

**REPORT OF LONDON STUDY AREA 2 COMMITTEE**

A.E. Duffield / M.B. McEachren

Wednesday, November 28

7:00 p.m.

**MINUTES**

M.B. McEachren

<p><b>VOTING MEMBERS</b>  T. Bailey, Citizen - M.B. McEachren P.S.  S. Baughman, Citizen - A.E. Duffield P.S.  L. Beattie, School Council - M.B. McEachren P.S.  S. Eagle, Municipal Leader, Councillor - City of London  G. Faul, Business  T. Lagoda, School Council - A.E. Duffield P.S.</p>	<p><b>ADMINISTRATION AND OTHERS</b>  T. Roberts, Trustee (Chair)  K. Dalton, Executive Superintendent  S. McCombe, Principal - M.B. McEachren  M. Moynihan, Superintendent  B. Tichenoff, Principal - A.E. Duffield  <u>Guest:</u>  K. Bushell, Manager - Projects and Maintenance  <u>Regrets:</u>  C. Van Every Albert   Community Guests</p>
---	---

**1. WELCOME**

T. Roberts welcomed Committee members, Guest Kevin Bushell and community guests.

**2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

Approval of the agenda was motioned and carried.

**3. CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS**

Committee members were thanked for preparing questions for K. Bushell. Clarification was given that minutes will record that a motion for recommendation was made and whether or not the motion was carried. No names will be attached to the motion.

**4. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes were approved as written.

**5. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

**5.1 Committee Questions: Administrative Response**

Administrative response to Committee questions arising from the October 25 meeting has been posted to the London Study Area 2 web location. Questions of clarification were answered.

**5.2 Projected Enrolment / Demographic Information**

This information is being compiled by Gil Owens, Planning Officer, and will be provided to Committee members once available. G. Owens has spent 33 years in his role as the TVDSB liaison with the City of London Planning Department, sits on the Committee of Adjustments and participates in the planning process for official plan amendments, plans for subdivisions, condominium developments, rezoning and area community plans.

**6. COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

**6.1 School Council Representatives**

T. Lagoda requested a tour be conducted of a school facility resulting from the combination of two school communities and that parents, staff and teachers involved in the process be invited as a resource to provide comments to the Committee. Community members are particularly interested in hearing about the differences between smaller and bigger school populations.

L. Beattie requested that questions generated by a community survey be answered in a written format. Administration Committee members noted that many of the survey questions have already been answered during Committee discussion. The public is welcome to attend ARC meetings to keep abreast of information given and discussed. It was suggested that L. Beattie review the survey questions and submit those questions that have not been answered for response from administration as per the established process.

## 6.2 Citizen Representatives

T. Bailey raised the following questions:

- If it is necessary to widen the road, would the cost be borne by the City of London or the Board?  
*The Board would work in conjunction with the City. A traffic survey would likely be done.*
- If M.B. McEachren were to close, what happens to the land and the playground equipment?  
*There is a process that is followed to divest property as the result of a school closure. The property is offered to various agencies and / or Boards prior to being sold on the open market. The Board will maintain the property throughout the completion of the process. Dependent on the condition of the playground equipment and the cost involved, it may be moved.*
- What happens to the funding for the Oneida students?  
*This funding is provided by the federal government to the Board. The Board determines the location of the program provided to the Oneida students.*
- Would there be a long-term savings in keeping M.B. McEachren open until a new school is built in the North Talbot area?  
*Operating costs would still be based on approximately 200 students and, therefore, would not allow for enhanced programming.*

S. Baughman had no comments at this time.

## 6.3 Municipal Leader(s)

S. Eagle made the following points:

- The Transit Commission was not aware that the Board had designated Lambeth as a transit area and will investigate this and other areas within the City that may also be viewed differently by the Transit Commission and the Board.
- The Board accepts an enrolment of 400 students as the benchmark for a school facility to be financially viable. The Board builds for the current number of students and not the projected number of students.
- Concern was expressed about:
  - the ARC process being a public relations exercise,
  - the method that the Board uses for future planning, and
  - the possible closure of an existing school with the plan to open a new school nearby and the associated capital costs.

## 6.4 Business Representative

- G. Faul's comments included the following:
  - providing the Committee with a presentation allowing individuals who have experienced a school closure in their community to share their observations.  
*The Committee was reminded that individuals and groups are invited to make presentations to the Committee by the established presentation process.*
  - noted that the business community and real-estate companies are not greatly concerned about the outcome of the ARC. The greatest effect of the outcome of the ARC will be on Lambeth homeowners.
  - expressed concern that because of a mistaken Ministry PTR rating, the Board has not maintained M.B. McEachren and is determined to close the school. G. Faul felt that the process had little to do with offering an alternative to closing M.B. McEachren and that there has been no attempt to discuss keeping both schools open.
  - asked what options other than closing a school in Lambeth were available to the Committee.  
*The Committee may endorse the administrative recommendation, maintain the status quo or draft a recommendation of their own. Whatever the ARC recommends will go forward to the senior administration for response. The administrative response and the ARC recommendation will go forward to the Board for a decision.*
  - felt that it was hard to evaluate and formulate options because the Committee does not have the knowledge base / information available to administration in order to build a recommendation.

## 7. PUBLIC INPUT SESSION

No requests for public input were received.

## 8. NEW BUSINESS

### 8.1 Post-Valuation Template

Discussion of the Post-Valuation Template took place as part of K. Bushell's presentation.

### 8.2 Guest: Kevin Bushell, Manager - Projects and Maintenance

K. Bushell presented an explanation of the evaluation process used on the Pre-Template and the Post-Template and responded to Committee questions. Points noted included:

- ReCAPP is the Ministry of Education Facility Information Survey, not a TVDSB program, that was established to quantify the amount of renewal issues for School Boards as defined by the Ministry of Education.
- The Post-Template provides information generated by structuring the school buildings to meet current building codes and providing program space to meet the Board standard. A standard set of criteria was used to evaluate school buildings in both the Pre and Post-Templates, therefore, a variance between assumed costing and actual costing would be negated because the same template criteria was applied to each school in order to maintain fairness.
- When will the Board verify costs associated with items such as sewers?  
*All renewal and program enhancements for A.E. Duffield will cost approximately 4.7 million dollars. It is difficult to determine what items, such as the septic system, can be modified or must be replaced until such time as the start of construction.*
- What would the cost be to demolish M.B. McEachren?  
*There is no plan to demolish M.B. McEachren. There is a process to be followed when a school is closed.*
- Will a new school be built in the Pack Road area?  
*A new elementary school will be needed in this area within 10 to 15 years.*
- What will the cost be to keep McEachren open until the new school is built?  
*This information was not available.*
- Opinion was expressed that there is no validation that items on the renewal list need to be done and the costs reflecting this are hypothetical. It appears that the Board uses incorrect numbers contained in the Ministry documents to sustain its recommendation. Why?  
*The cost of renewal in ReCAPP may be inflated however, the same criteria has been used for both schools so the resultant costs are relative, i.e., both schools would be equally affected because the same criteria was used for both. The figures used were given by the Ministry through an independent consultant using the same template for every school in the Province. The Board did not ask to have the figures corrected because this was not a Board initiative. However, a consistent measurement on the same template was used for all schools, i.e., the comparison basis is the same.  
The costing for the addition and program accommodation is fairly accurate. There is more school renewal work to be done at M.B. McEachren.*
- The percentages used might be the same but when this is translated into dollars it is not the same, is that correct? Yes.  
From a capital liability point of view is the administrative recommendation less expensive?  
*The administrative recommendation is less expensive and at the same time addresses accommodation and program issues for the future. The administrative recommendation is based on how to spend a significant amount of money to benefit the greatest number of children. Financially, better programming opportunities can be provided if M.B. McEachren and A.E. Duffield were to be combined.*
- What is the time line for construction / renewal for A.E. Duffield?  
*The whole project would take approximately 16 months.*
- Duffield Street is already congested, would there continue to be only one entrance?  
*There are not many options because the school property is landlocked. The municipality could be approached to widen the street.*
- Would buses park along James Street?  
*The configuration for parking would be reworked.*

- Does the space per pupil extend into the school yard?  
*Approximately five to eight acres is recommended to house an elementary school. A.E. Duffield is approximately 7.18 acres and M.B. McEachren is approximately 5.15 acres.*
- If A.E. Duffield were to be renovated during schools hours, how would student safety be ensured?  
*The area under construction would be gated / boarded off. Among other things, exits might be changed. Deliveries would not occur during school hours. There would be continuous meetings between the Principal and site workers to coordinate activities and ensure student safety.*
- What is the maximum number of students that the school would be built to accommodate?  
*The school would be designed for approximately 600 students with a plan for an addition to ensure services for up to 700 students. Portables might be a possibility.*  
It was noted that community members do not want portables.
- When will renewal costs be considered?  
*Renewal costs would be considered after the Board has approved the implementation of the Design Committee for the project. If both schools were to be kept open, there would still be ongoing renewal costs.*
- Can the Committee look at the option of having one school from JK to grade 4 and the second school for grade 5 to grade 8?  
*K. Dalton indicated that the Committee can make such a recommendation; however, the Capital Plan recommends that TVDSB schools use a JK - grade 8 configuration as the Board standard. Schools combined to meet this standard will provide the student numbers related to the square footage of the facilities to maximize funding and, therefore, maximize program enhancements. Senior administration would not back this recommendation. A safe school environment would be maintained but program enhancements would not be recommended.*
- How is it known if renewal is what the school needs? Concern was expressed that there was no validation that items listed in the renewal documents needed to be done and that the Ministry document was not valid.  
*The Committee requested copies of the report that led to the Ministry PTR report for M.B. McEachren. Renewal information represents a Ministry assessment using criteria set by the Ministry. This is not what the Senior Administration used to make its decision to consolidate the two schools. The decision for consolidation was based on declining enrolment and revenue and how to best provide program value to the students. Renewal costs indicate the relative costs of bringing both buildings up to current standards by looking at what it costs to upgrade to meet program objectives, based on the current facility, as opposed to the structure of the building. The same template has been used for both schools. Consideration should be given to the ratio of one school to the other rather than dollar amounts.*

A motion was made to invite G. Owens, Planning Officer to the January or February ARC meeting to discuss the impact of different areas of growth on school boundaries in the Lambeth area, carried. Committee members were asked to submit their questions to Mr. Owens through C. McRae.

The Committee motioned to have boundary maps and catchment areas of both A.E. Duffield and M.B. McEachren available to them prior to the ARC meeting that Mr. Owens attends. Carried.

The Committee agreed to meet at Eagle Heights for the 2008 January 23 meeting to hear opinions from members of the Eagle Heights community about the consolidation of two schools. S. McCombe has agreed to facilitate inviting guests from Eagle Heights to respond to Committee questions.

It was moved to adjourn the meeting. Carried.

## **9. QUESTIONS / COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS**

Committee questions were answered throughout the meeting.

## **10. ADJOURNMENT: 10:00 p.m.**

## **11. NEXT MEETING**

Wednesday, 2008 January 23  
Eagle Heights P.S., 7:00 p.m.

Terry Roberts,  
Study Committee Chairperson