

**Central Mountain Accommodation Review Committee
Working Group Meeting # 7
Tuesday, January 14, 2014
6:00 p.m.**

**Linden Park Elementary School
4 Vickers Road, Hamilton, ON**

Minutes

ATTENDANCE:

Committee Members

Chair - Michael Prendergast

Voting Members - Diana Asrani, Amber Bourque, Candice Campbell, Marney Campbell, Jenn Clarke, Leanne Friesen, Dianna Gamble, Adam Hinks, Marj Howden, Barbara Jalsevac, Kathy Long, Denise McCafferty, Jamie McLean, Sharon Miller, Patricia Mousseau, Robert Nixon, Candice Romaker, Janeen Schaeffer, Margaret Toth, Lourie Vanderzyden, Philip Viana, Laurie Walowina

Non-Voting Members - Linda Astle, Julie Beattie, Maria Carbone, Biljana Arsovic Filice, Colin Hazell, Lillian Orban, Jennifer Robertson-Heath, Nanci-Jane Simpson, Doug Trimble

Regrets

Voting Members - Philip Erwood

Non-Voting Members - Nil

Resource Staff

Ian Hopkins, Ellen Warling

Recording Secretary

Kathy Forde

Public - 13 public attendees present - Linden Park (5); Queensdale (7); No School Affiliation Identified (1)

1. Call to Order

Michael Prendergast called the meeting to order.

2. Agenda

2.1 Additions/Deletions

Order of agenda was revised to accommodate flow of discussions. Item 8 moved to Item 6; Item 6 becomes Item 7; Item 7 becomes Item 8.

2.2 Approval of Agenda

Changes as discussed were approved by consensus by a show of hands.

3. Minutes from Public Meeting # 3

3.1 Clarification

Item 5, page 7, regarding availability of Hill Park was clarified as follows: Hill Park is not currently viable as an elementary school. The school is not designed for elementary students - it would require extensive renovations. Capacity is approximately 1200 students and ideally we are looking at a school size of roughly 500. Although the Board has not yet started phase one of the property disposition protocol and no decision has been made regarding the property at this point, transition has started for closure. Technically, the property is available but funds have been committed. Trustees would need to vote to reverse the decision and keep Hill Park open as an option.

3.2 Approval of Minutes

With clarification, minutes were approved by consensus by a show of hands.

4. Minutes from Working Group Meeting # 6

4.1 Clarification

Co-facilitators were clarified under Item 6, Slide 20. Date and location were added under Item 7 for Next Working Group Meeting.

4.2 Approval of Minutes

With clarification, minutes were approved by consensus by a show of hands.

5. Public Meeting # 3 Feedback - December 10

5.1 Discussion

Members divided into groups to review feedback from Public Meeting # 3 on Options 6, 7, and 11. Items of relevance were reported back to the committee as follows:

Option 6

- Splitting of boundaries and separation of students is a concern - it will be important to keep kids together within school communities if possible
- Many parents concerned Linden Park could be lost
- Loosing green space at Linden Park and loosing the recreation centre is a concern
- Walkability

Option 7

- Data and capacity details have been a concern
- Not enough attention on quality of education

- Special need classes to be carefully considered (Tier 3 programs include students from various locations so it will be important to keep students together in an appropriate location - it is recognized these students need stability and minimum disruption)
- Public attendees are not hearing how options were chosen - should perhaps answer questions before presenting
- Greenspace is a concern
- Loss of using the recreation centre is a concern
- Building a new school south of the LINC is a concern
- GL Armstrong may be a prime property potentially for sale
- Not enough population at Queensdale to allow for a middle school
- Two schools closing rather than four

Option 11

- Splitting up Linden Park students is a concern - an alternative is needed
- GL Armstrong population would be too big
- Costs are a concern
- Would a holding school be necessary after 2014
- Walkability
- Safer not to cross streets
- Would be difficult to build at GL Armstrong - playground too close
- New school south of the LINC is a concern

6. Correspondence

Ian Hopkins provided one additional piece of correspondence to the package as a handout. Time was provided for members to review the correspondence. French Immersion was flagged as a concern, however, it was noted that this topic has been addressed at previous meetings. Correspondence from John-Paul Danko, requesting that his letter concerning process and timelines be read aloud, was contemplated. Most members thought that since everyone has read the letter to themselves it would be redundant to read the letter aloud. Ballots were handed out to determine the next step in response to the correspondence received. Votes were tallied. No further action required.

- YES - Take action - (7) votes
- NO - Receive as correspondence only - (14) votes

7. Public Meeting # 4 Discussion - January 21

7.1 Meeting Dates

Ian Hopkins provided a draft work plan with additional meeting dates in response to concern expressed on needing more time to develop options. Key dates were reviewed. Any further extension to the timeline would require a written request from the Committee to trustees for consideration. The following comments were shared:

- Members are tired but feel they need time to make a good decision
- Members have done due diligence
- Members would like to see the process through
- The public wants transparency
- It will be important for parents to accept decisions that are made
- Final options presented will require rationale
- Recommendations that impact the 2014/15 school year would likely impact staffing so need to be carefully considered

The last Working Group meeting is intended to finalize details and approve minutes from the Public Meeting. Minor modifications (edits, lines on maps, etc.) can be processed without public consultation. Only substantial changes would require public review. The public is provided with a final opportunity during the 60-day window when delegations are welcomed to present any concerns during the trustee review period.

The revised schedule will accommodate the extra time needed to move forward with clear direction. The schedule still allows time for one extra meeting if needed. Members agreed by consensus with the draft work plan that includes two additional Working Group meetings prior to Public Meeting # 4.

DECISION: Revised schedule accepted

The delayed date for the final Public Meeting will be communicated to schools involved.

The idea of writing an extension letter to trustees will be carried forward for further discussion. Rationale would be required.

8. Accommodation Options

8.1 Option 6, 7 and 11 Costing and Transportation Info

Ian Hopkins provided comprehensive costing based on the various options developed. Details were reviewed. Handout provided. Estimates include costs for new school construction, FDK, additions and renewal; potential funding from the Ministry and through proceeds of disposition; and savings through administrative and operational annual projections. Property value varies and can change so are provided as an estimation only. Numbers are subject to change with each option. There is still a high cost required to maintain schools as status quo so potential savings of up to 50% can be realized among the various options being developed. Administrative and operational costs are based on annual numbers and could potentially offset transportation costs over a 10-year period. Building size will impact the numbers, which are calculated based on square footage. Costs include desks and chairs, etc. Timelines for renovations are generally quicker than for new builds. Ministry funding would be required for any new builds. Option B is suggested as a fallback if Option A specifies a new build.

Jamie McLean created a rubric for evaluating the various options based on the information provided to date. It was suggested only as additional information that may be useful for members in their thinking for determining the best options.

8.2 Options 21-33

In reviewing additional options, members suggested each option be reviewed collectively as an entire group, options be eliminated if all members are in agreement, and that each member votes on their top two to five options if necessary. It was noted that some options may offer bits and pieces towards development of the options that will go forward. Review included the following comments:

Option 21 (remove)

- Portables may be needed
- Where do GL Armstrong kids go
- Need to look at reorganization
- Do not understand why a new build would occur on the Ridgemount site
- Not sure about Ridgemount, how Queensdale and Franklin Road can accommodate students when additions are underway
- Many questions including walkability

Option 22 (further consideration required)

- Three schools under capacity and two schools need new builds
- Does not meet reference criteria
- Great option / more involved / big picture for entire community
- Speaks to human factor / moves classes as a whole
- School south of the LINC
- Good walkability factor

Option 23 (further consideration required)

- Queensdale as a JK-8 would be under 300 students so would be approximately one class per grade - cannot separate students if dealing with problems
- Closes two schools opposed to three
- Cardinal Heights remains a middle school (grades 6-8)
- Need an option that does not have a new build
- Meets Board's criteria
- Has advantages and disadvantages

Option 24 (remove)

- Closes five schools - one school closes in 2014

Option 25 (remove)

- Not realistic
- Expensive
- Destructive

Option 26 (remove)

- Closing six schools / building two
- Major implications for transportation - many students would require busing
- Not close to criteria

Option 27 (remove)

- Much disruption
- Transportation
- Too many closures

Option 28 (remove)

- Appears to be Staff Option but builds new school at GL Armstrong
- Two new builds versus one
- Not viable - does not meet criteria

Option 29 (remove)

- Closing four schools and building one
- Closure of Queensdale
- Has potential but needs too much tweaking
- Similar to Option 30
- Too many questions - not meeting criteria

Option 30 (further consideration required)

- Closing four and building one
- A lot of over-capacity
- Some capacity numbers are low and some are high
- K-3 does not meet Board criteria
- In Staff Option there is a K-3 model
- Is doable - not totally off the rails

Option 31 (further consideration required)

- Similar to Option 29 but without odd years
- Does not close Eastmount Park
- Average capacity is only 80% - LTFMP is 90-110% for optimal utilization

Option 32 (further consideration required)

- Different - should be explored
- Closing two - building two

Option 33 (remove)

- Three new builds
- A lot of busing
- 2015 deadline for new builds too quick

8.3 Discussion and Development

Options 22, 23, 30, 31 and 32 will move forward along with Options 6, 7 and 11 for further consideration. Ian will provide costing numbers on the new options for comparison. Transportation numbers will be estimated based on current data due to the lengthy turnaround needed through the Transportation Department.

9. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

- **Working Group Meeting # 8 - January 21, 2014 at Eastmount Park**
- **Working Group Meeting # 9 - January 28, 2014 at Pauline Johnson**
- **Next Public Meeting # 4 - February 04, 2014 at Hill Park**
- **Working Group Meeting # 10 - February 11, 2014 at Ridgemount**

Handouts

- Agenda
- Draft Minutes - Public Meeting # 3
- Draft Minutes - Working Group Meeting # 6
- Public Meeting # 3 Feedback
- Financial Summary Options 6, 7, 11
- Transportation Costs Options 6, 7, 11
- Options 21-30
- Options 31-33
- Options 1-15 Committee Summary
- Options 31-33 Committee Summary
- Correspondence