



MINUTES

PUPIL ACCOMMODATION REVIEW (PAR) PAC WORKING GROUP MEETING #6

TO: PUPIL ACCOMMODATION REVIEW COMMITTEE (PAC)
DATE: March 10, 2009 AT MONSIGNOR LEE SCHOOL
RE: ORILLIA AREA CATHOLIC ELEMENTARY REVIEW, 2008/2009

1. **WELCOME/INTRODUCTIONS**

Provided by Darren Schmidt, Superintendent of Schools.

2. **OPENING PRAYER** Prayer *Spirit of Wisdom* was said by all

3. **REVIEW OF MINUTES (advise of errors &/or omissions)**

There were no errors or omissions noted by committee members.

4. **BUSINESS ARISING**

Purpose of tonight's meeting is to narrow down options.

5. **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (Binders)**

6. **SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK FROM PUBLIC MEETING #2**

7. **POWER POINT PRESENTATION**

by: Darren Schmidt, Superintendent of Schools

i) **COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE**

The following are suggestions for Public Meeting #3:

- Include in glossary of terms: GFA, OTG, FTE, ADE, FD45, GAN, MLE, SBE, FOL, NOD, retrofit, and facility condition index. (We will add these to the Glossary of terms as suggested).
- We need to explain Retrofit/Replacement issues for both NOD & FOL. It is beneficial to know what their status is.
- revise pupil distribution maps to remove 'matching' reference – too confusing

- remove site plans
 - include a map with FOLEY location
 - in slides that refer to enrolment, include Bodies #'s along with FTE
 - explain why analysis shown for both FD45 and without FD45
-
- explain why financial information is being presented; include explanation of why cost of teachers is not included in analysis
 - revise reference of 'revenue' to 'grants' on charts
 - explain square footage reference on operations slide
 - explain 65% threshold for Ministry re PTR – building lifespan explanation
 - provide example of calculation (i.e. Col A/Col B= C) on building cost chart
 - include pupil yield reference in building permit activity information
 - for enroll stats try to include comparators of w/wo FD45 on one slide and also an explanation of what it means
 - more explanation of capital funding information and opportunities
- a) Impact Slides
- explain consideration thru valuation exercise for each 'impact'
 - refer to categories considered within each impact
 - refer to handouts available for detail
- b) Alternate Accommodation Plans
- explain each option
 - discuss details
 - will receive input from Public on these options
 - will discuss Public's input, including pro's and con's at future working group meetings
- c) Enrolment Statistics
- Do not include matched note on pupil distribution.
 - We will include a summary slide with totals.
 - It is important to include capacity.
- d) School Operation Slide
- Remove (Square footage m²)
 - Funding/Grants instead of revenue
- e) Building Cost Slide
- Different studies through various engineering reports have been completed to illustrate key points and why we are doing this review.
 - 2008: follow-up review on 4 schools
 - Retrofit costs vs. Replacement costs
 - Summarized different reports
 - There is no question that schools are safe and clean

ii) MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT

iii) ENROLMENTS

by: Jennifer Sharpe, Manager of Planning

Tracking Municipal building permits assists with developing student enrolment projections. Actual numbers are less the projected.

Comment: Pupil yields are applied to the average permits per year. (We will add more information to the slide.)

iv) FINANCIAL INFORMATION

by: Glenn Clarke, Controller of Plant

Appendix A: Refer to Attachment

FACILITY CONDITION SUMMARY March 10, 2009

BUILDING CODE ISSUES

We would be required to upgrade all standards if we chose to do small upgrades to the schools. This would increase costs.

Question: How long do new buildings last?

Answer: Approximately 40-50 years for building life span and 20 years for roof etc.

v) IMPACTS RELATED TO ACCOMMODATION OPTIONS

by: Darren Schmidt , Superintendent of Schools

Appendix B: Refer to Attachment

REVIEW OF ALTERNATE ACCOMMODATION PLAN PROPOSALS

a) Alternate Accommodation Plan Strategies

- Should we look at more or less options?
- What are the impacts for each of the options?
- Provide pros & cons for each option

b) Key Highlights:

Reflect: (SBE) - Replacement should be included in all options
FCI is so high at SBE. Quite comfortable that Ministry will address this.

Reflect: (NOD) - Board to pursue West Ridge site sooner than 2014.

Reflect: (FOL) - At status quo – Possible boundary change.

Reflect: (MLE) - Retrofit or partial replacement.

Reflect: (GAN) - Status Quo or close or replace.

c) Long Term Issues

- Concern with MLE related to proposed catholic elementary school situated within the West Ridge development area adjacent NOD. Would it affect boundary in 5 years?
- Option 2A does not seem appropriate.
- Option 4B needs more discussion.

Appendix C: Refer to Attachment

Review of Alternate Accommodation Plans Working Sheets

vi) **QUESTIONS & ANSWERS**

Question: Bussing and green space issues at MLE. Is it realistic to consider larger school?

Glenn: Yes it is. Field delineation could be part discussed as part of the review. Portables removed.

Question: Are we limited to the properties we currently own?

Glenn: Good point. Inability to get additional sites as no funding exists. Public board secondary and elementary sites may be available due to their accommodation review. We would have to assume their pupil places if we took over their properties. We will look into how this could work through the Ministry of Education.

vii) **COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS**

Most felt that rebuilding on all 3 school sites was not a viable option. GAN parents feel that there could be a rebuild on GAN but it would need be sized appropriately.

Questions to be Answered:

- Would the ministry give us funds to rebuild a school on leased land?
- Are there any issues with respect to rebuilding on the current properties (i.e. zoning/setbacks/lot coverage/site plan process)
- Where would we get funding to purchase more land?
- Could we look at public board surplus properties to consider whether we could take over land through disposition?
- As part of the recommendation to the board, we could include potential to purchase another site.
- Environmental issues. Demolition costs would not be included
- Is demolition cost included in MLE/SBE replacement cost?

viii) POINTS FOR FOLLOW UP FROM DISCUSSION OF ALTERNATE ACCOMMODATION PLANS

- Additional information from GAN Parish / Archdiocese on their position related to replacement of GAN school at existing site (based on ongoing lease)
- Additional information on SCDSB disposition process for elementary schools (timing, site and building details) and for potential secondary schools which are currently under review (timing, site and building details)
- Additional information from Ministry related to process of disposition and, if acquired, impact on our capacity, capital funding, etc.

8. NEXT STEPS

- i) Considering approach for presentation
- ii) Other suggestions on how to share information effectively

9. CLOSING PRAYER

10. NEXT MEETING

Public Meeting #3
Thursday March 26, 2009
Guardian Angels School @ 7:00pm

11. ADJOURNMENT

APPENDIX A

Page 1

March 10, 2009

Facility Condition Summary

(excerpts from the January 2008 Jacques Whitford ReCapp engineering studies)

St Bernard's Elementary School, Orillia. Built in 1957 with additions in 1960, 1962, 1969 and 1993

Inspection 2008

Recommendations: Replace or repair in 3 yr period:

- Underground utilities
- storm water management systems
- Paving raveling – parking lots, driveway, playgrounds, walkways
- Damaged, deflecting, Siporex roof deck and leaking roof
- Uneven wood gym floor
- Single glazed windows
- Plumbing in poor condition should be replaced in 2 years
- Heating system
- No mechanical ventilation
- Electrical cabling, bus and raceways past EUL
- Interior lighting is in poor condition and was scheduled for upgrades in 2003

Monsignor Lee Elementary School, Orillia (original wing). Built 1965 with additions in 1966 and 1991

Inspection 2008

Recommendations: Replace or repair in 3 yr period:

- Frequent storm water back-ups – floods into library
- Raveled and fractured paving – parking lots, driveway, playground
- Uneven walkway paving
- Windows are single glazed and leak
- Interior and exterior doors and hardware
- Damaged foundation walls
- Carpeting and VCT in classes–worn excessively
- Soil erosion on playfield, track
- Mechanical equipment overall in poor condition
- No mechanical ventilation. Heating system
- Plumbing fixtures in poor condition
- Electrical systems in poor condition including lighting, fire alarm system, main switchgear
- Fire Alarm

APPENDIX A

Page 2

Guardian Angel, Elementary School, Orillia. Built 1969

Inspection 2008

Recommendations: Replace or repair in 3 yr period:

- Poor storm water drainage system
- Severe cracking of pavement. Repave
- Lighting in poor condition. New lights were to be installed 6 years ago
- Electrical switchgear
- Fire alarm and PA system
- Deterioration of Siporex roof deck and 23 year old EPDM membrane
- 40 year old exterior wood doors at end of EUL
- Interior doors
- Single glazed windows
- Flooring plus interior and exterior stairs replacement
- Controls have surpassed EUL
- Emergency lighting in fair condition
- No Building ventilation –does not meet code and there is no air conditioning
- Boiler, piping and radiant heaters
- Plumbing and plumbing fixtures
- *Not noted in the report is second floor has no elevator and is not handicap accessible*

APPENDIX B

Page 1

**ORILLIA PAC WORKING GROUP MARCH 10, 2009 MEETING
REVIEW OF ALTERNATE ACCOMMODATION PLANS
PROPOSALS BY COMMITTEE FOR PRESENTATION TO PUBLIC**
– consideration of boundary changes in all options -

Option #1

SBE:

Rebuild St. Bernard's based on funding from Ministry for Prohibitive to Repair (PTR) (size of replacement facility to be considered based on existing & projected enrolment – approx. 350 pp)

MLE

Rebuild Monsignor Lee (partial) on existing MLE site based on receiving funding from Ministry for Prohibitive To Repair (PTR) (size of replacement facility to be considered based on existing & projected enrolment – approx. 350 pp)

GAN

Close Guardian Angels – students to be consolidated with MLE / SBE

FOL

Foley – building is status quo

NOD

Notre Dame

– pursue acquisition of West Ridge site for future accommodation needs sooner than projected

APPENDIX B

Page 2

Overall consideration for review of boundaries to address the balancing of enrolment and capacity where possible.

– consideration of boundary changes in all options -

Option #2

SBE

Replacement of SBE on existing site based on funding from Ministry for Prohibitive to Repair (PTR) (size of replacement facility to be considered based on existing & projected enrolment – approx. 350 pp)

MLE

Replacement of MLE on alternative site based on funding from Ministry for Prohibitive to Repair (PTR) (size of replacement facility to be considered based on existing & projected enrolment – approx. 350 pp) and based on ability to fund site purchase and related costs

GAN

Close & consolidate Guardian Angels with Monsignor Lee

FOL

Foley – building is status quo

NOD

Notre Dame

– pursue acquisition of West Ridge site for future accommodation needs sooner than projected

APPENDIX B

Page 3

– consideration of boundary changes in all options -

Option #3

SBE, MLE, GAN

Replacement of St. Bernard's, Monsignor Lee and Guardian Angels on existing sites and based on funding from Ministry for Prohibitive to Repair project requests. Replacement schools to be the same pupil places as existing facility

FOL

Foley – building is status quo

NOD

Notre Dame

– pursue acquisition of West Ridge site for future accommodation needs sooner than projected

APPENDIX C

Page 1

ALTERNATE ACCOMMODATION PLANS WORKING SHEETS

**PAC Working Group Meeting #6
Monsignor Lee Catholic School
Tuesday March 10, 2009 – 7pm**

OPTION 1: STATUS QUO

PROS

- No impact on families
- No immediate financial impact
- High profile of Catholicism
- No upheaval
- No changes in boundaries
- Maintain traditions & history
- Maintains 4 schools in Orillia
- No impact on any families
- Schools in all city areas in community
- No change doesn't affect families
- School in every area of community

CONS

- Facility issues not addressed
- Unsustainable
- Facility cannot meet needs (i.e. Safety, curriculum)
- Old, inefficient schools
- Poor appearance – Poor reputation
- Safety concerns
- Inefficiency in operations
- No improvements
- Doesn't address physical issues of school
- Will be back in few years doing the same process

Additional Comments:

- Not an option
- Will not allow for another PAR for 5 years

APPENDIX C
Page 2

ALTERNATE ACCOMMODATION PLANS WORKING SHEETS

OPTION 2: REPLACEMENT/REBUILD

PROS

- New buildings
- Better facilities will meet needs
- Long term energy savings
- Green fit
- Long term stability
- Public image
- Up to code
- Meet safety standards
- More enrolment possible
- Energy savings
- Better technology available
- Healthier to staff and students
- No relocation

CONS

- Contingent on funding
- Short term inconvenience
- Costs, more expensive (short term)
- Impact of relocation
- Competition for funding between schools (internals)
- Ministry
- Construction transition (Where do students go during construction?) Portables?
- Environment

Additional Comments:

APPENDIX C

Page 3

ALTERNATE ACCOMMODATION PLANS WORKING SHEETS

OPTION 3: RETROFIT

PROS

- Improving buildings
- Access for funding more immediate (asking for less \$)
- Already have sites
- Building safer, up to code
- Students remain, less impact on kids
- Short tem fix
- Less expensive short-term
- Students stay in school

CONS

- More expensive than replacement
- Access to building is limited
- Short term fix
- Still an old building
- Excessive expenditure to maintain old buildings
- Continued upkeep costs
- Potential relocation (temporary)
- Upheaval to students
- Public image (old buildings)
- Unknown costs
- Safety risks
- Health – dust – safety
- Band aid solution
- Not cost effective, waste of \$
- One patch leads to another

Additional Comments:

- Not much of an option
- St. Bernard's needs replacement

APPENDIX C

Page 4

ALTERNATE ACCOMMODATION PLANS WORKING SHEETS

OPTION 4: CONSOLIDATE, CLOSE & REPLACE

PROS

- More cost effective – Operations, staff, admin costs would all be less
- More flexibility in program offerings and school organization
- Better use of funding
- More efficient to build and operate
- Public image
- Safe and modern
- Energy efficiency
- More variety in program offerings
- A new building with current technology
- Become closer to church
- More flexibility with classes

CONS

- Impact on students, community, etc.
- Change of boundaries
- Potential for very large schools
- Longer bus rides
- Need to rebuild school culture
- Fewer opportunities on school teams, etc.
- One school loses its identity and bussing
- What to do with vacant building
- Finding a location
- Securing a spot need bigger space
- Upheaval of families and staff
- Needs more bussing
- Job upheaval
- Lose proximity to church
- Long process

Additional Comments:

- Change in transportation (walkers now being bussed, bussed students now walking)
- Location is important
- Disruption of school communities

APPENDIX C

Page5

ALTERNATE ACCOMMODATION PLANS WORKING SHEETS

OPTION 5: BOUNDARY OPTIMIZATION

PROS

- Better utilization of facilities
- Fewer portables (cost savings)
- Fewer students in portables
- Best use of available space
- Shorter bus times
- Conflict management; less conflicts due to lower student enrolment
- Improve programming

CONS

- Does not address facility needs & concerns
- Displaced students
- Unpopular with parents
- Upheaval for parents and families
- Longer bus rides
- Enrolment decline; Families may change Boards or home school
- Families try to send kids to a closed school

Additional Comments:

- Addressing capacity only, not building condition
- Best combined with another option (retrofit)

APPENDIX C

Page 6

ALTERNATE ACCOMMODATION PLANS WORKING SHEETS

OPTION 6: PROGRAM ADJUSTMENT

PROS

- Curriculum focus (like grades together)
- Better sports teams
- Addresses capacity issues
- Specialized programming potential
- Small people small problems

CONS

- Doesn't address facility needs & concerns
- Division of family (kids in both schools)
- Fewer opportunities to play on teams
- Duplication for families (e.g. Concerts, conference nights, etc.)
- Dependant on stable enrolment demographics
- Duplication of bussing (overlap)
- Discipline issues in older schools
- Not as many leadership opportunities for grade 8's.
- Bussing longer: need to be picked up earlier

Additional Comments:

- Best combined with retrofit
- Addresses capacity only, not building condition

MINUTES

PUPIL ACCOMMODATION REVIEW (PAR) PAC WORKING GROUP MEETING #6

The Pupil Accommodation Review Committee (PAC) met on March 10, 2009 and the following members were:

PRESENT:	Megan	Bondy		Monsignor Lee
	Paul	Campbell	Principal	Monsignor Lee
	Sandra	Downer		Monsignor Lee
	Janet-Lynne	Durnford	Teacher Rep.	Monsignor Lee
	Rhonda	Lauer	Non Teaching Rep.	Monsignor Lee
	Jeff	Duggan	Chair	Monsignor Lee
	Janice	Tulipano	Non Teaching Rep.	Guardian Angels
	Christine	Fry	Co-Chair	Guardian Angels
	Eileen	Brown	Parent	Guardian Angels
	Paul	Frederick	Principal	Guardian Angels
	Audrey	Hamilton	Principal	Foley
	Carol	Taylor	Parent	Foley
	Karen	Whalen	Parent	Foley
	Sharon	Turlej	Parish Rep.	Foley
	Theresa	Robertson	Teacher Rep.	Foley
	Nadine	Lajoie	Teacher & Parent	Notre Dame
	Adrian	Zulian	Principal	Notre Dame
	Heather	Stanton	Co-Chair	Notre Dame
	Natalie	D'Agnillo	Teacher/Parent	Notre Dame
	Kevin	Strong	Vice Principal	Notre Dame
	Dave	Christie	Non Teaching Rep	Notre Dame
	Brenda	Lawlor-MacDonald	Teacher Rep.	St. Bernard's
	Darlene	England	Parent	St. Bernard's
	Valinda	Trivett-Cockburn	Non Teaching Rep.	St. Bernard's
	Rich	Foshay	Principal	St. Bernard's
	Glenn	Clarke	Controller of Plant	SMCDSB
	Darren	Schmidt	Superintendent of Schools	SMCDSB
	Jim	Canning	School Trustee	SMCDSB
	Jennifer	Sharpe	Manager of Planning and Properties	SMCDSB
	Kristin	Dibble Pechkovsky	Planning Officer	SMCDSB
Deacon	Harris	Parish Rep.		
ABSENT:	Karen	Murphy	Teacher Rep.	Guardian Angels
	Michelle	Tazzeo	Parent	Guardian Angels
	Joyce	Stanga	Parish Rep.	Guardian Angels
	John	O'Donnell	Councillor, Ward 2	Township of Ramara
	Sue	Peacock	Chair	Notre Dame
REGRETS:	Sherr	Black	Chair	Foley
	Paul	Spears	Councillor	City of Orillia
	Heather	Shier	Non Teaching Rep.	Foley