

Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board (HWDSB)

South Accommodation Review Committee Meeting

Education Centre Board Room

June 7, 2011

Minutes

ATTENDANCE:

Committee Members

Chair - Scott Sincerbox

Voting Members - Beverly Bressette, Jackie Brown, Alexandra Butty, Ken Durkacz, Margaret Eagle, Kim General, Al Pierce, Anne Pollard, Cheryl Poot, Julia Shen, John Whitwell

Non-Voting Members - Wanda Bielak, Donna Clappison, Gary Deveau, Angela Ferguson, Manny Figueiredo, Randy Gallant, Mag Gardner, Wes Hicks, Peter Joshua, Deb Jukes, Ted Kocznur, Renee Majic, Joanna Maull, John Miholics, Kevin Robinson, Lillian Orban, Laura Peddle, Paul Vukosa

Regrets

Voting Members - Bill Barrett, Donna Dixon, Derek Hambly, Susan Pretula,

Non-Voting Members - Scott Duvall, Brian Greig, Tom Jackson, Terry Whitehead

Resource Staff

Daniel Del Bianco, Steve Stirling, Jim Wibberley

Recording Secretary

Tracy McKillop

1. Call to Order

Superintendent Scott Sincerbox welcomed everyone to the sixth working group meeting. He informed the Committee that there was a package of information for the night's meeting.

2. Agenda

2.1 Additions/Deletions – Items that were added include:

- Data Updates - 4.3 Actual versus projected enrolment items.
- Agenda items 6 & 7 (Minutes) were moved up on the Agenda to become item numbers 3 & 4.

- School Tours
- The invitation from the South ARC to the North ARC – this will be delivered at the North ARC meeting scheduled for June 14, 2011.
- Business arising from the March 8, 2011 will become item 3.3.

2.2 Approval of the Agenda – Consensus was given to add the above listed items to the Agenda.

3.0 Minutes of the meeting of March 8, 2011

3.1 Errors or Omissions – there were minor changes made to the minutes.

3.2 Approval of the Minutes – The minutes were approved by consensus.

3.3. Business Arising from the Minutes

Q. Have the School Information Profiles (SIP) been corrected.

A. Mr. Del Bianco stated that he will verify that most up to date SIP is on the web site.

Q. Have the excess school properties have been distributed to the Committee.

A. Yes

Q. Has the Committee received the information regarding the number of students who complete a second year of grade 12?

A. Yes

There was consensus to move off of item number three.

4.0 Minutes of the meeting of May 17, 2011

4.1 Errors or Omissions – there were minor changes made to the minutes.

4.2 Approval of the Minutes – The minutes were approved by consensus.

4.3. Business Arising from the Minutes – none

5.0 Data Updates – Dan Del Bianco

Mr. Del Bianco spoke to the Committee about the hand outs that were distributed that evening.

School Tours – two dates were given out as tentative school tour dates. They were Saturday, June 25th and September 17th.

The time of the tours would be 8:30-2:15. After some discussion by the Committee consensus was given to have the school tour on September 17, 2011.

It was asked if the school tours could add Westmount Secondary School. Some of the members felt that it was not necessary to view Westmount school as it is a school outside of the ARC. Others may decide

not to attend the upcoming school tour because they had attended the original school tour on March 26, 2011. Mr. Del Bianco stated that the tour is not mandatory so they have the choice to see some or all of the schools. It was moved to view only the South ARC schools; however, consensus was not reached. A motion was then put forward to view all of the South ARC schools as well as Westmount School and the vote was carried. Westmount School will be scheduled at the beginning of the tour. Mr. Del Bianco will revise the Agenda to update the times and the locations of the tours which will occur on September 17, 2011.

The Committee discussed adding additional working group meetings. The addition of working group meetings on September 15, 2011 and October 27, 2011 were approved by consensus.

5.1 Maps – Student Distribution

There was some discussion about the map showing the distribution of the students. There was a request to have a legend added in the corner of the map which would indicate the students who are attending the school and where they are coming from.

There was a question of why Sherwood was mentioned twice and Mr. Del Bianco indicated that there are two components to the Sherwood boundary – one south of the Linc and one north of the Linc.

There was a lot of discussion around the date for the South ARC to meet with the North ARC. It was approved by consensus to invite the North ARC to attend the meeting scheduled for September 15, 2011 and if it is necessary to add another working group meeting that can be addressed later in the year.

There was concern expressed by the Committee members that the South ARC may need to extend the deadline in order to prepare the Report that will be going to the Board of Trustees. Mr. Del Bianco stated that more meetings could be added in November and December if the members felt that it was necessary.

Q. Why do we need a public meeting at the end of the ARC process?

A. Mr. Wibberley stated that the Ministry policy requires that the ARC shares its recommendations with the public.

Q. If the Committee does not come up with a finished report do we run the risk that the Board of Trustees will go with the Board recommendation?

A. Mr. Del Bianco stated that while the Board of Trustees will make the ultimate decision on all of the ARCs, in order to ensure that the vision of this Committee is clearly outlined for the Trustees, the South ARC needs to ensure that all of their work, including the final report is submitted on time.

There was consensus to move off of number 5.0.

6.0 Facilities Overview – Steve Stirling

For a look at the Facilities Management Overview Presentation please click on the following link:

http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arc/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/SouthARC_FM_Presentation_Final_June7_2011.pdf

6.1 Presentation

The Facilities Management (FM) has three divisions working together to provide educational environments:

Operations & Maintenance - Cleaning, Equipment Maintenance, Repairs, Utilities, Regulatory Compliances, Heating/Cooling, Automation, Building Envelop, Site Services, Vandalism, Security, Waste Removals, etc.

Capital Renewal - Life Cycle Renewal of Existing Facilities, New Construction, Renovations, Program Upgrades, Accessibility, etc.

Accommodations & Planning - Property which includes Acquisition, Disposal, and Leasing, Pupil Accommodations, Enrolment Projections, School Boundaries, Portable Allocations, Development Planning, Mapping, etc.

Mr. Stirling spoke of the declining enrolment which is not just a Hamilton phenomena but a Province wide decline in school aged children. He stated that funding is based on enrolments which mean that poor utilization and the age of the facilities compromises the Board's ability to meet the operational and renewal needs. Mr. Stirling showed the Committee an enrolment graph. The spike is the Baby Boomers and the second spike is the children of these Boomers. He referred to this as a Boom Bust Echo Graph. The chart shows the historical secondary enrolments from the early 60's and the number of secondary schools in HWDSB. The Board has historically adjusted the number of schools it has with new construction and closures to reflect the enrolments of the day. There is a peak in enrolments in the early 70's as the elementary students arrive in the secondary panel. The Secondary Schools were all constructed in the 60's which is all 50 years old now and at its natural renewal age. This means that they are all due at the same time. He showed another chart which showed the facility closures and consolidations.

Mr. Stirling stated that School Boards get all of their funding through the Province of Ontario. In Facilities Management there are two primary sources of funding for the Secondary Schools, the Operations Grant and the Renewal Grant. There are additional areas of funding

1. New Construction and Capital Priorities – these are funding sources where School Boards must provide business cases and compete for the limited dollars.
2. “Good Places to Learn” funding, which is ending this year.
3. “School Condition Improvement Grant” –School Boards get allocations to assist with the renewal backlog.
4. Energy Efficient Schools Grant – to assist with projects that reduce utility costs (lighting upgrades, efficient boiler systems, etc).

These additional funding sources are generally short lived and targeted. The main source of funding is the Operation and Renewal Grants. \$200 million dollars per year has been budgeted over the next three years by the Province and HWDSB in projecting that they will receive about five million per year.

Mr. Stirling showed a chart which displayed HWDSB Funding Challenges and the unfunded liability. At present five priorities govern the allocation of renewal funds:

1. Health and Safety Issues
2. Regulatory Compliance Issues
3. The risk that the failure of one or more components might cause a program (i.e. science lab) or the building itself to close, or cause secondary damage
4. High & Urgent ReCAPP Events
5. New Program Initiative Requirements

ReCAPP is a software program that was implemented by the Province. It breaks down the facilities into thousands of components and sets a life cycle for these components. The software does not account for upgrades like a building with heating only being upgraded to air conditioning. This is a planning tool that treats all facilities the same.

Mr. Stirling continued through the slides which showed each of the schools within the South ARC which showed the 10 year renewal needs of the schools as well as a summary of the capital expenses from 2000-2010. He stated that to create sustainability HWDSB needs to:

- Understand the current situation and resources.
- Consolidate or bring together planning approaches.
- Implement a corrective plan.

The Facilities Management Department of HWDSB has developed its own vision statement:

“Facilities Management this involves creating effective environments that stimulate academic achievement”.

The Deferred Capital ReCAPP events do not address:

- Building code upgrades.
- Municipal directed planning and building improvements.
- Academic program requirements.
- Accessibility needs.
- Changes required to implement a new method of program delivery within the overall school system.

Mr. Stirling stated that the status quo is no longer an option. Funding is tied to enrolments and the enrolments are projected to continue to decline. The Board has historically taken action to reduce accommodation in periods of declining enrolments. He went on to show the long-term Facilities Master Plan which combines the following Planning Strategies:

1) Academic Program Planning Strategy: This is the work of Executive Council, which Peter Joshua has shared with the Committee. Facilities Management reviews and provides analysis of the facility needs to support the Program Strategy.

2) Accommodation Planning Strategy: This is the work of Accommodation and Planning. They look at enrolment projections and demographics. Facilities Management provides facility planning to support the projected enrolment needs as well as clarity to project priorities and schedules.

3) Capital Renewal Planning Strategy: involves reviewing the Capital Program Priorities, setting design standards as well as project scheduling.

4) Maintenance & Energy Planning Strategy: Involves developing utility conservation programs, setting design standards, LEED principals, and equipment selections.

5) Operating Planning Strategy: This is the work of Senior Facilities Management. They look at department structure, staffing resources and inter-departmental alignments to support organization change.

The Facilities Management Master Plan takes a more holistic approach to Facilities planning:

- Ensures alignment with the Boards Strategic Plan.
- Ensures that individual planning strategies address the goals of the organization.

6.2 Questions and Comments

Questions (Q) Comments(C) Answers (A):

Q. Sherwood numbers are high. How much of the number was determined by the A/C system that was put in?

A. The A/C system was advanced in its day. It cost more to operate and if the A/C broke it would be an unpleasant place to work. With the make up of the building there is no air circulation in certain areas of Sherwood.

C. If more students leave due to school closures that would have a huge impact on the Board. If 500 students leave that would be a million dollars per year. If there are Catholic School is in the area you would lose that funding.

A. If the Board builds a school or if they provide better programming they could draw students in.

Q. Given the list of repairs to the schools how is it decided which schools get repaired? Why are schools like Sherwood or Westmount now in need of large dollar repairs?

A. The allocation of repair dollars is based on the five priorities.

1. Health and Safety Issues

2. Regulatory Compliance Issues

3. The risk that the failure of one or more components might cause a program (i.e. science lab) or the building itself to close, or cause secondary damage

4. High & Urgent ReCAPP Events

5. New Program Initiative Requirements

This results in needs being rolled-over to the next year.

Q. Why is there a discrepancy between the need of the two schools.

A. The size of the building, the make up of the building add to the grand total of what is required. An example would be a school which uses an HVAC system that needs duct work compared to a school using radiant heat.

C. A Committee members stated "there is a perception that certain schools are denied repair due to becoming obsolete. There are large discrepancies between the schools renewal needs."

A. There was no plan to deny certain schools repair dollars. Currently no major repairs are being done to the schools within the ARC process.

Q. Hill Park, Barton and Westmount are similar in design. Which school is better designed – Sherwood or Sir Allan MacNab? If building a new school will it be well designed?

A. All of the schools were built around the same time. New school designs take in new technology and learning environments.

C. Why is there is a discrepancy in the ReCAPP data summary provided as part of the school information profile and the ReCAPP summary prepared as part of the Facilities Management presentation?

A. The ReCAPP summary provided as part of the school information profile was for the 2010 -2020 time period whereas the ReCAPP summary from the Facilities Management presentation is for the 2011-2021 time period. Work not completed in the 2010 school year gets pushed forward and any additional year (2021) has been added to the ReCAPP total which accounts for any differences between the two data sets.

A. There could be a reason for the doubling up – e.g. 2 boilers. On ReCAPP if the life cycle of an item is short it could be repeated.

C. We are making decisions based on financial needs and these may be skewed.

Q. Some things are repeated and need to be looked at. Out of these South ARC schools would you recommend any one particular style over another in terms of longevity? What type of school is the most cost effective?

A. Each of the schools is a viable facility so we need to look at the renewal needs. Facilities Management does not have a preference. The schools were constructed using the standards of the time period. When we are building today we use what is viable and cost effective. The Board option incorporates what Facilities Management feels is best.

C. Sherwood has required less money to maintain than the other schools.

A. The money spent of the facility does not address the needs. We go with what is a priority.

C. The general public would be disturbed by these numbers. It is difficult to see that 4.5 million dollars has been spent on a school that is slated to close. It would be helpful for the ARC Committee to look at what the Board is going to do with Westmount. This is a school that requires a great deal of work and support. I would like to have a presentation indicating what the Board's direction is going to be in terms of the Westmount facility.

A request for a short presentation on the Board's allocation of future renewal funds for the South ARC schools, including Westmount, was made by Committee members. Consensus was given to have the presentation. Trustee Peddle would like to know when this will happen.

C. It might be advantageous to include all secondary schools as part of the presentation.

Q. When you add what has been invested in these schools versus the outstanding renewal needs, all of the schools, with the exception of Sherwood, are in a similar situation. Mountain is half the cost but also half the size. Were the funds withheld and repairs withheld at Sherwood? If the A/C is repaired at Sherwood is it a viable investment?

Q. Does priority supersede needs?

A. Yes.

At this point the Chair asked if this could be revisited after the 45 minute small group discussion and consensus was given to suspend at this time.

7.0 Accommodation Options

7.1 Discussion in small groups

Mr. Del Bianco shared that he would like the small groups to focus on boundaries, FCI, and what the Committee would like to see. How do we address the renewal needs and the declining enrolment? What other ideas do you have?

There was consensus to extend the meeting until 9:25 p.m.

Q. Is it possible to have the questions ahead of time going forward?

A. Yes.

7.2 Summary from the small groups

Mr. Wibberley shared that they have now had two small group discussions. It is the intent to bring back the summary of both of the small groups to help frame the discussion to take place at the next working group meeting.

Q. Can we go back to Facility Overview for a moment?

Q. Is it good plan ahead of time knowing that you are going to have to close a school further on down the road?

A. We don't plan on closing schools in advance.

Q. What is the lifespan of a new school?

A. Most of the components life cycle is 50 years; however, some components are 25 years. If those components are properly renewed they can last 50-100 years.

Q. Is building better today or do the old schools last longer.

A. There are new techniques in heating and other components. Some have proven to be good and some have not been so good. An example would be drywall versus plaster or asbestos. Facilities Management believes that the buildings which were built in the 40's were better than those built in the 60's.

Q. Did any schools in the South ARC have asbestos?

A. They all did.

Q. Can you clarify your comments regarding the cost to replace the A/C unit at Sherwood and how it would impact the structure of the building itself? What is different about Sherwood?

A. The mechanical system. The control strategy was part of that. The renewal need is based on the components that are cycling out.

Q. It is not the structure of the building then?

A. The layout of the building is such that there are a number of additional costs that the Board would incur do to the layout of the building and the challenges involved with cooling the inner core.

Consensus was given to move off of Facilities Management.

8. Correspondence

There was no correspondence handed out.

9.0 Other Business

9.1 Facility Partnerships

Mr. Del Bianco stated that an article went into the Spectator on Monday regarding Facility Partnerships. HWDSB is exploring other community partnerships to utilize the excess space. It is paid on a cost recovery basis and needs to meet a certain criteria to be selected. There is a link on the Board's web site and updates will be forthcoming in September.

Q. Can you bring back the figure of what is paid out for leased space in September?

Trustee Peddle shared that there was a recent Policy vote on this topic brought to the Trustees which ended in a split vote. It could be emailed out to everyone. It is a mandatory Policy, cascaded from the government, which the Board of Trustees had to approve even if they are not in favour of it.

Consensus was given to move off of item number nine.

10. Adjournment

The Chair thanked everyone for their hard work and the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 by consensus.