

Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board (HWDSB)

North Accommodation Review Committee Meeting

Board Room – Education Centre

September 13, 2011

Working Meeting #7

Minutes

ATTENDANCE:

Committee Members

Chair – Vicki Corcoran

Voting Members – Sandra Binns, Anna Busse, Michele Cameron, Michael Chalupka, Lisa Deys, Annie Fu, Laura Gill, Marie Jackson, Jane Henry, Rick Kunc, Prema Rao, Joyce Schneider, Dawn Spencer, Grant Thomas, Barb Wachner, Jane Withers

Non-Voting Members – Robert Barlow, Scott Barr, Marco Barzetti, Danielle Bawden, Paul Beattie, Judith Bishop, Marilyn Bratkovich, Lawrie Cook, Glenn Cooke, Geoff Coombs, Mark Currie, Peter Joshua, Nancy Leach, Ray Mulholland, Maria Pearson, Bob Pratt, Pam Reinholdt, Pat Rocco, Michael Root, Tim Simmons, Todd White

Regrets

Voting Members –

Non-Voting Members – Chad Collins, Jason Farr, Jim Holubeshen, Bernie Morelli, Sam Merulla, Don Pente

Resource Staff

Daniel Del Bianco, Jim Wibberley, Kevin Morton, Steve Stirling, Ellen Warling

Recording Secretary

Tracy McKillop

1.0 Call to Order

Superintendent Vicki Corcoran welcomed everyone to the seventh working group meeting. She spoke of the follow-up information from the previous meetings that had been included in the handouts and reminded the Committee that microphones were available for their use so that everyone could be clearly heard.

2.0 Agenda

2.1 Additions and Deletions – None

2.2 Approval or the Agenda – The agenda was approved by consensus.

3.0 Presentation – Paul Johnson – City of Hamilton – Director Neighbourhood Development Strategies.

To view the presentation please click on the following link: <http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arc/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/Neighbourhood-Development-Strategy-North-ARC-Sept-13-2.pdf>

Mr. Johnson expressed his appreciation at receiving the opportunity to present to the North Accommodation Review Committee. He commenced the presentation by speaking about “how did we get here?” On May 8, 2010 the City met to talk about the “code red area” in response to the study that Neil Johnson, from McMaster University, had completed. In September 2010 City Council approved the development of a neighbourhood initiative and committed two million dollars in reserve funds to support the objectives within the neighbourhood initiative.

Mr. Johnson spoke of Hamilton’s Neighbourhood Development Strategy which includes:

- Activities that are guided by best practices from other Communities.
- Approaches that will allow us to measure changes in outcomes over time.
- Structures and governance that will help leverage resources and align actions.

Time was spent researching successful neighbourhood development approaches in other Cities and from this they learned:

- **Community development workers** are critical human resources that support relationship building at the neighbourhood level
- Neighbourhood planning should be **comprehensive and holistic**
- A **multi-sectoral approach** is key
- Planning must be **inclusive and resident led**
- Plans must focus on the **long-term**
- **Investment is required** to implement neighbourhood

The City of Hamilton created “Neighbourhood Development Activities:

- **Putting more community development “boots on the ground”** – working with our partners to create an integrated team of community development workers.
- **Resident-led neighbourhood planning** – begin comprehensive resident led planning in neighbourhoods.

- **Increase neighbourhood investment to address opportunities identified in the neighbourhood planning process** – leverage funding where possible and directly invest new resources when it can move an identified priority forward.
- **Build new investment partnerships with senior levels of government** – fully explore the possibilities of developing an Urban Development Agreement to increase the health, social and economic outcomes of neighbourhoods.

The toughest part of exercise was determining where to begin the work. The priority area was the code red neighbourhood where health, social and economic outcomes were the poorest. Mr. Johnson showed a map with shaded areas that indicated the neighbourhoods that would be considered a priority. He shared the following slides:

Working in the Priority Area

- There are about 50 neighbourhoods in the priority area as shown on the maps...too many to tackle all at once
- Within the priority area specific neighbourhoods were selected to begin development work
- In 2011 three neighbourhoods were selected
- Criteria for selecting neighbourhoods will be based on a number of conditions for success...not on the relative ranking of neighbourhoods

The Neighbourhoods – 2011

Keith Neighbourhood – North End
 Stinson Neighbourhood – South of Downtown
 Stadium “Precinct” – neighbourhoods that surround the Stadium

The Neighbourhoods - 2012

Beasley Neighbourhood – Downtown Core
 McQuesten Neighbourhood – East End
 Rolston Neighbourhood – Hamilton Mountain

Mr. Johnson shared what will happen in the selected neighbourhoods:

- Increased involvement of community development worker
- Engagement in a resident-led neighbourhood planning process
- Opportunities for residents, businesses and other key stakeholders to access funding to implement neighbourhood initiatives
- All of the above work is built on a model of Asset Based Community Development (ABCD)

Building on the assets of a neighbourhood builds on the future prosperity and sustainability. Mr. Johnson spoke of translating assets and strengths into plans for the future:

- Neighbourhood Planning will be led by residents and key stakeholders and will focus on tangible steps the group can take over the next 4 to 5 years to build a healthy neighbourhood
- The plans will be holistic taking into account the physical, economic, social, cultural, human and environmental opportunities in each neighbourhood...as such they are “Quality of Life” plans
- The City and other external partners will play a “technical support” role...helping the neighbourhood planning group develop solid business plans

He shared that the road map for success does not mean a lot of meetings but focused initiatives and individuals. The anticipated results include:

- Detailed action plans with defined time- lines and accountability
- Shared ownership among residents, key stakeholders, the City and the wider community and a commitment to put the plan into action
- Identification of policy level issues for further exploration and discussion
- Business plan that clearly articulates opportunities for investment by private, public and voluntary sector

Mr. Johnson spoke of investing in the neighbourhoods and what the goals would include:

- Primary goal through planning process is to ensure current and planned investments are delivering high impact results
- Neighbourhood reserve funds would augment current work or fill in the gaps when other investments are not available
- Funding will be available for both “early action” projects and larger- scale initiatives

He indicated that it is critical to measure the outcomes and the City has partnered with McMaster University in order to do this. Mr. Johnson stated that people based outcomes will take time but those investments need to begin now. They are looking at doing this work more strategically:

Neighbourhood Office acts as secretariat (communications, reporting, outcome measurement, managing neighbourhood planning process) supported through alignment of staff from Public Health, Community Services and Emergency Services

Management level committee – building alignment among partners and identifying policy related issues for further discussion supported by staff from departments and agencies

Operational level committee – address delivery issues and coordinate on-the- ground issues supported by staff from departments and agencies

Mr. Johnson shared that they are working with community partners for example Hamilton Community Foundation & McMaster University. He stated that education is critical to the success of the neighbourhood and this provides an opportunity to work together with the ARC to revitalize the neighbourhoods. He also spoke of the Hamilton Police Services (the action team) and the strong approach to behaviour in downtown area. They have been handing out a lot of tickets. Through the neighbourhood development and the partnership with community partners, like the paramedics and police they have had a huge success. Investment in the stadium area is being allotted and the City would like to connect the neighbourhood to urban area and gage park. Mr. Johnson expressed to the Committee that neighbours and residents want to know that their neighbourhoods have a connection to schools in the area.

Questions:

(Q) Questions (A) Answers (C) Comment

Q. Is it a good idea to reinvent the school with a community centre?

A. People like the idea of having education, a social connection and recreation needs brought together and the doors are open to share partnerships with the City. Dr. Davey School has transformed the neighbourhood.

Q. Does your group have any ideas of how to bring middle class back into these areas when they have a reputation?

A. They have a concentration of poverty so the way to eliminate it is to reduce the concentration. Our planning vision is to encourage the same scenario. We need to have a conversation on how to have the right kind of support and how to balance the support across the neighbourhoods. We will work toward having a better balance in the neighbourhood.

Q. One challenge is we have Councillors saying “not in my backyard”. How do you get around that bureaucracy? What power are you going to have?

A. City Council has opened the door to dealing with this issue. Mr. Johnson shared that it will not be an easy plan but we have a volume of people who stand behind this and we need to have a strong plan in place.

Q. Will the closure of Delta and Parkview affect the area? Has the City come up with a plan and can we develop something with the City?

A. Education does come up often and we can co-ordinate conversation to go over ideas that are on the table.

C. I applaud your area development projects and the co-ordinating with all of the community groups.

4.0 Data Updates – Dan Del Bianco

Mr. Del Bianco introduced Bob Fex, Senior Planner of Accommodation & Planning, a new member to the planning department and Kevin Morton, Manager of Maintenance and Energy. Mr. Del Bianco shared that the staff of facilities and planning worked hard over the summer and give substance to the four options that the North ARC put together. The data from 2010 was used because the data from 2011 has not gone into the system and been updated to date.

Robert Fex went over the options along with the charts with the Committee. To view the options please click on the following link: <http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arc/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/North-ARC-Summary-Options-Sept-13-2011.pdf>

Mr. Fex also went over the boundaries as well as the projected enrolments for both the staff recommendation as well as the options. The year 2013 was used as the implementation date.

5.1 Full Committee discussion of Accommodation Options

Q. Why not move the Glendale boundary instead of overloading the new school in the first few years?

A. We did not want to stray too far from your original option. You can certainly make that recommendation.

Q. Can we have some schools at 115% without adding portables?

A. It may require some challenging scheduling in the beginning of the change.

C. We would like a school somewhere between Delta and Sir John A Macdonald. In light of information that we have heard about the community perhaps we could build a new school closer to Parkview and adjust the boundaries. When dealing with schools outside of the ARC we can make a recommendation for a boundary study. We have the ability to explore the stadium precinct in order to centrally locate a school.

Q. Orchard Park (OP) boundaries never changed. Is there a reason why?

A. It can always be a possibility however we didn't request a change to Stoney Creek. These are not set in stone and this is our first look at these options. This is a starting point for discussion.

Q. If the Committee chooses a smaller system school as well as a new secondary school what would be the optimal size?

A. When looking at a new school you are usually looking at 1200-1300 pupil places.

C. The students feel safer in a smaller school and I feel we need to focus on this in our discussion.

Q. Could this be worked into a lease of some industrial area?

A. Mr. Del Bianco shared that the Committee is talking about leasing for Parkview students; however two of the four options include keeping Parkview open. We did not focus on leasing because this is the first we have heard of this; however, we will look at the financial aspect of this.

C. The inner city kids move around a lot so we need to watch the boundaries.

Mr. Del Bianco stressed that the second part of summary is based on estimates only. To view the financial summary please click on the following link: <http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arc/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/NORTH-ARC-FINANCIAL-SUMMARY-SEPT-13-2011-2.pdf>

- 32 million for new school is based on a 1250 pupil placement school.
- **A** is higher for each of the options due to construction of a new school.
- Subtotal of **B** means the bottom line cost required to implement each of the options.
- **C** – Upgrades required to meet the facility and program needs that will still need to be addressed.
- **D** – Ministry funding for a new school – subject to approval – costs drop by 32 million dollars
- **E** – Less disposition from the sale of the properties.
- **F** – Operational savings and administrative savings – won't be a huge number but is potential savings.

There was discussion of the financial summary. Some comments were as follows:

- Sections A & B is the amount required to get everything up and running – the base amount.
- The downtown property (Sir John A MacDonald) has a higher resale value.
- All of the sites in the north were appraised and this is based on size and an average cost.
- Can we still tweak these options? Sir John A Macdonald is worth more money. Seeing that the Delta site is in the middle do you think we can do something with Delta? Do you think we can work with the City and look at a new recreation centre? This would keep a school in the middle.

The Chair shared that the North ARC has five more meetings and they are at the point where the options need to be narrowed down.

- What is the size of the site that you need for a new school? The Committee member mentioned that the old Scott Park location is near a skate park and a recreation centre.
- The School Board can build on any site and ideally it is the largest site that we can find. We are able to fit what you need on a 10 acre site; however 15 would be ideal but it is difficult to find in an urban area.
- All schools will have to be accessible and have asbestos removal. The Boards will have allotted for this.
- Once we open walls we have to deal with asbestos.
- The schools will have a map noting the areas of the school with asbestos.
- Having asbestos increases costs every time you make alterations; however, new schools will not have asbestos.
- Six million for land is based on what size of site? What would be size?
- It would be 10-12 acres.
- Did you find land between Delta and Sir John A Macdonald?
- We have nothing concrete to report back to you at this time. Our desire would be to locate something central especially after hearing Paul's presentation.
- What is acreage of Sir Winston Churchill School?
- 9.84 acres and Sir John A Macdonald is 8.0 acres.

There were no further questions.

5.2 – Focus on a recommendation

Mr. Del Bianco asked if there were any options that the Committee was not interested in. He shared that typically at the final public meeting there is usually only one option.

Mr. Wibberley shared that the Committee has to go to the Final Public Meeting with a recommendation and can't change their option after they present it to the public. He stated that at the next public meeting the Committee will need to work toward having their option set in order to receive feedback from the public.

A Committee member suggested sharing all three options at the next public meeting. He felt that it was better to show all of the options and then explain why they did not choose two of the three options.

Mr. Del Bianco asked the Committee to look at the Staff recommendation. He shared that the Staff recommendation goes to the Board of Trustees; however, they may not necessarily keep their original option. They may like the ARCs recommendation or they may alter their recommendation.

Superintendent Corcoran stated that since there is only about two million dollars between all of these options why not dream big and look at the type of programming that they would like to see in their school (s).

We still have questions outstanding, for example, how much money is spent on leased and offsite programming? Mr. Del Bianco informed the Committee that the leased information is on its way and they will have that soon.

Mr. Del Bianco shared that status quo is the benchmark and that is why it is listed amongst the options. He stated that Parkview is important to all of the ARCs options. The Committee has to ask themselves if they want Parkview in its own facility or in a wing of the new facility. He shared that the Committee can make a very strong case with any of the four options.

If we want a new school we have to go with one of the last two options. We can't have a new school and keep Parkview open. We need to have it in a wing.

Mr. Wibberley stated that if the Committee were to close three schools and build one it would be very compelling to the Ministry to receive funding for a new school.

Is there an elementary school that could take the Parkview program?

This could be explored and it has not been explored to date.

Does this include a recreation centre and new school?

No just the school. We have to look at a school and make a decision then we can go to the City for support. This is your opportunity to make this a flagship school.

Does the Committee as a whole want this? Discussion took place and the Committee arrived at the following decision:

- Consensus was given to eliminate Option 1.
- Consensus was given to eliminate the Staff Recommendation.
- Consensus was given to eliminate moving the Parkview program into the elementary schools.

This left Options 2, 3 and 4 on the table.

6.0 Minutes of the meeting of June 14, 2011

6.1 Errors or Omissions – there were none.

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

6.3. Business Arising from the Minutes

6.3.1 Facility Partnership Update - Mr. Del Bianco spoke of Facility Partnerships and shared that they had received a total of 18 expressions of interest for space within HWDSB. Of those 18, five could potentially meet the screening criteria according to the interim Facility Partnership policy which was passed by the Board in June. Some of the criteria include:

- The health and safety of students must be protected.
- Partnerships must be appropriate for a school setting.
- Partnerships must not compromise the student achievement strategy.
- No entities that provide competing education services such as private schools/colleges or credit offering entities are eligible.

Mr. Del Bianco shared that the Board reached out to the community through a number of mediums. There was an advertisement in the Hamilton Spectator. There was also outreach through social media channels such as Twitter and Facebook. The Board's website featured the application prominently on its homepage. There was an article in the Hamilton Community News as well as the Hamilton Spectator indicating that space was available. The Board also reached out to its current partners, not-for-profits and organizations outlined in the Regulation 444. This is the Regulation governing the disposition of property. In total, 440 letters were distributed to the community. The Facilities department is in the process of contacting those organizations that meet the screening criteria to get a better understanding of the facility requirements. Mr. Del Bianco shared that Boards are not expected to take on additional costs to support Facility Partnerships. They must be cost neutral.

6.3.2 Other - There was no other business arising.

7.0 Other Business

7.1 Meeting with the South ARC on September 13, 2011- The Chair shared that this is a South ARC working group meeting. They will be speaking about Mountain Secondary School and Parkview Secondary School for the first part of the evening. The second part of the meeting will be dedicated to whatever topics arise. This could take the entire 3 hours.

Q. Will we be watching or participating?

A. My understanding is that it will be a dialogue with the South ARC. Superintendent Scott Sincerbox will be the Chair. We will be sitting the South ARC members together and the North ARC members

together in order that the Chair will know which people are the members of the ARC. And the same rules will apply to the gallery that would typically apply in a working group meeting.

7.2 ARC Timelines – There was discussion on flipping the next public meeting with the next working group meeting. Consensus was given to have the next public meeting on October 25, 2011 and the working group meeting on October 4, 2011.

8.0 Correspondence – There was a proposal that was put forward at the West ARC Public meeting and a request came in to share this with the remaining ARCs as correspondence.

9.0 Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

DRAFT