

1. Will cross guards be looked at for the young walking students to the new consolidated site at Wyoming Public School?

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.

2. What changes will the LKDSB complete for Wyoming PS for September 2016 without getting funding as funding does not happen until October?

The LKDSB would ensure that the changes would include adequate classroom space and support space to accommodate the increase in student population. This would entail movement of classrooms and a review of storage and facility space to accommodate the students and staff population for September 2016.

3. Can you provide examples where an old gym has been refurbished to accommodate an updated learning space?

Photos of two kindergarten classrooms which were constructed from the old gym at Cathcart Blvd. PS.





Photos of two classrooms at Brooke Central PS where an old gym was converted into a computer lab and a classroom.





Photos of renovations completed at Queen Elizabeth II in Petrolia with the addition of windows.





Photos below show new windows that were cut into the existing wall during construction at Naahii Ridge PS. The first photo shows the gym during early demolition and the wall before the windows were added. The other photo show the before and after exterior photos of the gym.





4. We have studied in-depth, the information provided in the Information Profiles for both schools and feel that the research is very preliminary and not sufficient enough to base a final decision on.

There has been no final decision made. We are working through the process with the committee, the community and municipal partners. Please let us know which parts you would like further information on in regard to items in the school profiles.

5. We would like to see reports from a third party certified building inspector who has done a thorough investigation of both buildings. A history of improvements and projected possible 5 year renewal plan is too basic. We need to know all the facts on both of these building before a decision is finalized.

The condition assessments were done by the Ministry of Education's appointed engineering consulting company and they were both audited and recorded into the Total Capital Planning Solution in 2011. Since it was done in the same year, the LKDSB conclude that this makes a good comparison. We also have architects who have gone through both buildings and have been assigned the task of reviewing South Plympton PS and Wyoming PS to determine the possibility to accommodate all students at either school. They are assessing the potential costs associated for either scenario.

6. Where are the new plans for expansion? All parents that I have spoken with are extremely concerned about our children being safe throughout this process. Just imagine 30 or more 3 year olds being dropped off in a construction zone. Until we review a plan for that, parents are going to panic.

There has been no Final Staff Report delivered. We will have architects present at Working Meeting 2 to discuss plans. Safety of students and staff at school is very important to the LKDSB. We would not move forward with any situation that was deemed unsafe.

7. We need to see a project timeline. We want to see all planning prior to approval, this needs to be made public.

We are looking at the proposed alternatives recommended by the ARC Committee at the last Working Meeting. We will also have the architects present from ROA at the next Working Meeting to discuss both scenarios. It is impossible to have a project time line completed until the Final Staff Report has been written and has been voted on by the trustees.

8. Has any testing been done for hazardous materials such as asbestos and the black mould we keep hearing about at the Wyoming campus? This will have a serious impact on the construction process and should be a factor in the final decision. If these potential issues are only a rumour then we need to see sufficient documentation on that.

We have an asbestos assessment for Wyoming similar to what we would have for every school that is updated annually.

The LKDSB is not aware of any recent mould issues. We referred to both the recent site inspections and our potential incident system, Intellex, and there are no current reports that are present. The LKDSB does have consultants check for moisture and mould as part of their annual asbestos assessments. For Wyoming PS this is completed by Golder Associates. There was a report of some minor moisture leaks on ceiling tiles and a vapour barrier, but no mould was reported.

We did have an extensive mould assessment done in January 2010 by ECOH Environmental as part of an ETFO Mediation Agreement of 2007 to have all our elementary schools assessed for mould. All recommendations in regards to that report have been dealt with as part of the mediated agreement.

9. The picking up and dropping off of students will be a major issue. Most parents I know plan to drive their younger kids to school since they will no longer be bussed. This is already a problem at the Wyoming site. I would expect Parents and people living on these streets to be in an uproar from the traffic. I suggest you assess these numbers and re-plan this area accordingly. It will not work as it stands now.

The LKDSB has asked the architects to include this in their plans as it would be important to improve the design of traffic flow onto the school property. As mentioned, these architects will be present at the Working Meeting on March 31, 2016.

10. We feel that the numbers this decision is based on do not accurately reflect our specific situation, but are more countywide based.

The LKDSB is looking for efficiencies across the entire Board. In addition, this is the only school in the LKDSB that has two campuses.

11. In the minutes from the Feb29th working meeting, a portion of one of the responses is not quite correct. It should state “this would result in an approximate 4.4 student increase (PER 20 households of the development) in the elementary school population grades SK -8, taking participation rates into consideration. This is important because even if a 50% ratio of single family units is assumed of the 92 lot development (which is likely too low), this is 46 households and leads to an estimated student population increase of 11 students (10.12 unrounded), not 4.4 students.

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.

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.

The number 4.4 is based on per 20 single units. This can be clarified in the Record of Action.

12. What is the process to apply to the Ministry?

There are two funding application based programs that the Ministry allows the Board to access. The first capital funding program is specifically for school consolidations. The LKDSB approved the Wyoming Area Accommodation Review on November 24th, 2015. The Ministry released the Year Two timelines for the four year capital funding program on December 16, 2015 with an application deadline of February 29, 2016 and final approved ARC decision deadline by Board Trustees no later than March 29, 2016.

The second Ministry application program is the Capital Priorities Grant which is funding the Ministry makes available annually to all school boards for consolidation projects, additions and any other large capital projects. The current

annual capital funding received by the LKDSB is approximately \$14 million and is to be used at all schools across the district. The LKDSB will be competing with 71 other school boards across Ontario for this Capital Priorities Grant funding.

13. What are the Ministry requirements you have to have to apply for the funding?

To apply for the funding, the Board needs a final trustee decision on an accommodation review.

If there is a final trustee decision on an accommodation review, the Board can then make application for a consolidation project. Based on the last capital application process, eligible projects for funding consideration included the following:

- Consolidating two (or more) schools into one new facility.
- Building an addition and/or undertaking a major renovation to an existing school to accommodate enrolment from other schools that a board has made a decision to close.
- Right-sizing existing schools by renovating existing excess space for other uses including Community Hubs.

14. What is the final staff report?

The following information comes from page 11 of the Ontario Ministry of Education Pupil Accommodation Guidelines. It is located on the LKDSB website under the Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) under the Board Info Section.

Final Staff Report

At the conclusion of the pupil accommodation review process, school board staff will submit a final staff report to the Board of Trustees which must be available to the public as determined in the school board's policy, and posted on the school board's website.

The final staff report must include a Community Consultation section that contains feedback from the ARC and any public consultations as well as any relevant information obtained from municipalities and other community partners prior to and during the pupil accommodation review.

School board staff may choose to amend their proposed option(s) included in the initial staff report. The recommended option(s) must also include a proposed accommodation plan, prepared for the decision of the Board of Trustees, which contains a timeline for implementation.

15. What is the Transition Committee, how is it formed, and what are the expectations of it?

A Transition Committee is formed to oversee the blending of schools. This process is started after Trustees make a decision. The Transition Committee has staff on the committee and will consider items such as,

- School Colours
- Mascot
- Items in classrooms
- Memorabilia
- Scholarships
- Equipment
- Pictures on Walls etc.

Transition Committee Members:

From each school involved:

Principal, 2 teachers, School Council Chair, clerical/custodial staff, parent/community member, First Nation Partner, Educational Assistant and 2 Students.

Subcommittees are developed as needed.

There is a separate Reg on the renaming of a facility. *Naming and Renaming of Board Facilities*

16. What if the Trustees vote no, or to wait on closing the door till we have the funding in place?

If Trustees vote no to consolidation then consolidation does not take place. You cannot apply for Ministry funding unless a vote from the Trustees has taken place. It is not possible to wait on funding prior to a decision.

17. How does the voting work with the Trustees?

This is outlined under the LKDSB Board Procedural By-laws at <http://www.lkdsb.net/Board-Info/bylaws.htm>.

18. If someone votes down this motion then what happens, does it go forward to the board?

The ARC committee does not have to reach agreement and does not vote on what is to be included in the Final Staff Report.

19. Being told that our 3 and 4 year olds have to climb up onto a toilet is not safe or hygienic. Some of these children can't reach the sinks to properly wash their hands. There is safety concerns with only having one washroom for all of the girls student population and the boys student population.

Additional washrooms are part of our request of the architects for both sites. At present Wyoming PS has the following facilities:

Boys Washroom – 4 urinals + 2 toilets

Girls Washroom – 6 toilets

2 barrier free washrooms w/ 1 toilet each located in the special needs room. These fixtures can count as 2 for each boys and girls according to the Ontario Building Code but since the doors to the washrooms are not off the corridor, the general student population would likely not use these washrooms.

There is one washroom between what could be the 2 proposed JK/SK rooms w/ 1 toilet.

It could be considered as a universal toilet room and count as 1 fixture towards both boys and girls.

Totals:

Boys – 4 urinals + 3 toilets (7 x 30) = 210 boys

Girls – 7 toilets (7 X 26) = 182 girls.

The Ontario Building Code requires occupancy based on 50% boys and 50% girls. This would mean that there could be a total of 364 students (2 x 182) according to washroom fixture count.

At present South Plympton PS has the following facilities:

Boys Washroom = 5 urinals + 4 toilets = 9 fixtures

(9 x 30) = 270 boys

Girls Washroom = 7 toilets

(7 x 26) = 182 girls

Maximum allowable occupancy based on washroom fixtures = 2 x 182 = 364 (for 50% boys and 50% girls).

There are additional 2 boys toilets and 2 girls toilets in the best start. These are only used for the best start and general school population would not use these washrooms.

It should be noted that even though the washroom fixture count could accommodate up to 364 students, the septic system was designed for current building occupancy. It is doubtful that the current septic system could handle a load of 364 students.

20. Does the Ministry of Education not have a guideline on this.

- **a JK and a grade 8 student sharing the same washrooms?
(as a parent I have grave concern with this.)**

There is no Ministry of Education guideline on this. We refer to the Ontario Building Code reference Division B, Part 3, 3.7.4.3 (14).

21. Overview of what the school will look like?

We will bring architects to Working Meeting 2 and they will outline potential plans for either school.

22. Will the board sell the building?

- **Why is this outside the ARC. Why can't this be answered ?**

What will that money go towards ? ie.. the improvements to the chosen school here, or is that eating in to the board budget?

If the Trustees approve a consolidation, resulting in a surplus property, the Education Act, Ontario Regulation 444/98, outlines the process that must be followed.

23. Last year there was a full grade 1 class. This year after 4 days there was a ½ split because of additional students. What if after 5 years you need more classrooms?

- **Answer:If there is a drastic change in population we would have to review. We have to do the best we can with the predictions we have. There will be flexibility.**

-How can this be reviewed after the fact ?

-How can you can you say you are making the right decision when you haven't used all of the population information?

-How can you be flexible (there will be flexibility) what do you mean by that statement?

We have many schools where students move during the summer. This happens on a regular basis in all elementary schools across the LKDSB. This requires class reorganization to meet mandatory class sizes as outlined by the Ministry of Education.

The Ministry of Education is no longer funding unused spaces and our data at present does not show a population increase, nor does the data supplied to us from the County of Lambton.

24. How would the site be ready for FDK by September?

- **Answer: should the recommendations be approved, then the necessary accommodations would have to be made to provide a welcoming environment for the FDK students.**

What do you consider to be a welcoming environment?

Having 3 4 and 5 years in a school that they can't get on a toilet or wash their hands or even hang their bag up is NOT A WELCOME ENVIROMRNT.

What will be done?

What steps in details will be taking to have this school in a state of readiness for them, by September 2016?

The LKDSB discussed alternative time lines with the ARC Committee at the last Working Meeting. We will entertain this idea for a change in time line in the Final Staff Report.

25. Communication: *Mr. Girardi requested ideas for possible forms of communication at the most recent working meeting:*

- a) Provide drop boxes for questions at each of the schools. This would provide access to all (particularly those without internet access or skills) as well as an anonymous outlet for questions and concerns.**
- b) Upcoming meetings could be published in the events sections of the local papers - this is usually free of charge. Options: Sarnia This Week; Coffee News; Petrolia Independent; Sarnia Observer**
- c) Posters in schools of upcoming meetings and information on the process.**
- d) Please keep in mind that "Everything is posted on the website" is not a reasonable answer for all stakeholders. Not everyone has the time or resources to peruse the website at leisure. And no, not everything is on the website - contact information for all ARC members for instance is not.**

The following information has been circulated by the schools and/or the LKDSB.

--Notice of Amalgamation letter went out from Director Costello on November 25, 2015

--Notice of January ARC meeting was in January Newsletter and on the January Calendar that went out prior to the Christmas break

--ARC informed of avenues of communication at the Orientation Session on January 7

--Public informed of avenues of communication at the public ARC meeting on January 19th

--Notice has been posted on the School Website

--Separate notice went out on February 22, 2016 about upcoming March meetings.

- March calendar and newsletter had meeting dates and school tour dates.
- The Independent and The Observer had articles on the ARC and they listed the next ARC meeting, March 23
- Photocopies of all of the information off of the website (and updated) is available for the public at the schools
- Box at front door (at Wyoming) for questions since the last working meeting
- Notices that have been sent home about dates have been, and are, posted outside the offices

26. Reading through the ARC guidelines for the LKDSB, there doesn't seem to be clear communication responsibilities and although this may not have been an issue in the past, it seems to have caused a breakdown at the initiation of the Wyoming amalgamation discussions. Will this be raised as a flaw of the guidelines and corrective action taken to further develop the ARC policy and guidelines to better address the communication standards and responsibilities? With several more ARCs in the near future for the board, it would be prudent to not have this issue happen again.

This item can be included as part of our review of the LKDSB Guidelines.

27. How are the ARCs formed? Should this not be a nomination process? From speaking with the ARC parent representatives, they did not ask to be part of the committee but were called out of the blue and asked to participate. However, there was another parent that had asked to be on the committee prior to its formation who was not asked. This person is still very involved and supporting the parent representatives tremendously but this seems to be another fault in the ARC process. It would have been valuable to have a communication sent home requesting interested parties to notify the principal or the board and then the committee formed. This would provide more validity to the committee and process as well.

The ARC Committee is selected by the schools involved. This process can reviewed in our guidelines with the potential for a more specific process to be followed.

28. Should there be a member of the municipality/town on the ARC to facilitate the municipal impacts of the options and potential transition concerns? Ie. crossing guards, traffic studies, impact to downtown business, municipal funding, etc.. Or is this the responsibility of the community representative to seek this input and be the conduit for the municipal participation?

The LKDSB consults with our community partners. For example, we have met with the Town of Wyoming and are open to further discussions should the need arise. In addition, the LKDSB invited the following entities regarding community planning and/or facility partnerships to a special meeting in October 2015. The meeting and process was to allow community organizations to work together to optimize the use of our public assets. At this meeting we offered space in our schools to partners with the hope to strengthen the role of schools in the community prior to starting an Accommodation Review. We went through our list of schools with low enrolment. We continue to meet with interested communities and businesses. The following is a list of those invited:

- Conseil Scolaire Viamonde (116 Cornelius Parkway, Toronto, ON. M6L 2K5)
- St. Clair Catholic DSB (420 Creek Street, Wallaceburg, ON. N8A 4C4)
- Conseil Scolaire Catholique Providence (7515, promenade Forest Glade, Windsor, ON. N8T 3P5)
- St. Clair College
- Lambton College
- College Boreal (21, boulevard Lasalle, Sudbury, ON. P3A 6B1)

- University of Guelph (Ridgetown Campus)
- University of Western (Research Branch, Sarnia)
- Crown Right of Ontario - Infrastructure Ontario (One Dundas Street West, Suite 2000, Toronto, ON. M5G2L5)
- Public Works and Government Services, Real Estate Services (The Crown in right of Canada) (4900 Yonge Street, 10th Floor, Toronto, ON. M2N 6A6)
- Municipality of Chatham-Kent
- City of Sarnia
- Brooke-Alvinston Township
- Dawn-Euphemia Township
- Enniskillen Township
- Municipality of Lambton Shores
- The Township of St. Clair
- Village of Oil Springs
- Town of Petrolia
- Town of Plympton-Wyoming
- Village of Point Edward
- Township of Warwick
- Warden of Lambton County
- Sarnia Lambton Children's Aid Society
- Erie St. Clair Local Health Integration Network (LHIN)
- Chatham-Kent Public Health Unit
- Lambton Public Health
- Chatham Kent Children's Services
- St. Clair Child and Youth
- Aamjiwnaang First Nation
- Walpole Island First Nation
- Delaware Nation (Moravian of the Thames)
- Kettle and Stony Point First Nation

29. Who is responsible for soliciting feedback from the immediate neighbours of the school locations? For Wyoming site this is an immediate need given the increased traffic expected and where there is already congestion. These property owners should be contacted directly by the ARC and made aware of the potential change in the school capacity and construction. How is this being done? We know communication methods are already an issue so these stakeholders should not be left to be self-informed - particularly if they do not have children in the schools. Without children in the schools, some towns people are not aware of the issue at all. Only the SCITS/St.Clair issue is being highly publicized in the media.

The LKDSB can work with the school and the community to inform neighbours once a decision has been made.

30. With consideration that the Staff report was already very lengthy, I am concerned why were there not more than one option proposed by the staff report for potential amalgamation options for Wyoming/South Plympton. And the same can be said for the secondary school issue and future steps of the recommendation. It appears the staff report is lacking in alternatives for the ARCs to evaluate and therefore the ARCs are having to develop alternative lists and evaluate them themselves. Based on the documented ARC process available on the LKDSB website, this is not the mandate of the ARC. It is understandable that as part of the ARC review process, new alternatives may be raised that

were not thought of before and that is acceptable for the ARC to bring to the table as part of their review. But it appears that the ARC is doing a lot more than they should be due to the deficiencies of the staff report in alternatives available for each of the sites. As a tax payer and observer of the process, this is disappointing. Can we expect an amendment to the 2015 staff report or a more robust version of a staff report in 2016 to include alternatives to recommendations proposed for balance of the LKDSB 8 step amalgamation plan?

This is something that the LKDSB will discuss for future Pupil Accommodation Reviews.

31. If it is the intent per the Staff Report proposal to build a new ALLP classroom at Wyoming site (per page 27 of the report), then the fact that the Wyoming building has the existing ALLP classroom is not an advantage of the Wyoming site selection. Is this a correct statement?

The building of additional classrooms is subject to funding from the Ministry of Education. It may be more cost effective to keep the ALLP classroom and refresh it, as opposed to reconstructing the existing facility. Therefore it may be an advantage to the Wyoming PS site.

Written Questions placed in ARC Box from Public during the March 31st ARC Working Meeting

32. Why is there no Plan B if there is no funding?

If accommodation funding from the Ministry of Education is not available, then the capital focus will be on the renewal and refurbishment of the existing Wyoming Public School site or the existing South Plympton Public School site. The LKDSB's capital funding received under the annual Ministry of Education grant funding can be used to improve and refresh the current student environment. Areas of primary concern in this situation would include upgrading/increasing the classroom spaces to accommodate the consolidated student population. As noted by members of the Accommodation Review Committee this process would also be assisted with an extended time line for consolidation. The same process would apply where an architect is hired to design a facility to improve the building to accommodate the spaces necessary with an agreed upon funding total.

It should be noted that any new facility space would still need to be approved by the Ministry of Education even if the LKDSB elects to use its own capital funding.

33. What if the Board does not get any funding? What is the plan then? I am personally planning on building a multimillion dollar agricultural facility and I have a plan if I don't receive the funding for a Plan B. Why do you not have a Plan B?

See the response above. The primary concern is to accommodate the student population and this would be addressed using the LKDSB capital funding.

34. Is there a public input process to respond and participate in the proposed design once the decision has been made? For instance, the JK/SK classes are at the opposite end of the building from the daycare space. This seems counter-intuitive for parents with children in these similar age groups especially if daycare options expanded.

Should funding be acquired from the Ministry of Education, the final design will be determined after several reviews by the LKDSB. Input is sought out from several areas in the board including the school principal. This would relate to the meeting of program needs and operational needs of the school. The principal will be responsible to field questions raised by their staff and from the school community and bring forward concerns and input. The Board also seeks input from partnerships. For example, in regard to the day care input would be sought from CLASS and their dialogue with the County of Lambton. In this process, the LKDSB does not consult with the public directly. Should items be brought

forward from the principal there is no guarantee that design parameters requested are met but there would be an attempt to do so. Ultimately, there is budget, site condition and space constraints that have to be considered in the final design as well.

35. CLASS – when will the savings of redesigned routes be known? In time for the Final Report? Would it be reasonable to assume there would not be a significant savings potential at one site over another?

CLASS has stated that the incremental reductions will not be quantifiable until the complete routing solution is designed and that won't occur until the summer before the changes are implemented. As previously indicated, the savings is based on sharing 4 or 5 elementary bus routes in the Wyoming area for the coterminous boards as opposed to the current routes that include running 6 bus routes independently.

36. What percentage of natural light do the classrooms have to have?

The Building Code and Education Act do not have required percentage for natural light. Although not ideal, it is not against any code or mandatory regulations to have a classroom without natural daylight.

37. Why can't we look at making an ECO friendly school and using gray water systems and solar systems besides just LED lights at South Plympton?

We will make every attempt to employ Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED's) methods but the LKDSB will not make applications for certification as this adds unnecessary costs. Not all LEED's designs are cost effective. Based on past experience, the LKDSB would avoid LEED's, such as in-ground source heating systems, as they are hard to maintain and repair. Most architects are LEED's certified in design practices.

Please note that Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED's) is a green building certification program that recognizes best-in-class building strategies and practices. To receive LEED certification, building projects must earn points to achieve different levels of certification. Joe Ouellette who is one of the architects that presented at Working Meeting #2 is LEED's trained and has this designation.

38. Can we use a holding tank not septic system at South Plympton to cut cost?

If we were to temporarily locate to South Plympton PS it would make sense to have a holding tank and not expand the septic system. If we plan to permanently locate to South Plympton PS we would be required to replace the old septic system with a new and expanded service.