

Dear Mr. Don Hall,

The West ARC committee asked the board to evaluate the Parkside Plan B proposal which you presented on Thursday December 8th. As the author of the Parkside Plan B, I would like to respectfully point out that your analysis was not an accurate representation of the proposal. As a result, it was materially misstated financially and misleading to the committee. I am a Chartered Accountant and a small business owner and I can assure you that I would not have submitted a plan that was not financially viable with the funds available or that I didn't think could fit on the site.

Your presentation included all the students from both catchments and also you did not use time tabling(double lunch) which allows 115%+ utilization. The effect of which was a grossly oversized addition along with a grossly oversized budget which made the whole thing seem less plausible to the committee. The Plan B's catchment was to include urban Dundas students and Greenville students only. Seaton's catchment was to be directed to Ancaster because it is 6 kilometres closer than Parkside therefore reducing transportation times. This also helps boost Ancaster's utilization. Millgrove's catchment was to go to Waterdown (with it's new addition) to reduce transportation times for that community. That concern really came out in the last public meeting with some students spending 2 1/2 hours on the bus each day and that is where that community said it would prefer to go. The board's Highland option was also sending some students elsewhere because it lists Highland having 667 students and Parkside having 527 students in 2013/14 for a total of 1194 without closure but with only 1062 being in the combined Highland location. Where were those 132 students going?

So with this catchment (urban Dundas & Greenville), in 2013/14 there would be approximately 950 students. This is my best guess, given what has been presented by the board regarding 2013/14 (667 Highland + 527 Parkside less Seaton & Millgrove). In year 2000, Parkside easily accommodated 903 students in its current building and so an addition would only need to be constructed for the approximately 50 net additional students which is only 2 classrooms using time tabling ($50 / 115\% = 43.5$). Let's add 4 more classrooms for prep space or additional programs. The cost you should be looking at is the cost of a gym with fitness room (\$2 million) on the top floor together with 6 classrooms or as many as would fit in that foot print on the bottom floor plus the cost of improvements in the main school for science lab upgrades and possibly a few other things that could better be determined by the principal. My rough estimate is that in total this would cost around \$5 - 6 million with a much smaller footprint on site and also not the \$12 million you presented. This revised figure would therefore be able to be financed by the proceeds of disposition of Highland whichever number you decide is the correct figure (\$8.9 vs. \$7.1 million). Could you please revisit your analysis so that it represents a true evaluation of the Plan B as this was what the committee asked for. I will attach the original plan document again for you to study.

In addition, you have presented 2 different figures for the proceeds of disposition for Highland. In this presentation you showed a value of \$7.1 million whereas previously you presented a value of \$8.9 million. This discrepancy should be explained. If you were substantially off in these calculations in the previous submission, it certainly raises serious red flags as to the validity of any of the financial analyses previously presented to the ARC.

Also it was never intended that Parkside offer auto shop (with lifts) within the school as I heard you point out to the Highland rep but rather through co-op placements at local garages as they do now or students could go to Westdale as they do for IB and French Immersion. A shuttle bus perhaps as we have now with Highland. Also you mentioned that bus access would be difficult. As we have presented many times before, Parkside uses the park for its busses which provides more than ample & safe room for students without interfering with local traffic. Only the small, special needs bus uses the front entrance circle.

I have always known that the Parkside Plan B is not 100% ideal and that it would be great to offer all of the programs but if it were that easy we wouldn't be having the discussions we are because everyone agrees Highland isn't perfect either because they have no way to pay for the \$5.3 million in upgrades they require if we don't get funding for a new school in addition to serious congestion and bus accommodation issues. I offered it up because the gains available to Parkside students are the community partnerships with the Park and the Town. The breadth of co-op possibilities to explore career options for all the students within walking distance of Parkside outweighs the small changes in programming needed to fit on the site. Most importantly, the costs for the upgrades can be fully paid for.

I trust that you will present your revised analysis and diagram of the actual Parkside Plan B to the committee asap.

Thank you for your consideration.

Diana Kenel