

**WORKING MEETING #2 FOR THE WYOMING AREA SCHOOLS
PUPIL ACCOMMODATION REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES/RECORD OF ACTION**

Date: March 31, 2016
Location: Wyoming Public School, 606 Thames Street, Wyoming

Present: Committee Members: Gary Girardi, Superintendent of Education – Capital Planning and Pupil Accommodation, Taf Lounsbury, Superintendent of Education – Program: Early Years/Elementary, Deb Bramham, Principal, Chad Brown, Vice Principal, South Plympton School Campus, Crystal Hordyk, Parent Representative, South Plympton School Campus, Jen Crummer, Parent Representative, Linda Reid, Community Representative, Kaylee Clarke, Student Representative, Wyoming School Campus, Emma Gibson, 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, Kent Orr, General Manager of CLASS, Transportation Consortium, Wendy Pitvor, Health and Safety Officer, Andy Scheibli, Manager, LKDSB Building Services

Regrets:

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, Trustee Bob Murphy, Student Trustee Cole Anderson, Trustee Jack Fletcher, Chair of the Board Jayne Bryce and Mayor Lonny Napper. <p>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 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.</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action/Responsibility
	<p>Delegations can be made directly to the LKDSB Trustees at the April 12, 26 or May 10 Board Meetings. Those wishing to delegate to Board should Contact Executive Assistant Trish Johnston, trish.johnston@lkdsb.net. Delegations are limited to ten minutes and requests must be received no later than the Wednesday before the Tuesday Board Meeting.</p>	
Adoption of Agenda	<p>Question: Can I ask questions directly after the presentations? Answer: Yes.</p> <p>Question: Why can't the public ask questions instead of putting questions in the box? Answer: This element is not part of our Regulations and did not occur at our previous Working meetings. We must remain consistent in our process. We will take a break after the presentations and the Committee members can bring more questions forward after the break.</p> <p>The Committee did not have any concerns with the Agenda.</p>	
Adoption of Minutes/Record of Action from March 23/16	<p>The Committee did not have any concerns with the Minutes/Record of Action from the March 23/16 meeting.</p>	
Committee Reflections from the March 23/16 Meeting	<p>Jodi Campbell: I think we are being heard. You have listened and are willing to entertain the possibility of not doing things quite as quickly as originally stated.</p> <p>Linda Reid: I agree with Jodi. We were concerned that things were moving too fast but we are starting to feel that you are listening.</p> <p>Chad Brown: Like the others, I am relieved that the timeline is being reconsidered.</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action/Responsibility
	<p>Crystal Hordyk: I am disappointed that the presentations had to happen at the very last meeting. This does not give the public a chance to respond. We have more presentations tonight than we have had in the past 72 days. What is a presentation without a response?</p> <p>Response –The presentations that are being made tonight are in response to requests from the Committee. In comparison to previous ARCs we have drilled down more than we have in the past. We have tried to provide answers and respond to questions as quickly as we can.</p> <p>Jen Crummer: My only concern was that there were no presentations at the Public Meeting.</p>	
Presentations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kent Orr, General Manager of CLASS, Transportation Consortium spoke to the Committee about the impact of the subdivision, the walk boundary, and walk strategies. It was shared that Holy Rosary does not have a structured program for walk strategies. Typically the students partner up in peer groups and walk together. • Question: If the community had concerns, is there a way to discuss them with the town to look at alternative options other than a crosswalk? Answer: The formal process would be a written request. • Question: How many students/bus are there on average? Answer: For elementary the maximum is 60 students/bus. For secondary the maximum is 48 students/bus. • Question: If Wyoming PS is the school that is chosen, will there be one less bus? Answer: We would look at existing routes. • Question: What is the criteria for a courtesy seat? Answer: Courtesy seats are granted on a first come first serve basis if there is space. They must be on an existing bus route with no extra stops or cost. 	

Item	Discussion	Action/Responsibility
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question: Can we change the criteria and give consideration to FDK students? Answer: We could get input from the Principal. Some students may volunteer to walk and that would free up spaces. • Question: Is there a possibility that all 3 public schools would share a bus? Answer: That would be our intention. We would look at our existing routes. • Wendy Pitvor, Health and Safety Officer spoke to the Committee regarding Health and Safety issues at both schools. There are very minor asbestos issues in both schools. There have been no recent concerns from staff members or school representatives regarding mold at either location. If parents would like to go through the asbestos reports they can set up an appointment with the school principal and the Health and Safety Officer to review the report and answer any questions. • Andy Scheibli, Manager of LKDSB Building Services introduced architects Marco Raposo and Joe Ouellette from ROA Studio Inc. ROA Studio Inc. was asked to evaluate both sites without prejudice. Architectural drawings for proposed changes at both schools were presented to the Committee. Superintendent Girardi reminded the Committee that the Board must receive funding before renovations can begin. The drawings are not a guarantee of what will be done at either building. • Question: Do you have to provide your plan to the Ministry to get your funding? Answer: No, we request an amount. We do not submit drawings. 	

Item	Discussion	Action/Responsibility
	<p>Proposed improvements to South Plympton PS included a new gymnasium with change rooms and washrooms that would also house the daycare, two additional classrooms and a new administration office with increased security. Adequate parking and student drop off areas were also addressed. A new septic system would be needed to house the new occupant load. The mechanical distribution would need to be completely redone and lighting would require new service to the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A committee member questioned the need to update the septic system. <p>Architect Joe Ouellette clarified that the septic system at South Plympton PS is old and any work and/or additions to the bathrooms would require the septic system to be replaced. This is based on the number of toilets and washroom fixtures. It is not based on the number of students housed at the school.</p> <p>Proposed improvements to Wyoming PS included a new gymnasium/daycare, and a new administration hub. The only expansion would be the new gym and a small addition to convert the existing gymnasium into a resource centre/library and classroom. Parking and student drop off areas were also addressed. Electrical systems would need to be upgraded. All windows would need to be replaced.</p> <p>The classrooms in each school would be refurbished in both scenarios.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question: Do both schools have the same amount of tarmac? Answer: The asphalt area is the same at both schools. • Question: We currently have a room with no windows in center of the school at Wyoming PS. What is the plan for that room? Answer: It would be repurposed into 2 rooms, a staff work room and the remainder would be used as general storage for the entire school. • Question: What is the percentage of windows per square size of room? Answer: The minimum is 10 percent. We would try to maximize the windows • Question: As far as parking space, are they the same? Answer: The amount of parking space is exactly the same at both sites. 	

Item	Discussion	Action/Responsibility
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="457 212 1608 440"> <p>• Question: If there are more major things to do at South Plympton PS then it is done. You won't have to address bigger issues in the future. If you are applying for funding why not go with South Plympton PS? Let's choose the best school. Answer: Everything is predicated on a grant. The Ministry looks at the on ground capacity. Wyoming has more capacity. There is a concern that the Ministry would question why we would close a school with a higher OTG and ask for money for one with a lower OTG.</p> <li data-bbox="457 480 1608 610"> <p>• Question: In both proposals you talked about the general office area. Is that the staff room? Answer: We provided a meeting/conference area in each hub. This does not replace the existing staff room.</p> <li data-bbox="457 651 1608 748"> <p>• Question: Is it possible to add a grey water system? Answer: Yes, it is possible but not what we would want to adopt throughout the Board. It is more costly upfront. The payoff would be over the long term.</p> <li data-bbox="457 821 1629 951"> <p>• Brian McKay, Superintendent of Business presented 5 year capital project requirements for South Plympton PS and Wyoming PS. The figures reflect the latest 5 year capital data as provided to school boards by the Ministry of Education. The FCI for South Plympton PS was 53.82%. The FI for Wyoming PS was 33.71%.</p> <li data-bbox="457 992 1251 1154"> <p>• Question: Are these numbers what needs to be done? Answer: Yes.</p> <p>The 3 year average operating costs by school was very similar but Superintendent McKay clarified that the Board's decision would not be based on operating costs.</p> <li data-bbox="457 1227 1608 1357"> <p>• Question – Why is the maintenance & repair number higher for South Plympton PS? Answer: This number is based on normal maintenance items in that given year. It is driven by work orders for the school. More repairs were needed.</p> 	

Item	Discussion	Action/Responsibility
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question – Currently South Plympton PS has the higher FCI. Once the sites are revamped would South Plympton PS have a lower FCI than Wyoming PS? Does the Ministry look at what the FCI would be? Answer: The Ministry looks at the current FCI. They would factor the new FCI in for capital renewal money. • Question: Has there been any thought to putting blockades at the front of the building? Answer: The concern would be evaluated. • Question: What happens in other communities where there is only one location? Answer: It would be a multi-year construction project. • Question: Are you suggesting that in both scenarios that it would be more cost effective to vacate the students during construction. Answer: From a capital standpoint, it is more cost effective to turn the complete school into a construction site and only mobilize contractors once. However, the added cost of phasing in a construction project would need to be analyzed against portable and other costs required to temporarily move all students to one school. The Board, along with the architect, would also look at methods to have the contractor mobilize on-site and move around to different areas of the school without breaking the project into different phases. 	
Presentation and Examination of School Accommodation Options	<p>6.1 Close South Plympton PS for 2016 and move students to Wyoming PS</p> <p>The Committee unanimously agreed to take this option off the table.</p> <p>6.2 Close Wyoming PS for 2016 and move students to South Plympton PS</p> <p>The Committee unanimously agreed to take this option off the table.</p> <p>6.3 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.</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action/Responsibility
	<p>6.4 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</p> <p>6.5 Keep both open for 2016, make renovations to Wyoming PS and close South Plympton PS for 2017. Move all students to Wyoming PS in 2017.</p> <p>6.6 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.</p> <p>There was unanimous support for options 6.3, 6.4, 6.5 and 6.6. The preferred option was 6.3 or 6.4.</p>	
<p>Questions from the Committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question: Can the construction be done in one year? Answer: While it would be the Board's intention to perform all construction work in one year, this timeline is subject to delays based on possible available funding, timing of any funding announcements from the Ministry, and unforeseen issues that occur during construction that must be addressed. • Question: When would construction start? Answer: If we had approval in October we could start on renovations in November. Some work would have to wait until spring. 	
<p>ARC Final Input to LKDSB Administration for inclusion in the Final Staff Report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestion: As far as procedure, you should consider bringing in experts earlier in the process. I know that you can't commit to drawings but it reassures people when they can see what the building may look like. • Question: When it comes to selling one of these properties would it not be easier to sell Wyoming PS? Does that get put into your proposal? Answer: That is not part of the capital application. When we sell a property we put the proceeds into our capital funding. 	

Item	Discussion	Action/Responsibility
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: This has not been about trying to stop the School Board from closing one of our sites. We have never disagreed with this amalgamation. We have only asked that the School Board reconsider the time frame as well as do further research to choose the most adequate school that will provide our children the best educational environment as well as a safe institution to come to every day. Please take the time to review the frequently asked questions, meeting minutes, comments, statements and opinions that our community have stressed. Choosing the better institution is what our main focus has been since January 19 2016! • Suggestion: Site walkthroughs could be 30-60 minutes prior to a Working or Public Meeting. 	
Next Steps – Presentation of Final Staff Report to LKDSB Board of Trustees	Superintendent Girardi acknowledged that this was not an easy task for the Committee members. He thanked the Committee for their contributions.	
Adjournment	9:40 p.m.	