

**WORKING MEETING FOR THE WYOMING AREA SCHOOLS
PUPIL ACCOMMODATION REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES/RECORD OF ACTION**

Date: February 29, 2016

Location: Wyoming Public School, 606 Thames Street, Wyoming

Present: Committee Members: Gary Girardi, Superintendent of Education – Capital Planning and Pupil Accommodation, Deb Bramham, Principal, Crystal Hordyk, Parent Representative, South Plympton School Campus, Linda Reid, Community Representative, Kaylee Clarke, Student Representative, Wyoming School Campus, Jodi Campbell, Parent Representative, Wyoming School Campus

Resource Personnel: Lorie Vandeschoot, Planning and Reporting Officer, Sandi Vennettilli, Recorder, Brian McKay, Superintendent of Education-Finance

Regrets: Taf Lounsbury, Jen Crummer, Chad Brown, Emma Gibson

Note: This document is not a verbatim transcript. Questions and answers have been paraphrased for the sake of clarity and brevity

Item	Discussion	Action/Responsibility
Welcome and Call to Order	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Superintendent Girardi welcomed the Committee, Chair of the Board Jane Bryce and Mayor Lonny Napper. Superintendent Girardi explained that this was a working meeting of the ARC Committee to discuss the agenda items that were posted online. The Public was respectfully asked not to interrupt or ask questions during the meeting. They were asked to write down any questions on the question sheets at the back of the room and place them in the box provided. A response to their questions will be posted on the LKDSB website. Microphones were not being used to try to reduce costs. 	

Item	Discussion	Action/Responsibility
Adoption of Agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The agenda was posted last week. It was agreed to add to item 5.4 to discuss an extension in the timeline at the request of the committee. The discussion of this item included pros and cons for a change in the timeline. 	
Adoption of Minutes/Record of Action from Jan.19/16	<p>Clarification on questions and responses from the Jan.19th Minutes/Record of Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>How do we get our students out of portables if the funding does not come in? Answer: The LKDSB believes that we have a strong business case. If funding from the Ministry is not available, then the capital focus will be on the renewal and refurbishment of the existing Wyoming Public School. We would discuss changes to the current floor plan with our architects to accommodate students.</p> <p>Question: What is that business plan? Clarification: The present capacity of Wyoming PS is 219 (58%). The projected enrolment for consolidated schools in 2018 is 227 (103%). The projected enrolment for 2025 is 223 (102%). Just because a school is over 100% it does not mean that portables have to be used. For example, today at Cathcart the capacity is at 102% and there are no portables. Hillcrest is at 106% and does not have portables. Portables are a last resort for students. We would look to complete work to create more classroom space.</p> <p>Question: Was it not already suggested that we will need portables? Answer: At the last meeting the LKDSB stated that portables may be an option to accommodate a consolidation and any potential construction.</p> <p>Comment: You have no plan, you are rushing this. The Jan.19th meeting seemed as though there was no research done. Clarification: We continue to discuss all options for moving forward on the ARC. However, we cannot provide information that may prejudge the outcome of this ARC. Therefore, this committee can make a request for what they would like to see. It would have to include all options this committee is looking at. The Final Staff Report will not be written until all public and ARC working meetings have been completed. In addition, the timeline is important as the LKDSB is searching for ways to create efficiencies to compensate for the decline in funding from the Ministry which is already affecting the Board and the services we provide.</p> 	

Item	Discussion	Action/Responsibility
	<p>Where there is rationale to support community suggestions, we may incorporate those suggestions in the Final Staff Report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>Question: You are telling us you have no clue as to what will be done to the school? How are you getting a dollar amount to apply for? Clarification: The LKDSB must show plans that do not compromise the outcome of the ARC. Dollar amounts for requests refer to the amount the LKDSB believes is an appropriate estimate based on conversations with the Ministry. It is also based on similar types of additions in other elementary school locations within the LKDSB.</p> <p>Question: It was stated “This would increase operational efficiency and reduce the number of transitions for students. The estimated annual savings would be \$150,000/year. What makes up this number? Clarification: This number is a conservative estimate and is made up from utilities, contract custodial staff, secretarial staff and other operational items. It does not include the items of overstaffing relative to population that these two schools receive such as an extra administrator. There is also extra discretionary time that is provided relative to the school’s population because there are two buildings. There is a fixed amount allotted for these items to the school board which means we shift support here resulting in less elsewhere.</p> <p>Question: Has anyone received the funding but stretched out the date for consolidation? Answer: A change in the timeline would have to be included in the Final Staff Report.</p> <p>Question: Can we get a yes or no answer? Answer: When we apply to the Ministry it would be in our best interest to be sure about the timelines. If we receive funding and our construction plans are behind schedule, the timeline would have to change in order to accommodate the construction. In addition to this, Superintendent Girardi stated that he conferred with the Ministry of Education. The Ministry stated that there have been a couple of cases where consolidation was delayed due to unforeseen items (the discovery of asbestos in the receiving school, soil remediation issues), but generally the ARC decision and the timelines must remain consistent with the business case that was submitted to the Ministry.</p> 	

Item	Discussion	Action/Responsibility
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>• Comment: Plan A should be if the funding does not come through. Response: The Ministry has already set aside funds to support consolidation of schools. We would like to acquire a portion of this money to support consolidation of our schools that would improve our efficiencies and reduce the FCI of our schools. If we start with not asking for funding we would not receive any of the money that the Ministry has set aside.</p> <p>• Question: Why do SCITS and St. Clair students get to move to one school while all the construction is being done yet we are not given this option? Answer: SCITS/SCSS is a different scenario. The majority of students can be accommodated in either building.</p> <p>• Question: What about increased traffic and pedestrian traffic at this school, 21 Highway and Confederation Street? Answer: Safe pathways and design for parking areas would look to be addressed. These same or similar pathways exist for our coterminous board.</p> <p>• Question: What about parking? Answer: An architect would be able to offer ideas on how to create better flow in the parking area. We see good opportunity based on the land and pathways available.</p> <p>• There is no plan so the town can't take action. There is not space to add additional drop off zones. Response: There is space here. There may be congestion a few times per day. They are the same concerns that we have at schools across the board. Please refer to Question #1 on the Wyoming ARC page under frequently asked questions for clarification on school crossing guards.</p> <p><i>#1. In discussion with CLASS they explained their correspondence with the Town of Plympton-Wyoming. CLASS inquired if there were crossing guards in Wyoming as part of their preliminary review of the potential impacts associated with the Wyoming Area ARC. Please note that as per the Highway Traffic Act, municipalities hire school crossing guards, not school boards. The Township advised that several years ago they did have a crossing guard at the intersection of Niagara Street and Broadway Street, but this was replaced with a permanent pedestrian crossing device. CLASS could make a request on behalf of the LKDSB to include a crossing guard but that request could be denied. The coterminous Board in the community does have many young elementary students that are within the walk distance to their school and are required to cross Broadway Street in this same section using the crosswalk as well.</i></p>	

Item	Discussion	Action/Responsibility
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="457 212 1619 342"> <p>• Question: Why won't you bus juniors? Answer: Students are bussed according to the CLASS Student Transportation Policy. This policy applies to the LKDSB, and our coterminous board. Please refer to https://www.schoolbusinfo.com Quick Links-Policies & Procedures</p> <li data-bbox="457 383 1619 513"> <p>• Comment: It seems like all you care about is the dollar amount. What about the safety of our children? Answer: The LKDSB takes student safety very seriously as do all of our staff in our buildings. Many of us are parents, grandparents and community members as well.</p> <li data-bbox="457 553 1619 651"> <p>• Question: Are you counting the computer lab as a classroom? Answer: The library computer lab will not be taken away. Our plan is to enhance the building not detract from it.</p> <li data-bbox="457 691 1619 821"> <p>• Question: Why wouldn't you just build 2 new classrooms? Answer: In other communities it was seen as an advantage to improve the gym and increase the size. Given the age of our buildings and the needs of our students it would seem to be something that would apply here as well.</p> <li data-bbox="457 862 1619 1162"> <p>• Question: Wyoming is growing what if we get more students? Answer: The County of Lambton Planning and Development Services Department provided the LKDSB with a copy of their population projections. These population projections mirror the demographic data provided by our demographics providers for the Wyoming area, and do not indicate significant growth. The information for Plympton-Wyoming is shown in the chart below. If you consider the Reference column projection, which is the average of the high and low projection, the population in 2021 is projected at 7308, a decline of 268 from 2011 and five years later, in 2026, a further decline of 193.</p> <div data-bbox="432 1195 911 1442" style="background-color: yellow; padding: 5px; margin-top: 10px;"> <p>The projections in this spreadsheet were produced by the County of Lambton Planning and Development Services Department and the resulting total populations were adopted by County Council for Land Use Planning Purposes</p> </div>	

Item	Discussion			Action/Responsibility	
	Population and dwelling counts	Plympton-Wyoming, T			
	Census Year	2011			
	Population in 2011	7576			
	Total private dwellings	3148			
	2021 Projections (2011 as base year)		3 Census Avg		
	Growth Scenario	Low	Reference	High	
	Age 0-4	295	316	338	
	Age 5-9	354	385	418	
	Age 10-14	409	440	473	
	Age 15-19	466	491	516	
	Age 20-24	311	344	378	
	Age 25-29	267	296	327	
	Age 30-34	385	401	417	
	Age 35-39	389	419	449	
	Age 40-44	365	398	432	
	Age 45-49	407	429	452	
	Age 50-54	470	498	527	
	Age 55-59	589	612	635	
	Age 60-64	657	684	711	
	Age 65-69	505	540	577	
	Age 70-74	430	474	520	
	Age 75-79	279	301	323	
	Age 80-84	154	159	163	
	Age 85+	90	121	156	
	Total	6824	7308	7811	
	2026 Projections (2011 as base year)		3 Census Avg		
	Growth Scenario	Low	Reference	High	
	Age 0-4	275	307	341	
	Age 5-9	325	366	410	
	Age 10-14	360	402	447	
	Age 15-19	399	441	485	

Item	Discussion			Action/Responsibility	
	Age 20-24	316	358	404	
	Age 25-29	217	247	279	
	Age 30-34	301	338	376	
	Age 35-39	416	461	508	
	Age 40-44	404	446	490	
	Age 45-49	362	406	453	
	Age 50-54	411	446	483	
	Age 55-59	465	496	530	
	Age 60-64	559	600	641	
	Age 65-69	573	618	666	
	Age 70-74	396	450	508	
	Age 75-79	348	389	433	
	Age 80-84	197	215	234	
	Age 85+	91	129	174	
	Total	6416	7115	7863	
	<p>Superintendent Girardi spoke with Erin Kwarciak, Planning Coordinator at the Town of Plympton-Wyoming. She confirmed that a developer has a draft approval for 92 lots on the east side of Wyoming. Some of these lots would include row and or townhouses marketed towards seniors. According to Ms. Kwarciak no date has been set for ground breaking.</p> <p>Regarding the 92 lots, our demographics provider has a mechanism for determining enrolment increases for housing developments. They provide this mechanism for school boards across the country. They indicate that a housing development of 20 single units would create a student population increase of 8 students aged 5-12. Currently in Plympton Wyoming the participation rate for students in the LKDSB is 55%. This would result in an approximate 4.4 student increase in the LKDSB elementary school population grades JK to 8, taking participation rates into consideration.</p>				

Item	Discussion	Action/Responsibility
<p>Committee Reflection of Jan.19/16 Meeting</p>	<p>The committee was asked to provide reflections from the Jan 19th meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jodi Campbell: The general impression was that it is mostly South Plympton parents that are concerned. That could be because the Wyoming students are older and Wyoming is a known school. Concerns from the Public were more transition team concerns. It validated my first impression that we are already one school. We have been lucky to have 2 schools. Everyone acknowledges those days are over. I acknowledge that it is frustrating. • Crystal Hordyk: A lot of the South Plympton parents have done research to answer their own questions. Safety is a major concern. • Linda Reid: It is unfair that you bus the kids from the south and not the north. <p>No other committee members offered comments.</p>	
<p>Presentation and Examination of School Accommodation Options</p>	<p>Discussion took place for Agenda Item #5 ARC Options Pros and Cons. ARC Committee members reviewed each option, and were given an opportunity to provide opinions or seek clarification on the existing information, as well as add additional pros and cons to the list for each scenario. An itemized list of pros and cons will be posted under the Wyoming Area ARC on the LKDSB website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5.1 - Status Quo : No committee members desired further discussion on this option at the next working meeting. There was consensus to remove this option from the table. • 5.2 - LCCVI as a 7-12 School and close either Wyoming or South Plympton PS: No committee members desired further discussion on this option at the next working meeting. There was consensus to remove this option from the table. • 5.3 - Consolidation at South Plympton PS with closure of Wyoming PS: The committee agreed they would like to have further discussions at a future meeting. 	

Item	Discussion	Action/Responsibility
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5.4 - LKDSB Initial Staff Report Recommendation: Closure of South Plympton PS and Consolidation into Wyoming PS: The committee agreed they would like to have further discussions at a future meeting. 	
<p>Questions/Future Discussions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question: Who notifies the community and parents about ARC meetings? Community members expressed concern about not having information provided regarding the process. Answer: There is an ARC link on the website: www.lkdsb.net Information has been sent out in the school newsletter. Posters will be put up in the schools. School councils can put this discussion on their agenda. Superintendent Girardi will review this process to make sure communities are informed moving forward. Crystal Hordyk made the comment: You are jeopardizing safety. You are moving too fast. We are being pushed into amalgamation with a wait and see attitude. Need to have a better temporary plan in place. Question: We need a comparison of what Wyoming PS needs compared to South Plympton PS to consider consolidation at either school. Can you provide a breakdown of service needs for each school i.e.: interiors, service etc.? <p>The committee requested this breakdown to reflect 6 scenarios:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Close South Plympton for 2016 and move students to Wyoming PS. 2. Close Wyoming PS for 2016 and move students to South Plympton PS. 3. Move all students into South Plympton PS and close Wyoming PS to complete Construction. Move all students back to Wyoming PS for 2017 and close South Plympton PS in 2017. 	

Item	Discussion	Action/Responsibility
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Move all students into Wyoming PS and close South Plympton PS to complete Construction. Move all students back to South Plympton PS for 2017 and close Wyoming PS in 2017. 5. Keep both open for 2016 make renovations to Wyoming PS and close South Plympton PS in 2017. Move all students to Wyoming PS in 2017. 6. Keep both open for 2016 make renovations to South Plympton PS and close Wyoming PS in 2017. Move all students to South Plympton PS in 2017. 	
Future Meetings	<p>Wyoming Area ARC Public Meeting – March 23rd, 2016</p> <p>Wyoming Area Working Meeting – March 31st, 2016</p> <p>Public walkthrough of Wyoming Campus – March 9th from 3:30-4:30 p.m. Public walkthrough of South Plympton Campus – March 10th from 3:30-4:30 p.m.</p> <p>The Board meeting on April 12 that was scheduled for Chatham has been changed to Sarnia.</p>	
Adjournment	8:00 p.m.	