venues such as Inch Park Rec Center, a Public Library, it does have committed bike lanes to encourage exercise along Queensdale Ave from Upper Wentworth to Upper Wellington etc. Armstrong is

fully publically accessible to the public and the students NEITHER QUEENSDALE NOR EASTMOUNT CAN SAY THE SAME.

- The streets adjoining Eastmount are narrow and already congested with traffic and parking. Eastmount competes with the nearby hospital for parking. Adding more students increases the volume of traffic flow on streets that were not designed for this type of density, this is a SAFETY concern
- Add a bus whether it be a bus for trips,(which typically larger), or a regular bus for students or the handicap students and you will find that there are absolutely no safe places for either the buses, pedestrians, parents picking up or dropping off student, no safe place at all to conduct such common everyday occurrences. There is also no way to remedy this situation as Eastmount simply does not have the space to do so. At Armstrong the streets are wider and were widen some years ago to accommodate traffic flow and there is also plenty of room to necessitate any changes if needed
- Large majority of students from this area for grades 7-8 will have to be bused to Linden Park
- Those that may walk will be required to cross two major streets Upper Wentworth and Fennell Ave. ttwo very busy intersections that jeopardize the student's safety. In the recent pas there have already been two students hit by cars on Fennell Ave. This proposal doesn't address the SAFETY CONCERNS OF THE STUDENTS
- Queensdale unlike Armstrong is: not very accessible to the public or students via public transit, in most cases two buses would have to be utilized to access this school making it not very user friendly and put more private tires on the road to deliver and pick up their children.
- This increases traffic flow in neighbourhoods not designed for the density of this change and decreases pedestrian and student safety
- Lack of accessibility will encourage the need for the hiring of school buses for trips rather than the utilization of public transit
- The facilities are much smaller here than that of Armstrong, gym size would have to be modified and this would impact Queensdales green space
- Children will lose much needed and valuable school programs, after school programs and weekend programs already offered and utilized at Armstrong
- Queensdale already shares its streets with the catholic school and the nearby Adult Learning Center
- Queensadle doesn't support any local business, or have any of the walk to amenities that have been mentioned before that Armstrong has
- Queensdale doesn't meet the criteria for 500 students or the jk-8 format
- A large majority of the students from both the Armstrong and Queensdale communities will have to be bused to Linden Park, this will again encourage parents to drive their children to school increasing the volume of traffic
- Students that may walk are once again forced to cross two major intersections, Upper wellington and once again Fennell Ave, Again student safety hasn't been considered in this proposal

- There are too many transitions for the students going from an existing jk-8 school at Armstrong only to be sent to schools east and west that can only offer a jk-6 program, leaving student again to move to yet another school at Linden Park for grades 7-8
- There is no mention of a backup plan for the Linden Park students and all those affected in the event that the Linden Park property, like that of Hill Park has been offered in the same type of land trade off to subsidize other projects. The public was not made aware of this in the case of Hill Park they were only informed after the entire ARC process
- We have no assurances that this will not be the case for Linden Park but we also have no backup plan stated for this in this proposal
- Closes the only jk-8 escarpment school at Armstrong and moves everything east, west and south
- The proximity of the new proposed jk-8 Linden Park location is less than one km away from Franklin Road School also offering jk-8
- This is inefficient use of land resources and space to put the same facilities almost side by side
- Confusing ill explained details as to whether Ridgemount is to remain open or not
- The numbers reflect it closing but not staying open which would have a significant impact on student numbers at Pauline Johnson/Cardinal Heights
- This proposal doesn't address this issue at all or how the numbers including costs would be impacted
- Where will the children of Linden Park and all affected communities attend school during the extensive renovations needed at Linden Park? This proposal has no plan for this
- This proposal has absolutely no timelines given
- This proposal makes no mention at all of the extensive costs and construction needed at Linden Park to provide this school with a heating system that is independent of Hill Park
- Franklin Road student population is under utilized
- If Ridgemount is to remain open or closed it would still mean that the majority of students not only from this area but also that of Cardinal Heights will have to be bused for grades 7-8, once again this encourages parents to drive their children to school increasing traffic flow
- Those who are not being bused are once again having their students safety jeopardized by having, to once again, cross two major streets both Upper Wellington and Mohawk Road
- This suggests that student SAFETY was not given much regard or priority in the Proposal
- The proposed new school disregard the fact that there is a school almost adjacent to the proposed site given on the map, it just isn't shown.
- The board does not currently own any of this land
- This proposal does not give any type of financial detail for the cost of purchasing the land, if any is available for purchase at all. It fails to address the associated costs of servicing a site, the re-zoning of property, the variances and all the timely and costly public meeting that are associated with this.
- If someone or a group of people were to appeal this decision it would end up at the OMB, which is a time consuming and expensive ordeal. Again this proposal does not address this
- How would this school be funded?

- Where are the projected numbers for all the affected schools if this new school is built none are made available
- This proposal is being presented as if it were closing three schools when in fact the plan suggests that it may be only two if Ridgemount were to remain open, it is very misleading
- It closes Ridgemount one of the most up to date facilities that the board owns
- This proposal offers minimal school closures, maximum impact to one community that already serves 3 communities as a jk-8 school, this suggests that the board operate and maintain a large amount of school s that don't meet the minimum criteria of a jk-8 format or of 500 students
- Insufficient use of existing facilities and infrastructure
- This option has the most expensive renewal costs at over 28 million. It also provides the lowest potential savings in terms of renewal and administrative costs

Disadvantages of option 32:

1. Options 32 and 22 are virtually the same
2. This option closes the largest populated school Armstrong with over 300 students, that is an enormous impact to have on one community and school
3. This option closes the only school, Armstrong that now services all three of the escarpment communities, Armstrong, Eastmount, and Queensdale – it is the only school that offers a jk-8 format out of these three schools – the only school that both Queensdale and Eastmount now attend- wouldn't only make sense that a transition to Armstrong would be that much easier on all the students since they already attend Armstrong
4. Closing Armstrong will lose important partnerships with 4 major higher learning institutions, Mohawk College, Devry, Brock University, Redeemer College and Nurses who attend Armstrong regularly to learn and spread their knowledge to the students
5. Loss of programs at Armstrong the sporting activities, the after school care and pick up of children, the early years programme, the nutrition program and a unique confidence building program specifically developed to give girls more self-confidence within themselves and in the world
6. Eastmount facilities offer numerous problems, the first being that 1.7 acres of land it really too small to accommodate the needs of the students, - this asks the students to leave behind Armstrong that has ample green space as well as two gymnasiums, surrounding road structures that were designed for the extra volume of traffic etc.-leave all this and more to be compressed into a school that is one third the size of Armstrong, the students wouldn't be gaining anything from this in fact they would be losing a lot more-after school functions on weekdays and weekends-why?-the school facilities the grounds and the supporting streets simply cannot facilitate the functions and needs that this extracurricular events need – we have a school for that now – it's called Armstrong
7. The argument from Eastmount will be that “we have all this city land we can use”- that is correct PUBLIC PROPERTY NOT BOARD PROPERTY- just some facts about CITY PROPERTY, this particular property isn't even fenced in, there is no agreement between the board or the city regarding the use of this land whether it be verbal or written, the city may do as it wishes with the property at any given time, fence it off, sell it etc., there are no guarantees that it will be there next year, next week or even tomorrow for that matter- here is a CHILD SAFETY FACT any citizen may use public properties as long as they are performing within the confines of the law and municipal by-laws; this means that any individual at any time may play baseball, soccer, walk there leashed animal through the group of school children unchallenged-unchallenged as the board staff does not have the legal authority to challenge any private citizen in this case-both parties both school and citizen are merely visitors to this park-at board owned property, which is usually properly fenced in if you see a six foot figure playing soccer beside a three foot figure suddenly it becomes a rightful concern that may be legally addressed by board staff-in this situation with Eastmount using a public park for school grounds simply as the school does not have enough space leaves the children prone and vulnerable to the catch phrase “STRANGER DANGER”

8. Eastmount can't expand anywhere if needed there is simply no room to do so and the gym there leaves much to be desired-unlike the gym(s) at Armstrong, the one that actually could accommodate a public meeting
9. The adjacent side streets compete with the local hospitals for parking and are already narrow and congested: the more students added the more volume of traffic added to streets that were not designed to carry such density-add a bus to this and then you create real safety concerns, and yes there will be buses even in this so-called walkable school scenario, there will be buses for the handicap students-all this vehicular congestion in a neighbourhood not prepared or designed for creates a huge SAFETY PROBLEM for the students, parents and pedestrians that will be utilizing the streets at this time
10. Eastmount or Queensdale do not support any type of local economy, nor do they have any walk to venues to promote exercise, (Armstrong does, Inch Park, Library etc.)
11. Both Eastmount and Queensdale in this proposal are very difficult to access via public transit, a person would have to get two buses to access Queensdale school, the same true of Eastmount, (Armstrong has a variety of buses to choose from and also including a new dedicated bicycle lane running east and west from Upper Wellington to Upper Wentworth along Queensdale, this will encourage the students to bike to school.
12. This proposal suggests closing the most heavily populated, broadly used, centrally located school out of all three of the escarpment schools, Armstrong, to split the children up sending east to Eastmount for jk-6 and west to Queendale for jk-6, this is the exact opposite flow of students as what happens now
13. Both Eastmount and Queensdale are significantly smaller and therefore cannot offer the same facilities found at Armstrong, these children will be losing out if this occurs
14. The after school and weekend events will be lost if the kids have to go to Eastmount and Queendale
15. Queensdale already shares it's streets with the nearby catholic school and adult learning center
16. Queensdale and Eastmount don't meet the criteria of the jk-8 desired outcome or the student body numbers of 500, (Armstrong is already equipped to do so)
17. This proposal much like proposal 22 only closes the same two schools, Ridgemount and Armstrong
18. Queensdale grade 7-8 go to Linden Park, this will require most of these students to be bused, and of the ones that may walk there are serious safety concerns that this proposal does not consider, the children that must walk must also be forced to cross to major streets Upper Wellington and Fennell Ave. Fennell Ave has already had two accidents involving students crossing in the recent past, now your suggesting that these unnecessary student transitions from one school that attains a grade 6 level that they must travel across two busy main streets to attend a school that is not in their community, at Linden Park, for grade 7-8 and yet SAFETY DOESN'T seem to be a concern with this proposal-sounds like someone is only out to protect their own self-interests not the children's, this issue needs to be discussed further
19. The children of Armstrong area and Eastmount will be required to attend Franklin Road for grades 7-8, most students in the Armstrong area will have to be bused and some from the Eastmount area also, once again SAFETY has been ignored in this proposal, some children that

have to walk to Franklin Road from the Armstrong area will be required also to cross two major and busy roads Upper Wentworth and once again Fennell Ave(which has a history concerning children and vehicles), the children of Eastmount will face the same challenge themselves crossing Fennell, AGAIN the SAFETY of these CHILDREN has been completely ignored, WHY WOULD BE THE QUESTION? To make some numbers work. Crossing two major streets is most definitely not in any child's best interest

20. The boundaries of Sherwood Secondary School will absorb most if not all of the Eastmount residents and the Franklin Road residents. This means the children of Armstrong once again get divided from their peers, initially from the split up of over the 300 student base, and again once when they leave Franklin Road these students will be required as per the boundaries set up for McNab High school to attend that school not Sherwood as their peers will be. If you are truly looking deep into the long term plan you would see that this is indeed the case. Displacing those three hundred students at Armstrong now also gives them another separation from their peers to look forward to
21. Linden Park is to be renovated into a jk-8 facility but under the renovation section for this school there is no mention of any installation of any type of independent ,(from Hill Park), heating source. During these EXTENSIVE RENOVATIONS where will all these children be attending school this includes the children imported from the Ridgemount, and Queensdale areas. There is no contingency plan mentioned at all for this in the proposal
22. The proximity of all the jk-8 schools in this area is quite dense, Franklin Road is less than one km away from Linden Park and Linden Park is less than 1 km away from Cardinal Heights-why are they all lumped in together while leaving the escarpment residents with no jk-8 facility at all anymore
23. As one of the ARC committee members commented "I like because every little square has a school in it" wonderful sentiments except with one glaring exception the escarpment now has no jk-8 facility at all, everything is being pushed east, west and south. Pretty does not make practical
24. It is not clear by the description given where the former students of Ridgemount will be attending school; the description says either Linden Park or Pauline Johnson/Cardinal Heights and the boundaries drawn indicate Linden Park. Which is it? This would grossly affect the amount of usage in either school. Which numbers reflect which scenario?
25. If the students are going to attend Linden Park most will have to be bused and yes those that must walk are once again faced with the dangers of crossing two major streets Upper Wellington and Mohawk Road, this time the risks are much higher as we are dealing with much younger students in this case. SAFETY ONCE AGAIN FOR THIS ACTIVITY IGNORED, student SAFETY should be paramount and at the top of the list but in this proposal as with 22 it doesn't seem prevalent at all.
26. There are way to many transitions for students in this proposal many of them jeopardizing student safety, it closes only two schools and once again has the board maintain schools that are not jk-8 or at the 500 student mark, it closes down centrally located schools leaving escarpment communities with no jk-8 facility, such as Armstrong that already serves three communities, is a fdk-8 facility and is easily accessible, it divides up the largest community of

over 300 students to send them to sub-standard facilities that are not capable of providing the services the students get now-these students will lose not gain from this transition

27. Linden Park School may in all likelihood have been offered to developers as part of a package deal to obtain the land needed to build a new South High School. It is not impossible to consider this may be true. After all Hill Park shortly after the ARC was then decided to close down earlier by the board because all along it was promised to developers, the public was not made aware of this until now, the same could be true of Linden Park- what is the back-up plan for this proposal if this happens
28. In the public presentation of this proposal it states that the timelines are the most practical. No mention of the new boiler system that will have to be installed at Linden Park, or the structure that will have to house it, if a new build is proposed the timelines of 2015 would not be feasible unless of course the board already has the surveys, designs, plans, demolition and construction permits and the general contract already signed with a constructor. Not to mention the possible public forum meeting that would be implemented along with this. Unless all these things are in place the 2015 timeline is out the window.
29. One of the highest costs coming in at just over 26 million, one of the lowest projected renewable and administrative savings of all the proposals on the table

Advantages of Option 34

- Has the most minimal impact on a community by only separating only approx. 152 students as compared to options 22 and 32 that ask one community of 300 to divide
- Makes good use of existing structures
- Well balanced school distribution
- Maintains Armstrong School that is already being used for FDK-8 use
- Armstrong is the most centrally located school in the escarpment area as compared to that of Eastmount and Queensdale
- Armstrong is fully accessible to the general public and students by public transit, approx. 4 buses run by the front doors of this school, the other two community schools of Queensdale and Eastmount cannot not offer this simple yet important service
- Keeps Armstrong open a school that the students and communities of Queensdale and Eastmount currently attend and utilize as a fdk-8 facility
- Keeping Armstrong open would minimize the transition impact on the students of Queensdale and Eastmount as they already attend this school
- Armstrong offers services and facilities that Queensdale and Eastmount cannot such as:
 1. Armstrong has the support of and supports a large local community economy base, the other two schools do not
 2. Armstrong offers two gyms, (one gym is the only gym capable of holding a public meeting out of all the schools in the ARC), has ample well treed green space for students
 3. As stated before it is easily accessible to the public and students, this accessibility to the wide range of public transportation also offers the school and the students the opportunity to utilize this transit for shorter smaller day trips for the students as opposed to hiring a separate private bus to do so
 4. Armstrong encourages exercise for students as it has a dedicated bike lane on Queensdale Ave that goes from Upper Wellington to Upper Wentworth St.
 5. Armstrong has walk to amenities that the other two schools do not, such as a public library, Inch Park Rec Center etc. , this is vital for not only exercise but also in the maintenance of positive learning experience
 6. Armstrong offers many after school programs and weekend programs that would be lost if this school were to close and given the restrictions of Queensdale and Eastmount they would not be replaced
 7. A community policing center is situated 1 block to the east
 8. Traffic infrastructure has already been considered and control and safety measures have already been firmly established, such as the recent addition of a push activated stop light at the northwest corner of the property on Concession Street, a full time crossing guard on the northeast corner of Concession street, (a consideration for student safety that wasn't a priority in options 22 or 32)
 9. Unlike that of Fennell Ave. there has never been an incident involving a student and that of any vehicle on any of the adjacent streets that surround Armstrong

10. Side streets are significantly larger and wider than most to account for any extra traffic that may occur, drop and pick up of children either by private car or bus can be and is easily accomplished without any safety concerns or incidents
 11. If drop of zones were required Armstrong has the available property to accommodate this if needed the other two schools and particularly Eastmount cannot accommodate this
- Armstrong will finally be released from being locked into an ARC process for the last 5 years and with that all the capital funding will also be released so that maintenance that other schools have enjoyed may be initiated on Armstrong
 - Armstrong has after school pick up and daycare and a breakfast program
 - Armstrong can be easily retrofitted to accommodate and fix any deficiencies found within the school
 - Largest facility and on the ground capacity of all the schools
 - Maintains for the escarpment a FDK-8 school instead of relocating everything east, west and south
 - Armstrong has the early years program
 - Armstrong has Partnerships with 4 different higher learning institutions,(Mohawk, Redeemer College, Brook University, and DeVry) currently come into Armstrong train, share their knowledge with the students
 - Nursing programs also attend Armstrong every week at Armstrong
 - Armstrong has a unique program offering the girls of the school confidence building skills, Life skills to be carried with them
 - Armstrong has an early years program 4 days per week
 - Armstrong has a nutrition program, Ipads and Smart boards, all sports are also available
 - Armstrong has all the current structure in place to provide WiFi service it is just waiting to be released from the ARC process so that the funds may be released and the program fully implemented
 - Presently meets the boards criteria of a jk-8 format with approx. 500 students
 - This type of format will offer more programs to the student sand the increased student population will mean that cost of trips, sporting activities may be cheaper thus this expands the opportunities to some families and students to take part in such activities that they would normally be excluded from, this is what positive learning is, all inclusive not exclusive
 - NOTE IN ORDER TO LET THIS OPTION MOVE FORWARD THE TWO SCHOOLS OF PAULINE JOHNSON AND CARDINAL HEIGHTS MUST BE MERGED BACK TOGETHER AS THEY WERE IN OPTION 11 SO THAT THIS OPTION REMAINS VIABLE, THE NUMBERS OF OPTION 11 FOR CARDINAL HEIGHTS WERE BTWEEN 89% and98%....PLEASE MAKE THIS SMALL ADJUSTMENT BACK AS IT REQUIRES NO NEW BUILDS
 - This option keeps students well grouped together and with fewer transitions
 - Lowest cost option of them all with higher potential savings then all the other options
 - Doesn` t require children to cross two major streets to attend school, it actually is concerned with student safety as opposed to the options of 22 and 32

- Just by tweaking the numbers at Cardinal Heights by closing Pauline Johnson and merging these students with the students of Cardinal Heights as was originally proposed the numbers at this school would be more that acceptable ranging from 89-98%, I see no reason why this adjustment cannot be made as it involves no new builds
- A strong statement, sentiment, and message of support were given to the ARC at one of the first public meetings that carried a powerful message to the board, the trustees, our communities and the ARC committee. This was a 2084 name petition that has been signed by not only members of the Armstrong community but also by members of the Queensdale community, Eastmount and other surrounding supporting community members that are all concerned about the potential of Armstrong. These individuals recognize the value of service that this Armstrong gives to all our communities and **DO NOT WANT IT TO BE CLOSED**. If we are considering the public's opinions and input what broader more bold statement could be made than those 2084 names signed by concerned members of all our diverse communities. This statement and documentation should strongly be considered when deciding on the future of Armstrong

Disadvantages of option 34

- The two schools of Pauline Johnson/Cardinal Heights for some reason have not been merged together if they had been as they should be the enrollment numbers would be just fine. Is it possible to make this simple change to reflect the more positive numbers that were originally part of the number 11 proposal before it was merged with number 6. It would involve no new builds or complicated boundary changes just a simple merge of two schools that sit side by side on the same property. This would bring the capacity numbers of Cardinal Heights back to 89-98%

Advantages of Option 35

- Options 22 and 32 maximize community impact by dividing up more than 300 students from the one community of Armstrong this option
- This option provides a more balanced sensible approach which minimizes the impact on communities not maximize it
- It only divides up approx. the 152 students at Linden Park
- The students from Linden Park would only be asked to cross one major intersection that already has a stop light at Upper Wentworth and Franklin Road, this could be further safeguarded with a crossing guard
- The students from Linden Park that are attending Queensdale are only required to cross on major street at Fennell Ave., but this crossing to, that is adjacent to St. Peter and Paul school already has an existing light and crossing guard at the students disposal
- The large majority of the students from Eastmount that must now attend Armstrong may now walk and once again there are street lights at both upper Wentworth and Queensdale Ave and Upper Wentworth and Concession, addition crossing guards could be added to ensure student safety
- This scenario, unlike that of 22 and 32, considers student safety while crossing these streets and makes common sense use of existing traffic protection measures
- This proposal presents a really balanced approach in terms of school locations and utilization of existing already purposed use property
- There are none of the complicated transitions that we have seen from options 22 and 32 for students to manipulate within and complicating transitions that the students would have to adjust to
- A vast majority of this option does present walkable schools
- Student distribution numbers are good with the exception of Pauline Johnson/Cardinal Heights. But with little to no effort these two schools could be easily combined as they currently occupy the same space and the two schools could combine to make one school with an addition to Cardinal Heights. This involves no new builds or complicated boundary changes. This would bring the student population utilization to approx. 89-98% which is good it would also meet the boards criteria of a JK-8 school with numbers approaching or slightly exceeding 500
- It makes good efficient use of existing structures and surrounding street structures
- Keeping Armstrong open makes clear and efficient sense as Eastmount cannot support or accomplish the following as Armstrong currently does:
 1. Armstrong is currently a FDK-8 facility that already accepts the students from both Queensdale and Eastmount
 2. Since the students from Eastmount already attend the much larger facility of Armstrong there would be less student impact during the transition from school to school
 3. Armstrong supports a large community based economy and has the current support of these business, Eastmount does not

4. Armstrong has street infrastructure that is in place and proven to work, it has on Concession street a recent push activated stop light for pedestrians on the north/west corner of the property, a full time crossing guard can also be found on Concession on the north/east corner of the property, the streets are significantly designed wider than those of Eastmount so that it may accommodate the traffic flow safely, as it does now with regards to bus drop off and pick up as well as parent drop off and pick up, if found necessary Armstrong has the land to accommodate any change necessary, Eastmount cannot presently offer this, which jeopardizes student safety, nor does it have the land to accommodate the changes that would be necessary changes. The streets at Eastmount are narrow and ill designed for vehicular traffic
5. There has never been an incident at Armstrong whatsoever regarding a student and a vehicle, whether it be for drop off or pick up of students or just the basic function of crossing the streets and that is solely because of planning and the expediting of this plan to ensue student safety. It must work; there are no incidents to date. This should alleviate some of the parents' concerns over traffic concerns. The concern would lay Fennell Ave. that has already has two incidents involving students and cars and option 22 and 32 don't not consider this as this option does
6. Armstrong currently has two gyms one that was ironically large enough to accommodate a public meeting, something that no other school in the ARC can accomplish, it also has a well treed and ample green space, Eastmount is not independent on its 1.7 acre lot as it depends solely on the public property that adjoins it, it is not self-sufficient.
7. Armstrong play areas are fully fenced in Eastmounts are not
8. The sheer size of Armstrong and its grounds over that of Eastmount can offer students a better learning environment, attain and maintain more programs
9. Armstrong has the ease of public access via public transit making it very accessible by both students and the public, Eastmount does not have this type of access. This accessibility to public transit also offers the students of Armstrong the ability to utilize this transit for smaller day trips eliminating the need to hire private more costly bus transit
10. Armstrong offers a variety of extra-curricular activities that are already enjoyed by members of the Eastmount Community
11. Armstrong has a multitude of walk to amenities that other schools cannot provide such as: a nearby public library, Inch Park Rec Center etc., this encourages exercise and helps to maintain an optimal learning environment
12. Armstrong has dedicated bike lanes that may be found on Queensdale Ave running from Upper Wentworth to Upper Wellington, this also encourages exercise
13. A community policing center is only one block away

- Armstrong programs include:
 1. The early years program 4 days a week
 2. A nutrition program
 3. After school child care and pick up
 4. Ipads, smart boards, all sports available
 5. The largest facility with the largest on the ground capacity
 6. Armstrong has partnerships with 4 different higher learning facilities such as Mohawk College, Redeemer College, Brock University, Devry, all currently attend Armstrong and share their knowledge with the students
 7. Nursing programs also attend Armstrong
 8. A unique program for the girls students that encourages them to aspire to greater levels of self confidence

- Armstrong after 5 years of being fiscally locked into an ARC program with no funds being released will now have these capital funds released so that this school may also enjoy all the revitalization and maintenance that it requires
- Armstrong may and can be easily retrofitted to accommodate any deficiencies found with this school
- This proposal maintains that the escarpment community will have a school in place centrally that will serve the needs of future generations instead of sending everything to non-central locations, east west and south to schools that don't even meet the minimum of the board criteria
- Armstrong meets the expected JK-8 format with approx. 500 students
- The increased volume of students will benefit all students by offering and funding a broader range of programs. This population expansion should also make sports and trips etc. readily more attainable for those families and students that in most cases couldn't afford in the past to let their children participate. Opportunity for all student demographics will now be enhanced, allowing more of an inclusive learning environment rather than exclusive
- This option is the second lowest cost to implement with higher projected renewal and administrative saving
- Grouping and transitions of students seem sensible and are achieved with a minimal of impact on any particular community. Also student safety with regards to streets are better addressed in this option
- The purpose of these public meeting is to address public concerns and utilize public input and feedback in order to make the best informed decision that is in the students best interest. I believe some time ago at a public meeting that the voices of many communities were voiced quite prominently. These voices were expressed by a 2084 name petition that was presented to the ARC. These 2084 names were collected from a wide variety of communities, those of Armstrong, Queendale, Eastmount and the numerous surrounding communities. This petition demonstrates clearly the interest and the importance of keeping Armstrong open not only for all

our communities but for student's needs and 2084 members of our own communities recognize this.

Disadvantages of option 35

- For some reason again as in 34 the two schools of Pauline Johnson/Cardinal Heights have not been merged, which is an easy task considering they share the same lot and are side by side. There are no re-builds, no boundary changes, just a simple addition to Cardinal Heights to combine both these schools. This would bring it into line with a jk-8 format and a student body of approx. 500 students, which is what we are hoping to achieve. Why not do this then to preserve the integrity of this proposal.

Dear Accommodation Review Committee/Members of the School Board,

If you close Linden Park school you will affect the children **immensely**. The Board and other area trustees need to wake up and realize all the support and letters and signatures are in everyone's best interest. This amazing property on the central mountain is the only place that makes sense to accommodate the students. Don't try to change trustee's minds, especially those with political aspirations.

Parents have but one remaining option. If Linden Park closes, **get the school boards attention** and put your children in the school that is closest to your home. Send your children to St. Peter & Paul Catholic School with the Hamilton Wentworth Catholic School Board. Of course this may not be the best option, but the board is making it the only option.

SAVE LINDEN PARK!!!!!!

Concerned Parent,

Sophia Christidis



Sylvia Spisic Wilkes

30 October 2013

Please do not close franklin rd school.



Sylvia Spisic Wilkes

10 December 2013 

There are tons of kids in this area. We'd miss the school. I believe there is enough room to expand franklin rd school.



Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board

3 minutes ago

Thanks for your thoughts Sylvia, I can share this with staff.

Robert Nixon

11/022014

Arc Committee parent representative for Armstrong Elementary School

To all relevant HWDSB staff members:

It is with regret that I must submit this correspondence to the board and the members of the ARC committee. However I would be remiss if I did not.

All the volunteers of the ARC committee I believe performed this task with great diligence and effort and I do not want this correspondence to negatively impact these individuals at all. This correspondence is not a result of any actions carried out by any volunteer member of the ARC committee but rather falls squarely on the shoulders of the very individuals that presided and chaired these meetings, the board representatives themselves. It is unfortunate that the actions of some have cast a shadow over all the hard work and effort that has been accomplished by the ARC committee members to this point.

I make these statements to the Board and the Arc committee for the sole purpose of making my concerns public, with regards to the inappropriate actions that were facilitated at our last working meeting held on 04/02/2014. I strongly question the integrity and validity of the vote that was held last week and I would further scrutinize all subsequent actions taken after this questionable vote, including what may unfold at tonight's meeting. I have serious misgiving about the entire handling of the public input that was dismissed at the last public meeting held on the same day of the vote 04/02/2014. I do not believe that this public input should have been presented to the ARC committee at all for a vote. A vote to evaluate as to whether or not the public input, was to be accepted or rejected. None of the committee, to the best of my knowledge, including myself has the background or the insight into board policy concerning this type of issue, if any at all exists. That being said a vote should never had been offered by the chair of the meeting as we collectively as a group don't have the right to assess what public input was to be accepted or not. We are all given the opportunity weigh this information only after it has been properly distributed to the entire ARC committee. It is at this point that we individually and as a whole weigh it and assess the information. We then may discern of how we chose to evaluate it. I don't believe that the working ARC committee, nor any member of the board, has the right to refuse any public input that was transcribed to the "Professionally Trained Facilitators" provided for the public's use at this meeting. We, as a committee or the board cannot arbitrarily wave the rights of any community member to have their input properly evaluated and this is exactly what happened at the last working meeting. The sole intention of the public meeting was absolutely to evaluate public input, process it and then vote. The direction that the chair of this meeting that led the ARC committee actions were entirely inappropriate and unacceptable. Therefore I will reassert my position with reference to the vote that was held last week 04/02/2014 and would like it duly noted in the public records. I would like to re-state that I do not believe the fault falls on any of the Volunteer ARC Committee Members; it is the sole responsibility of the Individual(s) that chaired and guided this committee.

This statement is merely for public records. It is my observations of the events that transpired at our last working meeting. I am not asking for support on this issue or that any type of motions be made with regards to this information. I believe that at this stage of the process that this type of initiative would prove to be fruitless. The damage is already done and I believe that we should just move forward.

I was going to resign my position within in the ARC committee as a direct result of the aforementioned questionable activities but I decided that I owe it to the community in helping to ensure, along with my fellow ARC Committee Members, that all communities are fairly and equitably treated during the final meeting(s) of this ARC process.

My only desire at this point is not concerned with what options are considered or rejected by the trustees, whether it is one of the ARC committees, or that of the board or even some type of hybrid. I would only hope that their decisions this time are based solely and specifically on the needs and best interests of all the students of all our affected communities not just for the present but also for the future. The politically motivated decisions that we have seen in past ARC's don't benefit any community.

Thank You

Robert Nixon

Robert Nixon, Armstrong Parent ARC Committee Member

11/02/2014



Sylvia Spisic Wilkes

30 October 2013

Please do not close franklin rd school.



Sylvia Spisic Wilkes

10 December 2013 

There are tons of kids in this area. We'd miss the school. I believe there is enough room to expand franklin rd school.



Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board

3 minutes ago

Thanks for your thoughts Sylvia, I can share this with staff.

Dear Ms. Orban,

I am writing in regard to the potential closure of G. L. Armstrong school. I have just reviewed the two options that have been selected by the ARC committee to go forward to the Trustees. Obviously the ARC process has been very arduous and emotionally draining for all involved. I can understand completely the emotional attachment that every parent has to their neighbourhood school. However, ultimately the Board must decide what best serves the educational needs of the children and which option best meets the criteria set by the Board regarding funding and best use of available capacities.

I am adamant in my view that G. L. Armstrong remain open and be properly updated to serve the needs of the students in the surrounding neighbourhoods. While I am a parent of two G. L. Armstrong students and thus it may seem that I am biased in my view, in fact we live outside of Armstrong catchment, so geographically where our school is is of little consequence to us. My opinion is based solely on the logic of adapting Armstrong which has the greatest capacity, is centrally located to all potential students, and has the advantage of already being a JK to 8 school which is a parameter which the board has established.

Criticisms of this option are easily addressed by reasonable upgrades. The fact that Armstrong is a three storey school and thus inaccessible to those with handicaps can be solved by installing an elevator. The fact that some parents believe that there is limited green space at Armstrong can be addressed by fencing in the front of the school and thereby increasing the available green space. The fact that there are shops available to the staff and students near Armstrong can be addressed by parents by not giving their children a note to leave the school campus. This is a choice each parent must make. Lastly, the fact that Armstrong is on a busy street and thus the air quality is poor is a straw dog argument as most children will be attending Armstrong for Grades 7 and 8 anyway. The air quality will not have changed by the time their children are required to attend Armstrong.

While it is important that the community feel that their opinions have been heard, I trust that ultimately the Board will see that as a strictly logical solution it is imperative that G. L. Armstrong be the school that services the surrounding area. Mr. Trimble and his staff have made the Armstrong community one of acceptance, kindness, and dedication to learning and achieving the highest personal standards of each student. I am confident in my opinion that any student that would be moved to Armstrong would flourish in this nurturing environment.

I urge you and your colleagues Ms. Orban to mute the emotional outcry of those who have personal agendas and make the decision that most obviously meets both the Board's and the students' needs.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Sincerely,
Sarah Mastromatteo