

	<p>COMMENTS RECEIVED ON SOCIAL PINPOINT 04.10.19 THROUGH 05.01.19 617 visits; 530 unique users 27 persons making 35 comments</p>
1	This should stay as Lewis and Clark so it doesn't isolate that portion of the neighborhood from the rest.
2	People living in this area and working downtown or at the University will have to drive their kids 10 minutes out of the way, up Gharret to get the kids to school. Charlo is out of the way and inconvenient!
3	Why wouldn't you take the Chief Charlo District all the way to 39th street, instead of breaking it at Briggs St. The traffic on 39th to get to Russell School is terrible in the morning, and causes major delay as it is backed up into Miller Creek. Don't separate the lower South Hills, keep those kids together so that parents can car pool to Chief Charlo.
4	After reviewing the poverty maps, these changes to Franklin's district do not seem to significantly increase the socioeconomic diversity of the school. The more economic diversity a school has the more positive school culture and the higher test scores (though those do not necessarily equate to a more quality education). It seems that more area could have been allocated from the slant streets and Hawthorne district across third.
5	As lower rattlesnake residents, we are concerned about safe biking and walking to school. We have safe routes to Rattlesnake Elementary from our house. Redistricting us to Lowell will create a much more unsafe commute by bike. Our daughter will start kindergarten this fall. We have been looking forward to biking her to school safely since she was born. It is part of why we have stayed in the lower rattlesnake neighborhood.
6	The proposal to move 90+ kids from Paxson to Franklin stems from not enough capacity at the brand-new Jeannette Rankin School. This ripple effect impacts Chief Charlo, Russell, Lewis and Clark, Paxson, and Franklin. More kids could be moved to Russell from Lewis and Clark rather than moving 60+ kids to Paxson from Lewis and Clark. This would prevent the disruption of 90+ Paxson students.
7	There is no plan for Spanish Immersion at CS Porter. With the proposed changes, over 90 kids who have been in Spanish Immersion will move to CS Porter. There is no plan at CS Porter Middle School for Spanish Immersion while there is at Washington Middle School. Paxson invested in these kids and they will not be able to continue their Spanish education in middle school if these boundary changes are implemented.
8	Paxson will become more affluent with the proposed changes, which is in opposition of the goal of the Advisory Committee to create more economic diversity. The area with the highest poverty in Paxson (40-45.5% according to the poverty map on the MCPS website) is being taken out of the Paxson district and an area previously in the Lewis and Clark neighborhood, which has one of the lowest poverty levels in Missoula, is being added to Paxson.
9	Paxson is the safest school to bike/walk from the Riverfront neighborhood (via Riverfront Trail and Gerald or other university neighborhood side streets). Russell is too dangerous for kids to cross to get to Franklin. One of the primary goals of the Advisory Committee is to make schools more walkable and bikeable and keeping the Riverfront neighborhood in Paxson will accomplish that goal.
10	Paxson does not have an enrollment problem based on the current boundary lines. According to the data posted on the MCPS website, out of the 479 children currently enrolled, 71 of them are not attending from within those currently drawn lines. I'm not proposing that families

	from out of district shouldn't be allowed to attend, but why make unneeded changes to a system that is already working for the neighborhood?
11	Commuting by bike or walking from the Riverfront Neighborhood to Paxson is safer than it is to Franklin. It is an easy route via the river trail where crossing Orange & Higgins can be avoided.
12	this area appears to be closer to paxson
13	Why wouldn't more Lewis & Clark students be redirected to Russell School? It makes sense geographically and aligns with economic diversity goals.
14	I am opposed to the addition of the slant streets to area 22. This late addition has not had adequate time or consideration and without forethought about middle school boundaries could have far reaching negative impacts. The "domino effect" as described by the consultant, from Jeanette Rankin overflow is not a good reason to change boundaries. A thoughtful, comprehensive process is what is required. Enrollment goals can be achieved with fewer changes. Currently 6 of 9 schools are impacted.
15	This area is probably in a closer proximity to Lowell school according to this map.
16	It is unfortunate that after this time consuming and costly process, where Rattlesnake Elementary was initially identified as a targeted school due to exceedingly max enrollment, miniscule changes amounting to no change in enrollment are being made. This exercise was supposed to create better socio-economic diversity and better numerically equal schools in MCPS elementary. According to this final proposed "option," this is a big failed, no-gain process.
17	Please reconsider shaver drive it feeds directly into Jeff drive and our kids will be removed from neighborhood friends as classmates and it feels like it is breaking our neighborhood up. Our kids will have no safe means to walk or bike to their friends homes if they go to Chief Charlo. This street is full of retired people or those close to with the exception of two homes and it feels like drawing this line would create more heartache and safety concerns for us than it saves JR in numbers.
18	Rattlesnake is overcrowded and lacks the opportunities provided at other schools. This boundary change does not do enough for Rattlesnake's students, particularly when Lowell will have almost 100 less students than Rattlesnake. These proposals should also be viewed in conjunction with the middle school boundaries and crowding issues. Finally, the district should be looking critically at the unequal opportunities it provides its students and making widespread changes immediately.
19	My daughter has been attending Cold Springs/Jeanette Rankin since kindergarten. When I voted for the school to get funding to be rebuilt it did cross my mind that they would likely redo boundaries. Unfortunately I never thought our home would be out of her schools boundary or that we would have to try to enroll her there each year. It is definitely very upsetting to think that after 3 years, close knit friends and families we all rely on that she may have to switch schools. I think the new bound
20	Continued....I believe the new boundaries should only be implemented on incoming classes and all other previous students should be grandfathered in.
21	As the student population in the Rattlesnake Attendance boundary shrinks over the next few years, it is commendable that clear heads have determined that all students in the Rattlesnake should continue walking and biking to their Neighborhood school. This is incredibly important as it prevents splitting the Rattlesnake community in two and avoids major headaches when it comes to Middle School assignments. Thank You!
22	It seems there has been a lack of consideration for the children who have been at Paxson and the Spanish immersion profram since kindergarten. According to this new boundary, a big

	amount of kids will be extracted from this while a new area will be added with kids who will be thrown into the middle of the Spanish program without any experience. How is it helpful to take kids from this school who have years invested into the program to replace them with other children who have not.
23	The Broadway apartment complexes and the Easy Street area going to Lowell should only happen to relieve current overcrowding at Rattlesnake. As MCPS needs to open Mt. Jumbo school in East Missoula. When Mt. Jumbo school re-opens those areas should return to the Mt. Jumbo district.
24	There is nothing safe about biking on Rattlesnake Drive. Gilbert is also NOT SAFE. What is the criteria for a "safe route" to school? There is a lot of talk about it specific to this neighborhood school but the neighborhood council is still very busy establishing bike routes with the city. This is not a finished process and will probably take a number of years.
25	I think area 22 should be changed to keep the slant streets all together in one school district. This is a long standing historic neighborhood that should stay part of the Paxson school district. The new map divides the neighborhood almost in the middle. Please keep south of 6th St and Eats of Russell in the Paxson District.
26	With the potential developments of both #23 and #26 this will put too much strain on Chief Charlo. #23 should stay with JR and #26 should be added to Chief Charlo. This seems like a fair and equal distribution to both schools when the building developments are completed.
27	Changing this slant street area to Franklin would need major improvements for crosswalks and pedestrian safety on at least 6th at Russell and Knowles/11th at Russell.
28	the proposal as it stands now was rammed through and suddenly appeared after 3 meetings did not include it as an option. It makes no sense to divide the slant streets in this way with Russell as a significant barrier that younger elementary aged kids can't navigate on foot. Also, removing kids from the Spanish immersion program mid-stream and from their established peer groups is unfair. Let enrolled kids be Grandfathered in.
29	I may have pinpointed my last comment to the wrong address. I am opposed to moving area 22's boundary in the manner proposed. The proposal was not subject to comment in the 3 meetings leading up to the current map. Russell is an impossible walking boundary for young elementary school kids. Also it is unfair to take kids out of Spanish immersion mid-stream and to remove them from their peer groups. Let them Grandfather in at least.
30	There are a tiny number of current students (15 total) in this area, and very few younger households who might be likely to start families in the near future. Seems like a very small gain, but at a cost of splitting these few kids from the other kids on the lower part of this hill and in some cases on the same street (Simons).
31	I agree that this area should stay with L&C, it is part of the L&C neighborhood and maintains some economic diversity in Lewis and Clark. However, it appears that 90% of the overcrowding issue is from JR, rather than affect all other schools, why not just divert some JR neighborhoods to Russel and Chief Charlo and not impact any other schools - this seems like it would solve the biggest overcrowding issue with the least district-wide impact and creates the fewest unintended consequences.
32	I am not sure how changing students from L&C to Paxson solves the overall boundary issue which is over population at certain schools. When changing boundaries it really needs to be considered that people purchase homes for a certain school. The change in schools needs to help fix the overall problem. If it does not do that then why are the boundaries being adjusted?

33	<p>I'm opposed to the late addition of Slants to Section 22.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The process of adding the Slants to 22 was unfair and lacked transparency. 2) It divides our neighborhood in an arbitrary way. Children who live in the same neighborhood will go to different schools. The Slants is a vibrant hood where children play with each other from one end to the other. There is no line. 3) Russell is the natural boundary. 4) And, then there are serious equity issues, which I've detailed in a letter submitted.
34	<p>I strongly oppose change area 22. It is an ineffective way to try solving a larger issue in MCPS. More time is needed to look at mid/high school as they relate here. Taking lower income households out of Paxson & moving them to Franklin decreases socioeconomic diversity, & degrades the community by dividing neighborhoods & making certain educational programs available only to affluent households. This change literally divides us at the tracks! One idea is to stop taking out of district students.</p>
35	<p>Paxson is not at capacity and is not expected to be. Franklin will increase enrollment in the next few years as expected, so why rush to fill it now & then have to shuffle kids around again? Very disruptive. The Spanish immersion program needs to be seriously considered in these changes. Kids who've been doing it need to be able to continue this through high school, & kids who haven't need to be considered in how the program may not serve them if thrown into it in the middle of their schooling.</p>