

## MINUTES OF ACCOMMODATION REVIEW COMMITTEE (ARC) Central Whitby MEETING

Wednesday, January 14, 2009  
3:00 – 5:00 p.m. Education Centre - Room 1017

### *In Attendance:*

Chair: Joe Hircock  
Secretary: David Visser

### Members (alpha by school):

Monique deVillers (Principal, Capt. M. VandenBos)  
Linda Lyons (Parent Rep, Capt. M. VandenBos)  
Carole McLeod (Teacher Rep, Capt. M. VandenBos)  
Judy Wityszyn (Parent Rep, Capt. M. VandenBos)  
Alana Browne (Teacher Rep, Florence M. Heard)  
Chris Montgomery (Parent Rep, Florence M. Heard)  
Sharon Murdoch (Parent Rep, Florence M. Heard)  
Brigitte Sopher (Principal, Florence M. Heard)  
Carol Bell (Teacher Rep, Jack Miner)  
Trudy Collins (Principal, Jack Miner)  
Gail Dyson (Non-teaching Rep, Jack Miner)  
Cathy Wade (Parent Rep, Jack Miner)  
Jacquie Weber (Parent Rep, Jack Miner)  
Lynda Darling (Teacher Rep, Leslie McFarlane)  
Scott Irwin (Parent Rep, Leslie McFarlane)  
Jim Olson (Principal, Leslie McFarlane)  
Kirsty Sinclair (Parent Rep, Leslie McFarlane)  
Judy Whiteman (Non-teaching Rep, Leslie McFarlane)  
Marion Fulcher (Non-teaching Rep, Palmerston)  
Sylvia Land (Parent Rep, Palmerston)  
Leilah McBride (Teacher Rep, Palmerston)  
Tim Ralph (Principal, Palmerston)  
Angie Weiss (Parent Rep, Palmerston)  
Joe Hamilton (Non-teaching Rep, Pringle Creek)  
Sue Lunn (Principal, Pringle Creek)  
Jill MacCharles-Crain (Teacher Rep, Pringle Creek)  
Steven Misner (Parent Rep, Pringle Creek)

Facilitator: Lygia Dallip  
Consultant: Daniel Del Bianco  
ARC Resource Staff: Carey Trombino, Senior Planner  
Janet Edwards, Administrative Officer – Whitby/Oshawa  
Danielle Pépin, Administrative Assistant  
Regrets: Monica Porteous (Non-teaching Rep, Florence M. Heard)  
Debra Hayes (Non-teaching Rep, Capt. M. VandenBos)

Joe Hircock, ARC Chair, welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. He apologized for missing last week's meeting. He referred everyone to today's agenda for review and approval.

He stated that it will be necessary for the group to come to an understanding that there needs to be a solution in terms of Scenario 1 and Scenario 2. Chair Hircock referred to the six additional community-developed scenarios that came forward since the last ARC working meeting and that David Visser, ARC Secretary, will speak to these in detail. Joe Hircock then commented that a deadline date of January 9, 2009 at 4:30 p.m. for submissions had been established at last week's meeting. Time would be provided today to allow the group to talk amongst themselves, and then with others, to review the scenarios.

Mr. Hircock then referred the ARC members to the package of handouts they had each received upon arrival. He reviewed the contents of the documents, item by item, and asked everyone to ensure they were in possession of all named documents.

Motion to accept the January 14, 2009 Agenda

Moved: Chris Montgomery (Parent Rep, Florence M. Heard)

Seconded: Monique DeVillers (Principal, Capt. M. VandenBos)

Carried

The Chair requested that the ARC review the Minutes of January 7, 2009. There were no comments resulting from the review of the minutes.

Motion to accept the Minutes of January 7, 2009

Moved: Leilah McBride (Teacher Rep, Palmerston)

Seconded: Jim Olson (Principal, Leslie McFarlane)

Carried

Agenda Item #4 Review of scenarios:

David Visser, ARC Secretary, spoke of the four scenarios provided at the last meeting of January 7th, 2009 starting with Tab 17, referred to as Scenario A, Scenario B, Scenario C, and, Scenario D. It had been agreed at the last meeting, by the ARC, that these four scenarios were not to move forward.

Six additional scenarios were developed as a result of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Public Meeting, as well as the ARC working meeting of January 7, 2009. The ARC was provided with an opportunity to review all six new scenarios proposed by the community.

David Visser, ARC Secretary, provided a brief description and review of enrolment trends applicable to each of the six additional scenarios E through H. He indicated that in modeling the costs for a 392 Pupil Place school, resource staff did an averaging based on current construction costs since the Board does not usually construct schools of this size.

### ***Minutes of ARC Central Whitby Meeting, January 14, 2009 pg 3***

Scenario E (ARC binder tab 23) was at a cost of \$ 22.7M with a utilization average of 103%  
Scenario F1 (ARC binder tab 24) was at a cost of \$22.1M with a utilization average of 103%.

Scenario F2 (ARC binder tab 25) was at a cost of \$17M with a utilization average of 112%. Scenario G1 (ARC binder tab 26) was at a cost of \$22.1M with a utilization average of 106%. Scenario G2 (ARC binder tab 27) was at a cost of \$21.2M with a utilization average of 109%. Scenario H (ARC binder tab 28) was at a cost of \$13.9M with a utilization average of 124%.

With respect to proposed new construction at the Palmerston Avenue PS site, an ARC member observed that it may be necessary for some students to be moved twice during the ARC process as the site could not accommodate the students and the new construction at the same time. The initial move would be to hold the students at another school while construction was underway.

Joe Hircock, ARC Chair, asked David Visser if it was necessary to share all utilization information with the Ministry of Education. David Visser responded that all information was required to be available for any school named in this ARC Central Whitby process.

A member commented that in one of the newly presented scenarios, an addition of 10 portables for a brand new school was proposed at the Palmerston site and she felt that this seemed very odd.

David Visser, ARC Secretary, indicated that this was in a scenario brought forward by a community member. Mr. Visser indicated that the site size (5.36 acres) and narrow layout of the Palmerston location would not be conducive to placing 10 portables on that site. The school configuration, if larger than the proposed 392, would have to be long and narrow due to site constraints, instead of the Board's standard shape.

Mr. Visser brought the ARC's attention to the demolition costs included at Palmerston Avenue PS. David Visser responded to a member inquiring as to the cost of a school demolition. He stated that the average cost of a demolition is \$500,000.

A member commented that given that the Gifted and FI students come from all over Whitby, it would be ideal to consider a second site in Whitby rather than placing them in the same geographical area.

David Visser, ARC, Secretary, reminded the group that this ARC process was intended to deal with the six schools listed in this ARC Central Whitby process only. It may be necessary to establish other ARCs to address the other areas of Whitby.

Joe Hircock, ARC Chair, agreed that this was a challenge. He stated that Central Whitby is a more feasible location rather than North Whitby because of distance. Demographics must be taken into consideration. In time, there may be another school erected in North Whitby for a gifted program as the population moves northward.

An ARC member stated that bussing students is costly to the school board and that this very cost also needs to be considered.

***Minutes of ARC Central Whitby Meeting, January 14, 2009 pg 4***

Joe Hircock, ARC Chair, stated that portables are more expensive to purchase than it is to transport students. He reminded the members that at one time, there were no busses available for the transportation of students in the French Immersion or Gifted programs.

David Visser, ARC Secretary reminded the members that the DDSB currently has over 400 portables in the system. There is space available at a number of schools for specialized programming. Available classrooms for use have been identified in Ajax, Pickering and Beaverton. There is no available space in Central Whitby as the Board does not have schools operating at half capacity. Mr. Visser also expressed that the Board was fortunate to have this ARC committee working on such an ambitious project.

An ARC member stated that it must remember that funds will be received upon the sale of the Florence M. Heard property.

David Visser, ARC Secretary, informed the group that the \$14M coming from the Ministry is considered to be straight funding. An estimated land cost in Whitby is \$500,000 per acre. He added that half the balance of the funds would be available through a Ministry reserve which the Board would need permission to access, the balance would be in a Board Reserve Fund.

Joe Hircock, ARC Chair, offered the group time to discuss the scenarios further so that everyone could work collectively to determine which of the 8 scenarios would be preferred and voted upon. He asked the group to consider their two top scenarios for community feedback and recommendation to the Director.

Following a 45-minute breakout session, Joe Hircock, ARC Chair, requested that the groups reconvene and present their recommendations.

Two charts were made available for comparison. One chart was used to record the preferences of each group by school. The other chart was used to tabulate the number of votes by scenario.

	FIRST CHOICE	SECOND CHOICE
Leslie McFarlane PS	Community Scenario G2	Scenario 1
Pringle Creek PS	Scenario 1	—
Captain Michael VandenBos PS	Scenario 1	—
Jack Miner PS	Scenario 1	—
Florence M. Heard PS	Scenario 1	—
Palmerston Avenue PS	Community Scenario G2	Community Scenario E

**Minutes of ARC Central Whitby Meeting, January 14, 2009 pg 5**

**TOTAL SUPPORT**

Scenario 1	5 votes
Scenario 2	0 votes
Community Scenario E	1 vote

Community Scenario F1	0 votes
Community Scenario F2	0 votes
Community Scenario G1	0 votes
Community Scenario G2	2 votes
Community Scenario H	0 votes

Following the tabulation, it was determined that Scenario 1 had the majority support of the ARC.

A few minutes were taken to hear feedback as to why or why not, a scenario had been selected.

Palmerston Avenue explained that with respect to Community Scenario G2, they reviewed their priorities in order to make their decision. They realized the high cost associated with this Scenario was a factor but remembered that they had been told some time ago that money was not to be a concern.

David Visser, ARC Secretary, reminded everyone that the best interest of the students and the merits that place the students in a good learning environment should remain the ARC's focus.

Leslie McFarlane explained that the group considered which scenario would result in students continuing to walk to school versus bussing. They felt that Community Scenario G2 met that requirement.

A member was concerned that the public may not be agreeable with the selection of Scenario 1. Another member responded to that remark by stating it was the position of the ARC to inform the public rather than to seek permission.

Joe Hircock, ARC Chair, indicated that the ARC would continue to consider comments forthcoming from all Public Meetings. He asked the ARC to consider whether or not it wanted to have one or two scenarios as recommendations in the Draft report to the Director for public consideration. The group indicated they wanted one scenario to go forward.

A motion was made to move forward with Scenario #1 to the next Public Meeting

Moved: Sharon Murdoch (Parent Rep, Florence M. Heard)

Seconded: Lynda Darling (Teacher Rep, Leslie McFarlane)

Carried:

There was a show of 20 hands in favour

There was a show of 6 hands in opposition

There was one abstention

***Minutes of ARC Central Whitby Meeting, January 14, 2009 pg 6***

Joe Hircock, ARC Chair stated that the ARC members had performed due diligence with the utilization. He reminded the group that, as in all cases, some people will not be content with the decision brought forward at the next public meeting.

Lygia Dallip, ARC Facilitator, stated that the ARC would consider all information received from public meetings and therefore the group will need to consider what they hear at the 4<sup>th</sup> Public Meeting.

A member asked if the ARC will comment on the timeline of Scenario 1 at the Public Meeting.

David Visser, ARC Secretary, stated that every caveat possible needed to be considered as many of the timelines were pushed to November 2009, pending Ministry permission. If, nothing is heard back from the Ministry by November, the Board will need to decide if this will take another year. The Board will continue to press the Ministry for a decision.

A member asked if the Ministry had a deadline to respond to an ARC submission.

David Visser, ARC Secretary, replied that the Ministry does not have a deadline; however, the Ministry would have to respond by a certain time in order to start the relocation of students, and construction, in a timely fashion.

An ARC member asked when the demolition of Leslie McFarlane PS would take place if the Scenario is approved by the Board and the Ministry.

David Visser, ARC Secretary, replied that the Board would apply for permits while awaiting a reply and have those waiting in anticipation. He added that demolition would be subject to Ministry of Education approval.

Joe Hircock, ARC Chair, added that demolition would be based upon the approval of funds. In the meantime, contractual papers for teachers would also have to be examined. He stated that the urgency is with respect to the cash flow and a decision made by the Ministry. If a response is not received from the Ministry until May or June of 2009, it would mean not building until the following September.

An ARC member said that looking ahead to the next Public Meeting, it will be necessary for the ARC to explain to the community why the ARC turned down the other proposals. She added that they would like to express that there were good reasons why the other scenarios were not selected and want to ensure this information is communicated to the public.

Joe Hircock, ARC Chair, stated that we can anticipate an emotional pushback as we did at the first Public Meeting. He suggested that the next ARC working meeting, January 21<sup>st</sup>, be used to review what the ARC plans to present at the 4<sup>th</sup> Public Meeting.

David Visser, ARC Secretary, commented that the draft report to the Director would serve as a valuable tool to explain to the public the journey involved in coming to those conclusions. It is imperative that the public understands how the process continues to work from this point forward.

### ***Minutes of ARC Central Whitby Meeting, January 14, 2009 pg 7***

A member stated that some timelines suggest moves to take place prior to receiving Ministry funding and asked how that would be possible.

David Visser, ARC Secretary, referred the group to Tab 30 which indicates that Pringle Creek is currently the holding site for Tormina (scheduled to open in September 2009) and that there would be space at that school to house students while construction is under way. This would be a Board decision regardless of whether or not Ministry approval for the Scenario is received. The Board has the ability to move students and programs at it deems fit.

A member asked how the ARC, which will be disbanded by then, would remain in communication.

Joe Hircock, ARC Chair, offered various means of communication i.e., newsletters, emails, etc.

A member asked if the original Business Cases had received Ministry approval.

David Visser, ARC Secretary, stated that approval for the PTR project required a dual stage approval from Ministry. The first stage is planning approval while the second stage is final approval to move ahead with the construction of the approved Scenario. He added that the Ministry had been aware of the Business Case for a number of years and stage two will come as no surprise to them.

Joe Hircock, ARC Chair, added that the funding exists. The assumption is that this process will move forward. He also commented on the amount of work involved in this ARC process.

A member sought clarification on the Pringle Creek PS 10-room addition. She stated that outside the ARC, there was already a 4-room addition to be added. She asked if that cost was included in Scenario 15a.

David Visser, ARC Secretary, stated that it originally was intended to be a 6-classroom addition based on three being funded through the business case, and, three through the Primary Class Size grant. A portion of the funds for a 3-classroom addition had already been received. He clarified that the scenarios reflected the total estimated cost to construct and did not reflect the netting off of revenue currently available.

Joe Hircock, ARC Chair, then charged the group with reviewing the draft proposal to the Director and return to the next ARC working group meeting with the necessary key items. It will be necessary for them to work on this report either individually or as a group and it would be ideal if the group could respond with the comments by Friday in order to allow the Resource staff enough time for review.

Carey Trombino, ARC Resource staff, spoke on Agenda item 7 (emails). She stated that since our last meeting of January 7, 2009, emails had been received and were answered by way of scenarios developed and presented at tonight's meeting. There were no comments following the review by the group.

### ***Minutes of ARC Central Whitby Meeting, January 14, 2009 pg 8***

Motion to accept the prepared responses:

Moved: Linda Lyons (Parent Rep, Capt. M. VandenBos)

Seconded: Leilah McBride (Teacher Rep, Palmerston)

Carried:

There were no other general comments before adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

*The next meeting of the ARC will take place on Wednesday, January 21, 2009 at 3:00 in the Boardroom (Room 1017) at the Education Centre.*

*Minutes ARC Working Meeting January 14, 2009 - Approved*

DDSB