

----- Original Message -----

Thursday, September 20, 2007 1:35:50 PM

accommodation

From: "Maanselka, Heidi" <HMaanselka@hrsrh.on.ca>

Subject: Sudbury West

To: accommodation

Cc:

Attachments: Attach0.html 3K

Pursuant to last night's presentation by the ARC Committee, some of the options included changing the boundaries for RH Murray and Jessie Hamilton. I'm opposed to changing the boundaries as my daughter is currently in Jessie and I would want her to remain in Jessie Hamilton. If a new school was to be built combining Jessie and Vanier but not RH Murray, I would want my daughter to attend the new school instead of an older school. The programs and teaching staff is why we send our child to Jessie Hamilton. I feel a lot of people would find their own transportation to be able to still attend the school they want without uprooting their kids. It does not seem fair to single out 40 kids to change schools.

Of note though, in the presentation it said if 40 more students could go to RH Murray due to changing of the boundaries it would bring them up to 80% capacity. However, Dalron is proposing a 260 house development behind Oja subdivision, and as a result there could be anywhere from 50-150 additional kids and RH Murray does not have the capacity for this number, and then boundaries would again have to be changed to allow students to go to Jessie or a new school.

Heidi Maanselka, CA  
Accountant  
tel: 705-675-9193 ext 8331  
fax: 705-675-5839  
email: hmaanselka@hrsrh.on.ca

\*\*\*\*\*

The information contained in this email and document(s) attached are for the exclusive use of the addressee and may contain confidential, privileged and non-disclosable information. If the recipient of this e-mail is not the addressee, such recipient is strictly prohibited from reading, photocopying, distributing or otherwise using this e-mail or its content in any way.

----- Original Message -----

Monday, September 24, 2007 7:37:49 PM

accommodation

From: "TShields" <tshields@isys.ca>

Subject: Lively high problems

To: accommodation

Cc:

Attachments: Attach0.html 7K

Hi,

I attended last night's meeting at Lively High. I have a daughter in grade 10 there. It seems to me the school board is trying to solve 2 separate problems with 1 solution. You have aging public schools which should have been addressed years ago because of the overcrowding in both of them. And you have a high school with reducing numbers.

They proposed changing borders to help keep RH Murray open in Whitefish. The kids of Naughton enjoy a lot of options of extra curricular activities such as band and numerous sports teams. RH Murray cannot offer those types of options. It would seem a shame to take that away from the children of Naughton to save such a small school when the kids at RH Murray would benefit so much by going into a new Lively public school.

The presenters mentioned for overpopulation there is money available to build new schools. But none have been built, and no renovations have been done to public schools in the Lively area. It seems they were hoping for a large reduction in numbers so they would not have to address the problems of overpopulation.

During the same time, the enrollment numbers are down at Lively High. They cut core programs such as French immersion. Lively High doesn't have enough unique offerings to draw enough students to the school. If they don't raise the numbers, the pathways they do have will diminish, causing a further decline in enrollment. If they end up closing Lively high, where do they go? Lockerby is busting at the seams, Lo-Ellen is nearing capacity as well. If the school board moved a couple of the unique courses at Lockerby to Lively, they would retain more kids in the Lively area and make it more attractive for kids to choose Lively high, as well as improving the school experience at Lively, and it would help alleviate overcrowding at Lockerby. To me it seems like a logical, win-win situation.

I asked if they could rezone to save RH Murray, what is the result of rezoning towards Sudbury to capture more kids into Lively. The answer was they hadn't even considered the possibility, and made clear that they would not. The only options that were tabled were ones involving moving public school grades into the high school, which is something I would consider a last resort.

It seems to me that the school board is avoiding the issue of Lively high, possibly choosing something that ultimately will be the demise of Lively high, and provide the school board with a large viable building to amalgamate the public schools in Lively.

I must say, I am disappointed with the options tabled. I have a second daughter entering high school next year. I must wonder if I should start her elsewhere to avoid what seems a strong possibility of her having to move before completing high school.

Sincerely

Terry Shields

Concerned lively area father.

Submission to Accommodation Review Committee  
Re: Sudbury West Area Schools  
By: Martha Palys  
Date: October 15, 2007

I attended the meeting held on September 19, 2007 and received the written information. I currently have a daughter attending George Vanier in the French Immersion program. While I can appreciate the difficulty of the task before this committee, I have several concerns regarding the options presented.

I can't support an option that would see a student population close to 800 spread over JK-12. I understand that there are schools in small jurisdictions that may contain all grades under one roof, however, I suspect that none of them have this many students. It is too many, especially for the youngest kids. Although they would be on different timetables, there would be ample opportunities for the students to overlap. For example, we have already heard stories of young GVPS students outside at recess witnessing the antics of high school students who are skipping class or on a spare. What about trying to keep track of JKs waiting for their buses as cars speed in and out of the parking lot? If this option were to occur, I suspect that several families from that area would consider moving their children to the English program at another school within their boundary (such as Jessie Hamilton or RH Murray) or to a French program at another school board. For students who would be entering the English program, the Rainbow board would lose students to schools of other boards.

I also can't support an option that separates the French Immersion from English ("Move French Immersion from George to a wing of Lively High", while English program is combined into a new green school). Why can't the students in French Immersion also benefit from the opportunities at a new green school? Why must the French Immersion students give up the friendships and contacts with their English counterparts, with whom they spend half their day during Math and Science in straight grades? Why must these students feel segregated and stuck in a wing of a high school because they have chosen to learn a second language and second culture? If this option were to occur, the Rainbow Board would definitely lose students from the French Immersion program as well as the Board, for all the reasons listed so far.

It is important for the board to close unused school space. However, it seems to me that the options presented are done so in order to keep the high school in Lively open. Let's be realistic; should the board be keeping open a high school that contains mostly elementary school students? Are we sacrificing 10 years of elementary school education in order to keep 4 years of high school in Lively? Are the students remaining in high school at LDSS getting an optimum education with a variety of course selections that meet all their needs? I do believe the decision to keep LDSS open deserves some reconsideration. If the high school were to close, the building could still be used as an elementary school.

If the ARC and board feel that the high school must remain in Lively, then all students of Lively deserve to be treated equally. I could accept moving the grade 7 and 8 to LDSS. If that capacity is not high enough, then move grade 6 also, and keep all the JK to grade 5 (French Immersion and English) together in one school. At least this way, they will be with each other, and no one group will be selected out.

Finally, I believe that the board needs to look at its projections beyond 5 years. I think that the numbers for 10 years and 15 years need to be considered. It was stated at the last meeting that 15 years is too far in the future, since these children are not yet born. While they may not yet be in school, they are born, since students do not leave high school until age 18 or 19. Are the projections for 5 years applicable to 10 and 15 years from now? That needs to be investigated, before any closures are considered.

In closing, I thank you for the opportunity to express my concerns. Please, in making your decision, consider the needs of ALL the students of Lively.

Thank you.

To: Accommodation Review Committee  
Re: Sudbury West Area Schools  
From: Marianne Coleman (dancoleman@sympatico.ca)

Date: October 16, 2007

I am writing to express my concerns with a couple of the options presented at the meeting of September 19<sup>th</sup>, that being the "French Immersion Wing" in Lively High School and the JK-12 Mega School.

I have some serious concerns with the housing of children age 4 – 17 in the same building. This would be a huge endeavour in the construction alone to retro-fit the school for the younger students, let alone the obvious "social elements" that exists in the high school level that we all so desperately try to shield our young children from. I believe that the board would risk losing a lot of children to another board if this option was chosen. If the first priority of the committee and the board is the safety and education of our children then I would not consider this to be a viable option.

My other concern is with the "French Immersion Wing" in LDSS. As a parent of children who are in the French Immersion program (1 child at George Vanier, grade 6 & oldest child is at Lockerby, grade 9, STEP French Immersion) I would not support this option. It is completely inappropriate to segregate this group from their English elementary classmates. They cannot possibly have an enriched elementary experience while being separated from all other students in the area. Although this is a distinct program, I believe that all children benefit from the interaction between the two programs enhancing the French cultural experience for all. In light of the fact that we are ALL living in a bilingual society it is in the best interest of ALL our children to develop an appreciation for the diversity of language and culture.

What was apparent to me, after I rose the "Where's the money coming from?" question at the last meeting, was that there really are no funds available to build a new school for our area. With that reality I think you might want to consider the option of renovating/adding on to George Vanier to accommodate grades JK through 6 and move the grade 7 & 8s from ALL the schools to Lively High. Following are some of the benefits choosing the George Vanier site would offer:

- walking distance to the Public Library
- walking distance to the Arena
- next door to LDSS - providing the opportunity to enhance the relationship with the high school in hopes of attracting more students there
- convenient use of the larger high school facilities ie. gym, track
- property value of Jesse Hamilton is likely higher and in greater demand for development therefore providing a better return to re-invest into our education system

I was a member of the committee that reviewed this issue during the last accommodation review and realize that a change is necessary to deal with the aging facilities as well as the space utilization. I also realize how difficult and emotional these decisions are and I hope that the needs of ALL our students will remain the focus of this committee.

Thank you.

----- Original Message -----

Thursday, October 18, 2007 10:31:50 AM

accommodation

From: "Adam Walli" <awalli@laurentian.ca>

Subject: Sudbury West review Options 1 & 2 Oct. 16 response.

To: accommodation

Cc:

To the ARC committee,

I would like to make two main points in response to the Oct. 16 meeting for the review of Sudbury West schools.

- 1/ I cannot stress STRONGLY ENOUGH that Option #2 at last night's meeting SHOULD NOT EVEN BE AN OPTION. The number one issue, and this has been brought up at other meetings as well, is that JK to 6 should NEVER be in the same building as high school students. Do you remember at the previous meeting in September, when a mother described "high school students leaving the parking lot in a car almost on two wheels"? Let me ask you, would you send YOUR four year old to be in the same school with high school kids... ?!! This option DESCRIMINATES against the population (and taxpayer) base in the MAIN PART OF LIVELY. What we are saying is that if you live in the CENTRAL part of Lively that you have to send your little kids to a high school, meanwhile if you live in the Mikkola subdivision everything is as it was before (in fact your school is improved upon). Ridiculous. The POST OFFICE, CHURCHES, STORES, POLICE, FIRE, LIBRARY AND EVERYTHING ELSE ARE IN THIS PART OF LIVELY. This proposal (Option #2) would GHETTOIZE old Lively and would be very bad for the STUDENTS (your primary directive) and the ECONOMY of the old part of Lively (one of your other directives). Would you want to live in an area where you have to send your 4 year old to a high school? NO ONE WOULD.

THIS WILL BRING DOWN THE PROPERTY VALUES AND HURT THE STUDENTS, AND IT WILL NOT HELP THE HIGH SCHOOL BECAUSE PARENTS WILL OPT NOT TO SEND THEIR KIDS THERE. SCRAP THIS IDEA, PLEASE. IT IS VERY DISCRIMINATIVE TO THE MAIN PART OF LIVELY.

- 2/ My second point is that Option #1 could be revisited (with different variants) at another public meeting. There seemed to be general will in the room to have one more meeting. I have personally spoken to many different parents who feel that moving grade 7 and 8 from the various schools to help the high school is not a bad thing. I feel that in order to get the backing of the population, whatever you come up with as a committee needs to be EQUITABLE to old Lively, Mikkola, and the French immersion subject. I suggest for variants of Option #1:
  - a. If we go with the "Green school" scenario, to locate this demographically where it will best serve both old Lively and Mikkola.

Get some current population data and locate the new school somewhere between these two areas (i.e. meet halfway). This shouldn't negatively impact students or property values of either area. Find the demographic centre of these two population areas. Also, include French Immersion in the new school to get those parents on board with the idea as well. THIS OPTION WOULD LIKELY UNITE RATHER THAN DIVIDE US.

- b. Take a hard look at whether the new "Green school" would in fact be cheaper to build than fixing Vanier and Hamilton.  
Possibly consider sending 7 & 8's from both schools to the High School, repairing Vanier and Hamilton, shifting the Vanier catchment (slightly) towards Hamilton in order to ease overcrowding. Students already in the Hamilton system could be grandfathered so as to ease that transition. With this scenario, both enrolments would be reasonably healthy.

One final observation is that I think an 80% enrolment target for the high school is unreasonable right now. Sending 7 & 8's to the high school (I think) brings you around 60%... however, bear in mind that this may have a "trickle down" effect, because the 7 & 8's may stay and not go after these two years to other high schools. They may try Lively High and hopefully like it. This may stem the outflow significantly, bringing up the enrolment at Lively High after about 3 years.

PLEASE LISTEN TO MY VOICE ON THESE POINTS, I AM A CONCERNED PARENT, RATEPAYER AND CITIZEN OF LIVELY. And finally , thank you all for your effort so far.

Sincerely,

Adam Walli

234 4th Avenue,  
Lively

**----- Original Message -----**

Thursday, October 18, 2007 11:42:37 AM  
accommodation  
From: "Maanselka, Heidi" <HMaanselka@hrsrh.on.ca>  
Subject: Sudbury West Accomodation Review  
To: accommodation  
Cc: "Maanselka, Heidi" <HMaanselka@hrsrh.on.ca>  
Attachments: Attach0.html 7K  
School review.xls 26K

Following up to last nights public input meeting, I have a few comments and some analysis I have prepared.

First, I would like to recognize all the work the committee has been putting into this review, and it is a tough job to analyze all the data, consider all the input and come up with recommendations.

In last night's Preferred Option presented by the ARC team, it says to keep RH and Copper Cliff open however did not detail if that did in fact include changing the boundary for RH Murray which I would like if someone could clarify for me.

I am in support of Gr 7&8 going to Lively High if necessary from George Vanier and Jessie Hamilton, however do not support the French Immersion program being put into Lively High instead of the "new school" I also support many of the comments that changes need to be made wether to bussing rules or programs offered to increase the enrollment of Lively High secondary students.

I am not in support of the boundary change though for RH Murray. My daughter currently attends Jessie Hamilton Public School and we live in OJA subdivision therefore would be affected by this change. I have done an analysis based on the enrollment figures provided, and still do not see how moving 30 kids to RH Murray will sustain it long term. There were two conflicting numbers in the projected enrollment figures based on data provided by the School Board and data in the ARC presentation. Using the ARC presentation, projected enrollment in 5 years would only bring occupancy up to 60.1% In the analysis I have documented where I pulled the figures from. I don't see how they can meet the 80% target. On another note though, Long Lake Public School has been allowed to remain open at only 50% occupancy. So if RH is to remain open, leave the boundary's as they are.

Reasons for wanting to stay with Jessie Hamilton or the "New School"

- She has already an established circle of friends and peers
- She already knows most of the teachers and routines of the school
- Jessie offers a music program and additional extracirricular activities than RH Murray
- Changing schools would be detrimental to her outlook on school
- Jessie Hamilton has some split classes but largely a straight grade school, whereas all RH Murray offers is split classes
  
- EQAO Results are higher at Jessie
- Jessie is a very strict school and has a strong teacher base



- Jessie has a full support team of principal, vice principal and secretary

These are just a few of the reasons. We choose to live in OJA subdivision based on the fact that my children would be able to attend Jessie Hamilton. By forcing her to attend RH Murray, we would strongly have to consider changing school boards or moving.

I do not feel it is fair to single out a handful of kids, when they would have the opportunity of attending a brand new school, or newly renovated school. The new school would have many options and activities that RH Murray would not. I would rather she be able to make whatever change will happen with the whole group and not be segregated. RH Murray requires significant dollars \$2.5 million currently to be spent on the structure.

Also how will bussing work if our daycare provider is not in the boundary for RH Murray? How would she get to school out there?

In the past the boundary review was looked at and has never been changed.

Attached is the analysis I have done on the enrollment data, renovation costs, and differences in RH Murray and Jessie.

I would also like to see more information provided on the cost of a new school vs. renovating one of the existing schools. If a new school is built and RH Murray and Lively High kept open, there is still substantial costs to be incurred.

I would appreciate some response to the following:

- 1) Does the ARC Preferred Option include a change in boundary for RH Murray
- 2) If the daycare provider is outside of the boundary, can they still attend Jessie Hamilton
- 3) What is the cost of new school?

I also support the request to have another public input meeting prior the the report going to the Board.

Thank You

Heidi Maanselka, CA  
Accountant  
Sudbury Regional Hospital  
tel: 705-675-9193 ext 8331  
fax: 705-675-5839  
email: hmaanselka@hrsrh.on.ca

\*\*\*\*\*

The information contained in this email and document(s) attached are for the exclusive use of the addressee and may contain confidential, privileged and non-disclosable information. If the recipient of this e-mail is not the addressee, such recipient is strictly prohibited from reading, photocopying, distributing or otherwise using this e-mail or its content in any way.

## Sudbury West Accomodation Review

### RH Murray Enrollment Analysis

#### Analysis #1 Using School Facilities Inventory System Enrollment Data Collection

	No Boundary Change			With Boundary Change		
	Current	5Yr Projected	10 YR Projected	Current	5Yr Projected	10 YR Projected
<b>RH Murray</b>				(105+30)	(87+27)	(83+24)
Average Daily Enrollment	105	87	83	135	114	107
Capacity	158	158	158	158	158	158
	66.5%	55.1%	52.5%	85.4%	72.2%	67.7%

Estimate of 30 kids to transfer for current period

Estimate of 27 kids to transfer for 5 years

(30 kids reduced by 10%)

Estimate of 24 kids to transfer for 10 years

(27 kids reduced by 10%)

#### Analysis #2 Using Enrollment Data from ARC Presentation on September 19,2007

	No Boundary Change			With Boundary Change		
	Current	5Yr Projected	10 YR Projected	Current	5Yr Projected	10 YR Projected
<b>RH Murray</b>				(105+30)	(68+27)	
Average Daily Enrollment	105	68 Not		135	95 Not	
Capacity	158	158 Provided		158	158 Provided	
	66.5%	43.0%		85.4%	60.1%	

Estimate of 30 kids to transfer for current period

Estimate of 27 kids to transfer for 5 years

(30 kids reduced by 10%)

Estimate of 24 kids to transfer for 10 years

(27 kids reduced by 10%)

Slide # 12 in the presentation estimated RH Murray enrollment to be only 68 kids in 5 years.

However on Slide #22 with 40 extra kids at RH Murray it says enrollment would be 80%. That would be 126 kids which does not correlate with 68 kids plus 40 kids which is only 108 which is 68% capacity.

## RENOVATION COSTS AND NEW CAPITAL COSTS

	RH Murray	Copper Cliff	Jessie Hamilton	George Vanier	Lively High	New School	Total
<b>Current Status</b>							
Renovation costs required (5 year cumulative)	2,574,505	3,456,924	3,725,472	4,861,579	8,298,996	0	22,917,476
<b>Option 1 Preferred by ARC Committee</b>							
Renovation costs	2,574,505	3,456,924	0	0	8,298,996		14,330,425
Additional if combine elementary with secondary					Not provided		?
Capital Project - New School						Not provided	?

### RH Murray Comparison to Jessie Hamilton

	RH Murray	Jessie Hamilton	Comments
Split classes	Yes	Yes	All of RH Murray's classes are split classes where Jessie has both split and straight grade classes
Straight grade classes	No	Yes	
Number of classrooms	5	17	
Instrumental Music Room	No	Yes	
Computer lab	No	Yes	
Child care services	Yes	No	
EQAO Results			
Primary Reading	65%	81%	Large variance
Primary Writing	56%	62%	
Primary Math	44%	92%	Large variance
Full time supports (princ, vice, secr)	No	Yes	

**----- Original Message -----**

Thursday, October 18, 2007 2:33:55 PM

accommodation

From: "Gwen Doyle" <gwen-paul.doyle@sympatico.ca>

Subject: Request from Walden-CAN Education Task Force to ARC-Sudbury West...what do you th  
To: accommodation

Cc:

Attachments: Attach0.html

4K

**To: ARC-Sudbury West**

**From: Walden-CAN Education Task Force**

After listening to all the questions and concerns raised by the parents and other residents of Sudbury West re:

- a. Option to move K- Grade 6 students to LDSS
- b. Option to move F.I. K- 6 students to a separate wing in LDSS

We believe that it is vital that the ARC-Sudbury West hosts its own Public Meeting to share the final Option/s which you plan to present to the Administrative Council ...with the parents and the residents of Sudbury West.

As we understand the ARC Process , it is up to the descretion of the ARC-Sudbury West to determine how many Public Meetings will be held.

Up to this point , it is clear that you have worked hard to incorporate the input provided by the communities in Sudbury West into the Options you have developed.

Now that you have narrowed your Options to 2- as presented last night and you have heard the very strong opposition to several recommendations within these options,everyone will be waiting to see how the input from the Oct. 11 Public Meeting will impact your Final Options.

**We strongly suggest that you share your Final Option/s at a special ARC-Sudbury West Public Meeting.**

Let us hear directly from the ARC committee- the what & whys behind your Final Option/s...not as another public input session-there will never be a one-size fits all solution- but as a way of informing us 'first-hand' what you plan to recommend for the future of our 5 schools in Sudbury West.

Thanks for your consideration

Gwen Doyle, Co-Chair, Walden-CAN 692-3021 [www.Walden-CAN.com](http://www.Walden-CAN.com)

----- Original Message -----

Monday, October 22, 2007 10:07:53 PM

accommodation

From: "Dawn Vaneyk or Tim Lehman" <tim.dawn@sympatico.ca>

Subject: Sudbury West Accommodation Review

To: accommodation

Cc: <ernie.heerschap@ontario.ca>

<tim.dawn@sympatico.ca>

Attachments: Attach0.html 6K

October 22, 2007

Nicole Charette  
Senior Advisor  
Corporate Communications and  
Strategic Planning  
Rainbow District School Board  
69 Young Street  
Sudbury ON P3E 3G5

Dear Ms. Charette

I would like to provide my comments and input to the options presented at the October 17, 2007 Sudbury West Accommodation Review Public meeting held at Lively District Secondary School. I find it difficult to do this as I do not have a copy of the two options presented that evening and a copy of both the presentations and minutes have yet to be posted on your Accommodation website. This is a critical gap in the process as I realize that the Sudbury West ARC will be meeting this Wednesday Oct 25, 2007 to review the input and finalize their report for presentation to the Administrative Council. In spite of this I will attempt to provide some input.

It is obvious that George Vanier P.S. is old and falling apart, and needs to be replaced. Although not as old and not as in poor shape as George Vanier, Jesse Hamilton is starting to approach an age where some major retooling in the near future will be needed. It is also obvious that the low numbers at Lively District SS are curtailing the breadth and number of programs which can be taught there. I understand that some of the givens in this whole process is that due to funding and budget constraints the Board believes it must close at least one school building. I could support the option where R.H. Murray and Copper Cliff remain open, the Grade 7 & 8 from Jesse and Vanier are moved into the Lively District, and Jesse and Vanier are torn down (or sold) and a new K - G6 school is built for the students from Jesse and Vanier, with the following accommodations made:

1 - the new school to be built will house both the English and French immersion elementary programs;

2 - the Gr 7 & 8 from Jesse and Vanier are housed in a separate wing of Lively District with a separate administration and barriers from the high school, basically a middle school and high school under one roof;

3 - the music program at Jesse is an important school and community program and should be moved with the 7 & 8 to Lively District and extended to include the high school students, also that the introductory instruction being carried out in G6 at Jesse be continued at the new school;

4 - that options be developed and considered which would increase enrollment at Lively District at the high school level (it is surprising that during this process no options to do this appeared to have been considered and presented for public input), if this is not done we may well be back in a similar process in another five years.

It is also important that the public be able to review the final report produced by the ARC when it is submitted to the Administrative Council and that the report to be produced by the Administrative Council is available to public at the time (December 17, 2007) it is presented to the Board. People who wish to present at the Board's meeting of January 21, 2008 will need to have had number of weeks to review the Administrative Council's report in order to make an informed and constructive presentation to the Board. It is imperative that these become available on the Board's website in a more timely fashion than material from the most recent public meetings. Some how, a notice to parents with students in the affected schools must be distributed to let us when and how these reports are available (perhaps through a special newsletter through the School Councils).

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Tim Lehman

114 Jacob Street

Lively, ON P3Y 1E5

[tim.dawn@sympatico.ca](mailto:tim.dawn@sympatico.ca)

October 31, 2007

Sudbury (Walden) West Accommodation Review Committee  
c/o Rainbow District School Board

We want to begin by thanking and congratulating all the members of the Accommodation Review Committee for showing such commitment and dedication to all the students and parents in the Sudbury (Walden) West **COMMUNITY**. It is never easy to deal with such emotional issues as moving students to a new school; closing schools, etc. It is very clear that the committee volunteers have listened to all the public input, and after hours of deliberation, have presented an option which will stabilize and enhance the education opportunities for students in Walden West for many years to come.

**Option A** is a sensible, reasonable, and comprehensive recommendation. Younger students will have a new school, learning together in english and french. The communities of Copper Cliff and Whitefish will each maintain a community school. Copper Cliff was never a part of Walden politically. Copper Cliff was, for whatever reasons, included in this review process, and must now experience the benefits of this recommendation by being a part of the solution.

The key to the Option A recommendation is the retention of Lively District Secondary School (LDSS), and in fact, it contains a sound strategy to enhance this COMMUNITY secondary school. Making the LDSS plant a Grade 7 to 12 facility, for both english and french immersion students, is an excellent recommendation.

The most impressive and insightful part of the LDSS recommendation is to again have a full and complete Grade 9 to 12 french immersion program at LDSS. It makes no sense to offer the french immersion program up to Grade 8, and then have most all of those students leave Walden for the City schools. LoEllen and Lockerby both offer french immersion programs, and are located within five kilometres of each other. As well, there is an english catholic secondary school in the same catchment area which also offers french immersion. St. Benedict may or may not currently be at full capacity, however, it would never have been needed in this part of the City, if either LoEllen or Lockerby had been exchanged a number of years ago when such discussions were held between the school boards.

A COMMUNITY and a COMMUNITY secondary school, must not have to see their children and students bussed out-of-town if they can continue a program at home. When LDSS again has the full french immersion program, most of the students will likely choose to stay at LDSS. These and all the other students, in Grades 7 to 12, will contribute to the vitality and growth of LDSS. Academic results; sports; volunteerism; and school pride will flourish.

On a personal note, I am proud to say that I attended George Vanier and LDSS; both my children attended George Vanier; my son attended LDSS; and unfortunately, my daughter had to go to LoEllen to continue in the french immersion program. More importantly, my father was an educator at George Vanier for 30 years. He saw thousands of kids grow and thrive in our COMMUNITY schools. We must accept the fact that, to strengthen the community and our schools, George Vanier will close. Change is difficult to accept, however, growth and progress in a community are vitally important.

Therefore, we strongly endorse the Option A recommendation from the Accommodation Review Committee. This recommendation is totally in line with the four guiding principles that the committee had to follow and most importantly, it completely encompasses the two key principles of ensuring the best education for the students based on the funding available. We strongly suggest that the Board's Administrative Council, and ultimately **ALL** Board Trustees, must endorse this renewal of schools and education opportunities in the Sudbury (Walden) West COMMUNITY.

Thank you for receiving this input. In conclusion, we are still waiting for the installation of the new Rainbow District sign at LDSS just like at all the other secondary schools supported by this School Board.

Paul & Jane Sajatovic  
65 Third Avenue  
P.O. Box 719  
Lively, ON P3Y 1M6  
(692-5292).

**----- Original Message -----**

Friday, November 2, 2007 7:45:33 AM  
accommodation  
From: <iboyne@sympatico.ca>  
Subject: Feeder school - Copper Cliff  
To: accommodation  
Cc: <pgiommi@gmail.com>  
Attachments: Attach0.html 3K

Further to my previous message, I have a few more points to add before the input deadline. This feeder school recommendation was such a last minute addition to Option A that I am afraid there may not be ample time for all parents to offer their input.

1. Many Grade 7 and Grade 8 students at Copper Cliff Public School have already made their secondary school choice based on the existing busing rules. I hope this will be taken into account.
2. Currently, students are being bused to Lockerby from Hanmer, Skead, Chelmsford, Lively, Levack, etc. as long as they are enrolled in the STEP programme. As a parent and a taxpayer, it would upset me if Copper Cliff students are denied busing to the one school within closest proximity to them simply because they have no aptitude or interest in science and technology.
3. If the busing rules do change, there is potential for a family to have one sibling being bused to Lockerby while the younger sibling in the same household is denied this busing - even though the bus will be stopping at their house.

Thank you,  
Ardith Boyne

---

**----- Original Message -----**

Thursday, November 1, 2007 6:19:51 PM  
accommodation  
From: <iboyne@sympatico.ca>  
Subject: Re: ARC - feeder school  
To: "Paul Giommi" <pgiommi@gmail.com>  
Cc: accommodation  
Attachments: Attach0.html 11K

Hi Paul:

Thanks for forwarding my e-mail, however I do have a few more points to make which I will list in this message. I share your belief that LDSS is a fine high school and its smaller size is definitely attractive. I also agree that Judy Noble is an excellent Principal. I do feel though that LDSS should simply be an added option



for Copper Cliff students.

This recommendation was only recently added to Option A and I am sure many parents are not yet aware that if this recommendation is followed, the Lockerby/Lo-Ellen busing option would be lost to non STEP, non pre-IB students. Since the deadline for input is almost here, there may not be enough time to hear other opinions on this matter.

Here are some more points to consider:

1. Possible loss of students to the Separate Board. If parents and students find that Lively is too distant, they may simply opt to go to a separate school to stay within the Sudbury area - perhaps even non-Catholic families. The Rainbow Board would lose these students altogether - along with that funding.
2. Busing from Copper Cliff to Lockerby and Lo-Ellen would continue anyway to accommodate the STEP and pre-IB students even if this recommendation is followed. There is currently busing to LDSS. Giving Copper Cliff students all options would not affect busing to any great degree - it would be pretty much status quo. Since Lockerby is closer, the busing costs should be less to bus students there.
3. Since the closing of Copper Cliff High School - almost 30 years ago, Lockerby and Lo-Ellen have been the 2 schools to which Copper Cliff Public School students have been bused. This was prior to the creation of magnet programmes. There were decisions/promises made at that time which will hopefully be honoured. I am sure geographic proximity was taken into account.
4. There are many more public busing options for students when attending Lockerby or Lo-Ellen. This enables the student to participate in more activities than may be possible at LDSS due to lack of frequent buses. Many parents work in Sudbury and I can vouch that it is much easier to pick up a child on the way home from work rather than drive 20 - 30 minutes extra out of the way to Lively and back.
5. There seems to be a huge development boom in the Lively area. In time, LDSS may become overcrowded itself, especially if Grade 7 and Grade 8 students are added to the building.
6. I am not convinced that this option will do much to alleviate current surplus space at LDSS. I feel that students will just opt for other school choices and the students who are able to will enroll in STEP or pre-IB or another magnet choice in order to receive busing to Sudbury. Any student not wishing to attend LDSS for geographic reasons will surely find a way around this.

In conclusion, I sincerely hope that the Rainbow Board will continue to allow Copper Cliff students the choice of attending at least Lockerby with full busing even if they are not in the STEP programme. This school is so much closer in proximity that discontinuing this option just does not make sense to me.

Thanks,  
Ardith Boyne

Paul - Please forward to Lesleigh Dye, Sharon Speir, Nicole Charette for me as a follow-up to the message below -thanks.

---

On 10/31/07, [iboyne@sympatico.ca](mailto:iboyne@sympatico.ca) <[iboyne@sympatico.ca](mailto:iboyne@sympatico.ca)> wrote:

Hi Paul:

How are you? I hope you had a good Halloween night.

I was reading the ARC recommendations and noticed a new item within Option A. It mentions that Copper Cliff will be a feeder school for Lively High. This seems like a recent addition to me?

Do you know any details about this? Do you know if the intention is that Copper Cliff would be a feeder school for Lockerby, Lo-Ellen and Lively in future----- or Lively alone? I really hope that the option of Lockerby and/or Lo-Ellen will not be taken away from our students.

Geographically, Lockerby is definitely the closest school to Copper Cliff. In a pinch, a student could even walk home. There are many more city busing options also for after school activities and because it is close to Sudbury - any parent working in Sudbury can drive from work to Lockerby on the way home to Copper Cliff to pick up a student if they miss the bus or are involved in an activity. Lockerby and Lo-Ellen have been the Rainbow Board choices for our school since 1980 - almost 30 years now. I'm sure that proximity was taken into account at that time.

If Lively would become the only Rainbow option for Copper Cliff students, I would like to express my concerns about this to the board.

Any information you could provide would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks for all your time and effort on behalf of our school.

Ardi

**----- Original Message -----**

Thursday, November 1, 2007 12:32:48 PM

accommodation

From: "Francisco, Suzanne" <sfrancisco@hrsrh.on.ca>

Subject: George Vanier Closure

To: accommodation

Cc:

Attachments: Attach0.html 3K

I feel, that if George V., where my daughter presently attends gr. 5 FR. Immersion MUST close, the best option is a green school. Combined with students from Jessie H. French immersion should definitely continue to be offered, and I think the green school should be for up to the end of gr. 8.

As the jump to highschool is big, it should not be rushed, and I think a green school promotes LONGTERM thinking, of the things that are important to us all.

Sincerely, Suzanne Francisco- concerned MOM

\*\*\*\*\*

The information contained in this email and document(s) attached are for the exclusive use of the addressee and may contain confidential, privileged and non-disclosable information. If the recipient of this e-mail is not the addressee, such recipient is strictly prohibited from reading, photocopying, distributing or otherwise using this e-mail or its content in any way.

## **Response From Walden-CAN Executive & Education Task Force to**

### **The three ARC-Sudbury West Options- as outlined in Oct.29, 2007 Media Release**

The Walden - Community Action Network has reviewed the final three options to be presented to the Rainbow D.S.B. The result of this analysis leads us to fully endorse and support Option A of the three possibilities.

The mandate of A.R.C.- Sudbury West included a statement that student welfare should be paramount. The Committee has, in our opinion, succeeded in fulfilling this promise with Option A. This option also appears to accommodate most of the concerns of the parents and community, yet it addresses the need to reduce space within the existing group of schools. The realignment of boundaries, a new 'green' school, along with a restructuring of the profile for L.D.S.S. seems to be a creative yet pragmatic solution to the dilemma presented to the Committee.

Options B and C were also discussed, however, both of these present situations contrary to the wishes of an overwhelming number of parents and community stakeholders. These views were made apparent during the public meetings in a vociferous and forceful manner. As such, the Walden C.A.N. cannot support Options B or C in any aspect.

We wish again to thank the members of the Accommodation Review Committee for their excellent work, as well as the staff and Trustees of the Rainbow D.S.B. for their diligence and sensitivity to the needs and wishes of our community members and their children.

Submitted: November 2, 2007

From: Gwen Doyle, Co-Chair, Walden-CAN [www.Walden-CAN.com](http://www.Walden-CAN.com)

From: Sharon Speir "Visser, Christina" <[christinav@ionic-eng.com](mailto:christinav@ionic-eng.com)> Sharon Speir"Visser, Christina" [christinav@ionic-eng.com](mailto:christinav@ionic-eng.com)  
Tuesday, November 6, 2007 11:32:11 PM

Subject: Fwd: Accommodation Review

----- Original Message -----

Hello.

I'm the parent of a JK student at Jessie Hamilton, and I'd like to register my vote for maintaining two elementary schools in Lively. In general, I believe that the best size for an elementary school is small-ish, 150-300 students, big enough to provide a selection of children for making friends, but small enough to know everyone. Brendon's only been at Jessie Hamilton for a couple months, but we're already pleased by the school. We'd hate to see it change to something bigger and less personal.

Also, I also like the idea of my son and later my daughter walking or biking to a nearby school on secondary roads when they get bigger. I'm sure parents on both sides of the highway feel the same way.

I understand that changes need to be made, but I don't think a superschool is the best answer. Please keep elementary schools small.

Thanks,  
Christina Visser  
705 692 4170

----- Original Message -----

Sunday, November 4, 2007 9:25:11 PM

accommodation

From: Alicia Topp <aliciatopp@hotmail.com>

Subject: Sudbury West Schools

To: accommodation

Cc:

Attachments: Attach0.html 5K

I am a mother of a grade one student in the French Immersion program at George Vanier. Next September, my daughter is to begin JK. I am writing because I am disturbed by a number of the options proposed by the Accommodation Review Committee.

The thought of my children being placed in Lively High is especially upsetting. I live just one street away from the high school and in the past month I have personally broken up three fights involving Lively High students. These fights occurred at the park and the church at lunch hour. In the first two fights, I watched as over 50 students ran to the park to cheer on the fight. I ran into the middle and broke up two bleeding boys. This fight took place in front of my three year old daughter as well as 4 other pre-school aged children. The fight then broke out again between two churches. I also broke that fight up and found that one student was recording it on his cell phone. The third fight involved one student being sat on by another, while a third boy kicked him in the face. Other students stood around watching. I was again with my daughter when this fight happened. My point is that under no circumstances is it a wise choice to place elementary students into Lively High. I firmly believe that they cannot be protected from witnessing fights, sexual behaviour, drug and cigarette use, and poor language. After all, if the students will fight in front of children at a playground, it is safe to assume that the bathrooms and hallways of Lively High will be targeted as well.

At the last meeting on October 17, the committee stated that Grade 7 and 8 students that would be placed into the high school would have their own floors, bathrooms and hallways. If the committee knows that these students need to be segregated for their protection and development, doesn't that prove that the high school would not be a suitable environment for them? Why place the 7 and 8's into a situation that they should not have to experience.?

I would like to remind the committee that grade 7 and 8 is a very sensitive time and I believe that students of this age can gain more confidence and security if they are kept in elementary school. It is there that they can mature free from the influences and pressures of older students.

Regarding the French Immersion program, under no circumstances should it be separated from the English program. I urge the committee to spend a couple hours at George Vanier to see for themselves that the inclusion of both languages in the same school, on the same floor, beside one another is progressive and inclusive. Separating children based on language is a recipe for disaster, resulting in elitism and division.

In short, if a new school must be built, I urge you to include all students, French and English, JK to 8, "to ensure that all students continue to have access to the best programming possible in quality school facilities". The surplus space at Lively High is not the problem of the elementary students. Although I don't want to see the school close, I also do not want children to be placed in a situation that they are not prepared for.

I am not entirely pleased with the idea of a 'super school', especially because it seems so out of place in a small town like Lively and also because I am curious to what it would cost to repair and build on to George Vanier and Jessie Hamilton versus building a new school. With that said, I can accept a new school if it can include ALL of Lively's public students. It is utterly inane to separate any of the children.

It should be noted that I am upset that my children's right to the French Immersion program is being put into jeopardy. Yes the Board may continue to offer it, but I know of very few parents who will allow their children into the high school, thus ending French Immersion in Lively.

How does the committee think that the Lively parents will react if the students on one side of town get a new , "green" school, while the other students are placed in with teenagers? Or worse yet, if the French students are segregated. If a new school is to be built, it must include ALL elementary students. Do not separate the children of the same, small town and consider the delicate needs of 12 and 13 year olds before making any decisions.

The decision that the Board makes will deeply effect the parents and students of Lively. Keeping all of the students together is the only choice.

Sunday, November 4, 2007

Dear Accommodation Review Committee for Sudbury West Options /  
Sharon Speir, Lesleigh Dye:

Please accept this letter as written input to the Accommodation Review Committee as per letter received dated Monday October 29<sup>th</sup> for Sudbury West Options.

As concerned and involved parents of students attending Jessie Hamilton Public School and Lively District Secondary School we would like to submit our input to the options being submitted to the Board by the Accommodation Review Committee.

We have attended both the Public Meetings as well as a couple of Accommodation Review Committee Meetings.

In regards to the recommended options by the Accommodation Review Committee we are in favor of option "A" only. With a strong emphasis on Copper Cliff becoming a feeder school for Lively District Secondary School and offering French Emersion from grade 7-12.

The option of a New Green School would mean a closure of two of our aging schools that are in need of major repairs, providing a cost saving of \$ 7,524,729. as outlined in the Cumulative Capital Projects report for 2006-2007 that could be put towards the cost of a new school.

We strongly oppose to options B & C that would create a school within a school . We want to maintain a "High School" entity in our community.

In addition to option "A" we would like to see that all grade 9 students within the Rainbow District School Board attend their local High School. This would give the students the opportunity to see and experience what their community school has to offer.

This could help alleviate some of the costs of busing, overcrowding of Sudbury South End schools. This would also help to utilize surplus space and increase enrollment in the outlying community Secondary Schools. The option of Magnet School programs could be offered starting at the grade 10 level.

The majority of students entering Secondary Schools are undecided as to the career path that they wish to follow, many choose to follow their friends and not necessarily the program that best meets their needs.

It is sad, but true that our Secondary Schools have resorted to calling students at home, scouting out students and using marketing strategies to lure students into their schools.

Are we not a public school system (not private) that offers students access to the same quality of education, same Ontario curriculum to graduate, no matter what school they attend.

Sincerely,  
Mary Ferro  
Kim Peura



----- Original Message -----

Sunday, November 4, 2007 9:54:08 PM

accommodation

From: "Bill & Barb Maki" <bbmaki@persona.ca>

Subject: Option to ARC-Sudbury West

To: accommodation

Cc:

Attachments: Attach0.html

4K

To Whom It May Concern:

More recently I have been following the developments about the schools in Sudbury West. My children have attended both George Vanier Public School and Jessie Hamilton. At present one is attending Lively High and the other two attend Lo-Ellen Park, French Immersion.

I strongly believe that the first **Option A** is the most suitable for the following reasons.

- We need to have a High School in Lively
- Lively High School once offered French Immersion; my children would have been able to attend Lively High instead of having to go to Lo-Ellen for French Immersion. It would be a great advantage if this community could offer the French Immersion program.
- It seems the addition of Grade 7 & 8 students at Marymount has been successful and would be a suitable solution for the Lively students. I do NOT think it suitable to have children younger than Grade 7 situated in the High School environment.
- The advantages of combining the JK to 6 (English & French Immersion) from George Vanier and Jessie Hamilton to a new green school must far outweigh the cost of bringing the two existing buildings up to standard.

I would also expect that this options is best suited to ever-changing demographics.

Thanks to all on this Accommodation Review Committee for their consideration, ongoing efforts and the public meetings they have co-ordinated for the Sudbury West residents.

Barb Maki  
8 Melvyn Avenue  
Lively, ON P3Y 1A8  
705-692-9398

Dear Accommodation Review Committee for Sudbury West Options/

Sharon Speir, Lesleigh Dye:

Please accept this letter as additional public input to the letter dated October 29, 2007 to the Accommodation Review Committee for consideration into the Sudbury West Options.

We are residents and parents of children attending both Elementary and Secondary Schools of Walden. We are concerned that the data presented regarding population growth is not reflecting what we are seeing in Lively / Greater City of Sudbury area and would like to present to you further information regarding our community.

Lively District Secondary School has room for growth. Sudbury South end Secondary Schools are at or over capacity with no room for growth. We need to keep this in mind during this review.

The mining companies are increasing their work force as well as their production of minerals. We hear this from the mining companies via the media often as of late. The mining companies have reopened old mines requiring more employees and contractors to build and maintain these mines as well as office staff.

Media has stated that Sudbury, along with Calgary, are the two areas of growth and prosperity.  
The jobless rate is at its lowest in 33 years.

Inco has hired 165 employees for the month of August. Inco has released to the media of hiring 500 more employees in the New Year. Inco has invited the work force from the lumber industry that has been laid off to apply at the mines.

FNX projected tons of extraction of minerals for 2010 is double to triple from 2006 figures. So the future looks bright for our area.

The Walden community is growing because of how well the mining sector is doing and proposing of doing very well for years to come. Walden has room to grow and the land to build. Even though the population growth from the city doesn't show that Walden is growing. In the near future it will,  
Therefore, filling our schools to the desired 80 percent and more.

Dalron, in the future, plans on building 700 homes in the Walden area with 150 of these homes in for draft approval now. Sugarbush has 38 completed, sold homes with a projection of 300 more to be built.

Evergreen, which is also a Dalron project in Mikkola Subdivision, has 24 of 34 homes either sold or in process of building. This project just began this year.

There have been 22 homes built on Bonnie Street in Mikkola subdivision within the last year to two years and a proposed expansion.

There are numerous private homes being built within the region of Walden.

In conclusion this data shows that we are a viable and growing community. We need to allow for this growth. Therefore we can only support option "A" as it allows for this growth both in a New Green School and Lively District Secondary School as a separate entity.

Sincerely,

Kim Peura

Mary Ferro

Dear Accommodation Review Committee;

I was very distressed and disappointed upon reviewing the final options that will be presented to the Rainbow District School Board. Ideally, Option A will be considered the best solution and the board will go forward with it. However, if capital funding to build a new green school is not available, as was implied at previous ARC committee public meetings, the only option left for the board is to combine the elementary school and the high school. Extensive renovations would be required to the school and the grounds to ensure this 'school within a school' could provide for our young children's emotional and physical well-being. This money would be better spent on renovations to combine the two Lively elementary schools into one of the existing sites.

The committee must consider the effect it would have on our children and their future. Children in the primary grades are highly influenced by older peers. The safety and social development of these children must be protected. Our children deserve an environment where they will feel safe and nurtured. Of course, there are many wonderful teenagers in our town, but one incident of bullying, swearing, or smoking in the parking lot is more than I want my 4 year old witnessing!

Combining elementary and high school students into one school has been done successfully in other regions of Ontario. However, it is generally done in areas where the population cannot support two separate schools. Presenting this option for the Lively district will be detrimental for the Rainbow District School Board. Parents have other school options and will exercise their right to switch school boards if a decision is made to put elementary children into the high school. George Vanier with a current reasonable usage of 74% will suffer for this poor decision. Parents will do what is right for their child, even if it means relocating or physically driving them to a different school if bussing is unavailable. I ask the committee to rethink the proposed Option B. If the school board's hands are tied due to funding, a disastrous decision may be made with the incorrect assumption that the community supports this decision.

Sincerely,

Julie Collie  
36 Sugarbush Drive  
Lively, ON  
P3Y 1R1  
705-692-0689

To: Accommodation Review Committee  
Re: Sudbury West Area Schools  
From: Marianne Coleman (dancoleman@sympatico.ca)

Date: November 5, 2007

I am writing to simply state my disappointment with this committee for including Option C in its final submission to the Administrative Council. I believe that the public was very clear in its message at the last public meeting that it did NOT see this as an option. Every person that spoke that night spoke against this option, so what rationale is being used to keep this as a valid option? I have attended the meetings and at no other was the message more clearly spoken. Why are you seeking public input if you just ignore it anyway?

To suggest that a "new green school" be built for the children in the English program is completely discriminatory. Why would we spend money building a new school that wasn't big enough to house ALL of the elementary children and provide them ALL with the benefits of a new facility? Why are you choosing to send the children of a program that is not even offered at the high school to the high school? You have nothing to gain from them being there as they will have to leave to continue their program. Lively High school tried and failed to have a French Immersion program. There simply are not enough students to provide a true immersion program at this level.

It appears that George Vanier has been chosen as the scapegoat in this process. Option B will see us offer up ALL the Vanier students to the high school environment. And from all accounts presented at the last several meetings we KNOW that this is NOT an option any parent considers as reasonable. In fact it scares them to death. And so I ask "How does this option meet all the criteria of your mandate?"

Option A is the only option that truly meets your mandate and provides a solution that is in the best interest of ALL the students of our community.

I await the Administrative Council's recommendations in December in hopes that they will come forward with an Option of their own that will put the interest of ALL the children of our community first.

Sincerely,

Marianne Coleman

Dear Accommodation Review Committee:

I vote in favour of Option A.

I have taken so much time to collect enough evidence-base research and contacted many experts in my quest: Health Canada; CHMC; Ontario Lung Association; Canadian Lung Association; Sudbury District Health Unit Asthma program in schools Kasie Rautiainen, Reg. N., BScN, PHN 522-9200, ext. 362; Institute for Clinical Evaluative Studies (ICES) Jun Guan, Senior Analyst and Report on the Burden of Asthma in Ontario; Nation Research Council Canada Girish Patel PhD Microbiology and leader in Biological Sciences, Public Health Agency of Canada, Respiratory Disease in Canada (2001) new study coming out in Fall 2007 and many scholar articles related to Indoor Air Quality (IAQ), ventilation, and building-related health problems in US elementary schools since no indoor air quality monitoring is done in Canadian elementary schools. I request environmental study is performed during the months of August -September before and after new fiscal year begins, April [allergy season], and May-June [when hot weather arrives] This environmental testing is urgent in all schools since our children are at high risk to exposure to formaldehyde volatile organic compounds (HVOC), NO<sub>2</sub>, high levels of CO<sub>2</sub>, poor ventilation, molds and microbial, and allergens; leading to causal relationships between pollutant exposures and health symptoms such as Asthma and 'sick building syndrome' symptoms are commonly reported.

Please consider these new research evidence facts ....

The surplus at the some of these schools is not your only problem....

1. At all 5 schools, these schools are aging and at **critical to prohibitive need of repair** it is not feasible to invest 1.9 million, 3-4 million or 6.7 million to repair an old school.

	Year built	Enrollment 2006-07	Capacity	% capacity	FCI	Cost
Copper Cliff	1937	213	288	73%	62-critical to repair	3.2 M
George Vanier	1950	346	480	72%	69- prohibitive to repair	4.4 M
Jessie Hamilton	1958	337	302	111%	64 - critical to repair	3.1 M
RH Murray	1956	105	158	66%	72- prohibitive to repair	1.9 M
Lively High School	1956	399	852	47%	40 - critical to repair	6.7 M

## Option to build 4 Green Schools in Sudbury –West

- Research done in the US proves and identified commonly reported building-related health symptoms involving schools until 1999.
- Build 4 Green school in Sudbury West
- One English new elementary school to accommodate Copper Cliff Public growth of new families who want local school in their community, feeder school to Lively high-school
- One English new elementary school to accommodate RH Murray growth of +150 new employees when Totten mine opens in Worthington, feeder school to Lively high school
- One English/ FI new elementary school to accommodate JK to grade 6 from George Vanier and Jessie Hamilton, feeder school to Lively high-school
- One English/FI new high school to accommodate high-school students and 7/8 from George Vanier and Jessie Hamilton

### 2. According to *Indoor air quality, ventilation and health symptoms in schools: an analysis of existing information Indoor Air (2003)*

<http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/doi/abs/10.1034/j.1600-0668.2003.00153.x>

- We reviewed the literature on Indoor Air Quality (IAQ), ventilation, and building-related health problems in schools and identified commonly reported building-related health symptoms involving schools until 1999. We collected existing data on ventilation rates, carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) concentrations and symptom-relevant indoor air contaminants, and evaluated information on causal relationships between pollutant exposures and health symptoms
- The paper summarizes and explores the peer-reviewed literature on Indoor Air Quality in schools, a field that is of increasing interest to the research community, educators and school facilities managers, and the public at large.
- These experts generally agree that healthy indoor school environments are a necessity if a high standard of education is to be expected.
- Although peer-reviewed literature on this subject is sparse, there is a clear indication that classroom ventilation is typically inadequate.
- Researchers observed specific allergens in classrooms at levels sufficient to affect sensitive occupants
- Reported ventilation and carbon dioxide CO<sub>2</sub> data strongly indicate that ventilation is inadequate in many classrooms, possibly leading to health symptoms
- Total volatile organic compounds, formaldehyde and microbiological contaminants are reported
- Low formaldehyde concentrations were unlikely to cause acute irritant symptoms (<0.05 ppm), but possibly increased risks for allergen sensitivities, chronic irritation, and cancer.
- Reported microbiological contaminants included allergens in deposited dust, fungi, and bacteria
- Measurements of airborne bacteria and airborne and surface fungal spores were reported in schoolrooms.
- Asthma and 'sick building syndrome' symptoms are commonly reported.
- The few studies investigating causal relationships between health symptoms and exposures to specific pollutants suggest that such symptoms in schools are related to exposures to formaldehyde volatile organic compounds, molds and microbial, and allergens

### 3. According to *Do indoor pollutants and thermal conditions in schools influence student performance? A critical review of the literature Indoor Air (2005)*

<http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1600-0668.2004.00320.x>

- To assess whether school environments can adversely affect academic performance, we review scientific evidence relating indoor pollutants and thermal conditions, in schools or other indoor environments, to human performance or attendance.
- We critically review evidence for direct associations between these aspects of indoor environmental quality (IEQ) and performance or attendance.
- Secondly, we summarize, without critique, evidence on indirect connections potentially linking IEQ to performance or attendance. Regarding direct associations, little strongly designed research was available.
- Persuasive evidence links higher indoor concentrations of NO<sub>2</sub> to reduced school attendance, and suggestive evidence links low ventilation rates to reduced performance.
- Also, much evidence links poor IEQ (e.g. Low ventilation rate, excess moisture, or formaldehyde) with adverse health effects in children and adults and documents dampness problems and inadequate ventilation as common in schools.
- Overall, evidence suggests that poor IEQ in schools is common and adversely influences the performance and attendance of students, primarily through health effects from indoor pollutants.
- Evidence is available to justify (i) immediate actions to assess and improve IEQ in schools and (ii) focused research to guide IEQ improvements in schools.
- There is more justification now for improving IEQ in schools to reduce health risks to students than to reduce performance or attendance risks.
- However, as IEQ-performance links are likely to operate largely through effects of IEQ on health, IEQ improvements that benefit the health of students are likely to have performance and attendance benefits as well.
- Immediate actions are warranted in schools to prevent dampness problems, inadequate ventilation, and excess indoor exposures to substances such as NO<sub>2</sub> and formaldehyde.
- Also, siting of new schools in areas with lower outdoor pollutant levels is preferable.

4. According to Institute for Clinical Evaluative Studies. (ICES)(2006) Jun Guan, Senior Analyst

The cumulative asthma prevalent [will be diagnosed with Asthma by their doctor] rate in 2006

- One in 4.6 in age group 5-9
- One in 3.9 in age group 10-14
- Asthma has increased in school-age children

5. According to Institute for Clinical Evaluative Studies. (ICES)(2006) Report on the Burden of Asthma in Ontario

One in 4 school-age boys and One in 3 school-age girls have a risk of developing asthma

6. According to Institute for Clinical Evaluative Studies. (ICES)(2004) Report on the Burden of Asthma

One child out of five has asthma

One out of five Ontario children has asthma. As a result, there are likely to be several children in each classroom with asthma. Uncontrolled asthma is a leading cause of



school absenteeism and may limit children's learning opportunities. Uncontrolled asthma also causes many nights of interrupted sleep, several days of limited activity, and disruptions in normal activities of life.

According to your Priorities in Option Decision Making [ARCJune20\_Open]

- Value to Student – Over riding priority – our number one consideration in decision making

Make our student have a safer place to breathe and learning environment, build green school for our children

Indoor air quality, ventilation and health symptoms in schools: an analysis of existing information Indoor Air (2003)

Do indoor pollutants and thermal conditions in schools influence student performance? A critical review of the literature Indoor Air (2005)

Institute for Clinical Evaluative Studies. (ICES)(2006) Report on the Burden of Asthma in Ontario

- Value to Community – recognized that schools area very important part of the sustainability of our communities

Invest in our community, homeowner pays \$200 - \$400 thousand to build new homes and the +300 units to attract new families to our area

- Value to Board – realize that funding and government direction requires action to be taken.

Statistic say smaller schools help our children learn better and 32.9% more violent incident reports at larger schools +1000 students

- Ontario's Small Schools - People for Education, May 2004
- The Hobbit Effect – Why Small Works in Public Schools – Lorna Jimerson Ed.D
- Towards Sustainable Rural Schools – Robert Laurie, Telegraph Journal, Cape Breton Post May 29, 2007
- School Size, School Climate, and Student Performance – Kathleen Coton, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
- Small Schools: Great Strides- Patricia A. Wasley, Michelle Fine, Matt Gladden, Nicole Holland, etc., 2000
- Small Works – The Series Summary – Rural Policy Matters, April 2004
- Rural Education – National Education Association, [www.nea.org](http://www.nea.org)
- Big School, Small School - Barker & Gump, 1964
- Size Matters – Susan Black, 1996
- The Ultimate Education Reform? Make Schools Smaller – Center for Education Research at University of Wisconsin

- Value to Economy – Our schools are connected to the economic stability in our communities.

Invest in green schools in our communities is to invest in our children, invest in the families who build their homes and allow their children to attend schools in our community

# **Green School Option**

Sudbury – West Schools

## **I vote in favour of Option A**

- R.H. Murray Public School and Copper Cliff Public School remain open
- R.H. Murray boundary extended towards the east for new students effective September 2008
- Copper Cliff becomes feeder school for Lively District Secondary School
- Move Grade 7 and 8 students from George Vanier Public School and Jessie Hamilton Public School to Lively District Secondary School (English and French Immersion)
- Combine JK to 6 students from Jessie Hamilton Public School and George Vanier Public School into a new green school (English and French Immersion)
- Use a portion of Lively District Secondary School for non-student use
- Offer Grade 9 to 12 French Immersion at Lively District Secondary School (Lively District Secondary School would offer French Immersion from Grade 7 to 12)

## **Option Build 4 Green Schools In Sudbury -West**

- Research done in the US proves and identified commonly reported building-related health symptoms involving schools until 1999.
- Build 4 Green school in Sudbury West
- One English new elementary school to accommodate Copper Cliff Public growth of new families who want local school in their community, feeder school to Lively high-school
- One English new elementary school to accommodate RH Murray growth of +150 new employees when Totten mine opens in Worthington, feeder school to Lively high school
- One English/ FI new elementary school to accommodate JK to grade 6 from George Vanier and Jessie Hamilton, feeder school to Lively high-school
- One English/FI new high school to accommodate high-school students and 7/8 from George Vanier and Jessie Hamilton

## **Option Build 4 Green Schools In Sudbury -West**

- Ensure the new green schools reflects  
The greater City of Sudbury plans \$30 million investment to build Sports Facility and \$60 million investment to build new Arts Center
- With nickel prices increasing the time to invest is now ... According to city councilors for 2008 budget

## Evidence-base research

- Health Canada;
- CHMC;
- Ontario Lung Association;
- Canadian Lung Association;
- Sudbury District Health Unit Asthma program in schools  
Kasie Rautiainen, Reg. N., BScN, PHN 522-9200, ext. 362;
- Institute for Clinical Evaluative Studies (ICES) Jun Guan, Senior Analyst and Report on the Burden of Asthma in Ontario;
- Nation Research Council Canada Girish Patel PhD Microbiology and leader in Biological Sciences,
- Public Health Agency of Canada, Respiratory Disease in Canada (2001) new study coming out in Fall 2007

## The surplus at the some of these schools is not your only problem

- At all 5 schools, these schools are aging and at critical to prohibitive need of repair it is not feasible to invest 1.9 million, 3-4 million or 6.7 million to repair an old school.

	Year built	Enrollment 2006-07	Capacity	% capacity	FCI	Cost \$ Million
Copper Cliff	1937	213	288	73%	62 - critical to repair	3.2 M
George Vanier	1950	346	480	72%	68 - prohibitive to repair	4.4 M
Jessie Hamilton	1958	337	302	111%	64 - critical to repair	3.1 M
RH Murray	1956	105	158	66%	72 - prohibitive to repair	1.9 M
Lively High School	1956	399	852	47%	60 - critical to repair	6.7 M

***Indoor air quality, ventilation and health symptoms in schools: an analysis of existing information Indoor Air (2003)***

- We reviewed the literature on Indoor Air Quality (IAQ), ventilation, and building-related health problems in schools. Proved and identified commonly reported building-related health symptoms involving schools until 1999. We collected existing data on ventilation rates, carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) concentrations and symptom-relevant indoor air contaminants, and evaluated information on causal relationships between pollutant exposures and health symptoms

***Indoor air quality, ventilation and health symptoms in schools: an analysis of existing information Indoor Air (2003)***

- The paper summarizes and explores the peer-reviewed literature on Indoor Air Quality in schools, a field that is of increasing interest to the research community, educators and school facilities managers, and the public at large.

***Indoor air quality, ventilation and health symptoms in schools: an analysis of existing information Indoor Air (2003)***

- These experts generally agree that healthy indoor school environments are a necessity if a high standard of education is to be expected.
- Although peer-reviewed literature on this subject is sparse, there is a clear indication that classroom ventilation is typically inadequate.

***Indoor air quality, ventilation and health symptoms in schools: an analysis of existing information Indoor Air (2003)***

- Researchers observed specific allergens in classrooms at levels sufficient to affect sensitive occupants
- Reported ventilation and carbon dioxide CO<sub>2</sub> data strongly indicate that ventilation is inadequate in many classrooms, possibly leading to health symptoms

***Indoor air quality, ventilation and health symptoms in schools: an analysis of existing information Indoor Air (2003)***

- Total volatile organic compounds, formaldehyde and microbiological contaminants are reported
- Low formaldehyde concentrations were unlikely to cause acute irritant symptoms (<0.05 ppm), but possibly increased risks for allergen sensitivities, chronic irritation, and cancer.

***Indoor air quality, ventilation and health symptoms in schools: an analysis of existing information Indoor Air (2003)***

- Reported microbiological contaminants included allergens in deposited dust, fungi, and bacteria
- Measurements of airborne bacteria and airborne and surface fungal spores were reported in schoolrooms.

***Indoor air quality, ventilation and health symptoms in schools: an analysis of existing information Indoor Air (2003)***

- Asthma and 'sick building syndrome' symptoms are commonly reported.
- The few studies investigating causal relationships between health symptoms and exposures to specific pollutants suggest that such symptoms in schools are related to exposures to formaldehyde volatile organic compounds, molds and microbial, and allergens

***Indoor air quality, ventilation and health symptoms in schools: an analysis of existing information Indoor Air (2003)***

- This article investigate the Indoor Air Quality (IAQ), ventilation, and building-related health problems in US elementary schools since no indoor air quality monitoring is done in Canadian elementary schools.
- I would like to request environmental study is performed during the months of August - September before and after new fiscal year begins, April [allergy season], and May-June [when hot weather arrives]



***Indoor air quality, ventilation and health symptoms in schools: an analysis of existing information Indoor Air (2003)***

- This environmental testing is urgent in all schools since our children are at high risk to exposure to formaldehyde volatile organic compounds (HVOC), NO<sub>2</sub>, high levels of CO<sub>2</sub>, poor ventilation, molds and microbial, and allergens
- leading to causal relationships between pollutant exposures and health symptoms such as Asthma and 'sick building syndrome' symptoms are commonly reported.

***Do indoor pollutants and thermal conditions in schools influence student performance? A critical review of the literature Indoor Air (2005)***

- To assess whether school environments can adversely affect academic performance, we review scientific evidence relating indoor pollutants and thermal conditions, in schools or other indoor environments, to human performance or attendance.

**Do indoor pollutants and thermal conditions in schools influence student performance? A critical review of the literature Indoor Air (2005)**

- We critically review evidence for direct associations between these aspects of indoor environmental quality (IEQ) and performance or attendance.
- Secondly, we summarize, without critique, evidence on indirect connections potentially linking IEQ to performance or attendance. Regarding direct associations, little strongly designed research was available.

**Do indoor pollutants and thermal conditions in schools influence student performance? A critical review of the literature Indoor Air (2005)**

- Persuasive evidence links higher indoor concentrations of NO<sub>2</sub> to reduced school attendance, and suggestive evidence links low ventilation rates to reduced performance.
- Also, much evidence links poor IEQ (e.g. low ventilation rate, excess moisture, or formaldehyde) with adverse health effects in children and adults and documents dampness problems and inadequate ventilation as common in schools.

**Do indoor pollutants and thermal conditions in schools influence student performance? A critical review of the literature Indoor Air (2005)**

- Overall, evidence suggests that poor IEQ in schools is common and adversely influences the performance and attendance of students, primarily through health effects from indoor pollutants.
- Evidence is available to justify (i) immediate actions to assess and improve IEQ in schools and (ii) focused research to guide IEQ improvements in schools.

**Do indoor pollutants and thermal conditions in schools influence student performance? A critical review of the literature Indoor Air (2005)**

- There is more justification now for improving IEQ in schools to reduce health risks to students than to reduce performance or attendance risks.
- However, as IEQ-performance links are likely to operate largely through effects of IEQ on health, IEQ improvements that benefit the health of students are likely to have performance and attendance benefits as well.

**Do indoor pollutants and thermal conditions in schools influence student performance? A critical review of the literature Indoor Air (2005)**

- Immediate actions are warranted in schools to prevent dampness problems, inadequate ventilation, and excess indoor exposures to substances such as NO<sub>2</sub> and formaldehyde.
- Also, siting of new schools in areas with lower outdoor pollutant levels is preferable.

**Institute for Clinical Evaluative Studies. (ICES)(2006) Jun Guan, Senior Analyst**

- The cumulative asthma prevalent [diagnosed with Asthma by their doctor] rate in 2006
- **one in 4.6** in age group 5-9
- **one in 3.9** in age group 10-14
- Asthma has increased in school-age children

## **Institute for Clinical Evaluative Studies. (ICES)(2004) Report on the Burden of Asthma**

- **One child out of five has asthma**
- As a result, there are likely to be several children in each classroom with asthma. Uncontrolled asthma is a leading cause of school absenteeism and may limit children's learning opportunities. Uncontrolled asthma also causes many nights of interrupted sleep, several days of limited activity, and disruptions in normal activities of life.

## **Institute for Clinical Evaluative Studies. (ICES)(2006) Report on the Burden of Asthma In Ontario**

- **One in 4 school-age boys and  
One in 3 school-age girls have a risk  
of developing asthma**

Exhibit 2.1 Risk (percentage) of developing asthma before the age of 40 years, from a given age, in Ontario

Age (years)	Birth	School age	Early adolescence	Late adolescence	Early adulthood	Adulthood	
	0	6	12	18	24	30	36
Overall risk* (%)	41.2	25.9	20.0	16.0	12.3	8.2	3.5
Male (%)	42.3	23.4	16.4	12.8	10.1	6.7	2.7
Female (%)	40.2	28.1	23.3	19.0	14.5	9.6	4.1

\*The risk of developing asthma is calculated based on age- and sex-specific asthma incidence and mortality rates for Ontario in 2001, and on life tables based on 1995–1997 all-cause mortality rates.

**We want the best  
for our children**

The Green School option