

## MEETING RECORD

**DATE/TIME:** 2/28/2019 6:00 PM – 8:00 PM

**PROJECT NAME/NO:** 120508.2

**SUBJECT:** MCPS Boundary Study Advisory Committee

### Meeting Purpose and Introductions

Anne Cossitt reviewed the purpose of the meeting, which is to review school enrollment projections and begin addressing how existing schools will accommodate students over the next 10 years.

### Actions from Last Meeting

At the Jan 31 meeting, the Advisory Committee agreed to eliminate item # c from the “Additional Criteria.” Item #c addressed middle school considerations. The group also agreed to revise item #a to read “Minimize bussing time wherever possible.”

### Public Engagement since last Meeting

Cossitt referred to two handouts – one with comments received at the Jan 31 Open House and another with comments received on social pinpoint. About 85 of the 100 comments on social pinpoint map were regarding the Rattlesnake school. Kristie Scheel and Robyn Nygren reported on the Rattlesnake issues, which Kristie likened to a rumor going wild about how the school might be split by grades and other. A special meeting was held to address these concerns. Hatton came to listen and share information, which has seemed to help people better understand where we are at in this process.

### Updated Schedule

The schedule for this project has changed and resulted in more open houses and more Advisory Committee meetings. A schedule was included in the Advisory Committee packets.

The Advisory Committee was asked their thoughts on implementation – whether boundary changes should take place in 2019/20 school year or 20/21 school year. There wasn’t much discussion on the topic. Mark Thane indicated that it could be a scramble for some if the changes were implemented in Fall of 19, but it might be possible to allow people to sign up for changes.

## Enrollment Forecasts

Anne Cossitt and Ryan Sadowski presented on the enrollment forecasts and also presented a map of potential future development areas.

## Small Group Discussion

The Advisory Committee was in three groups and each group was asked to answer the following questions.

1. Do you think major adjustments are needed to the forecasts? If so, where? And why?
2. According to the forecast, the District has overall capacity to handle the ten-year change. Assume no additional schools in the district over the next ten years. What schools will students from over-capacity areas attend? Be specific about where students come from and where they go to. Use the maps to illustrate.

## Comments

Table 1:

- Decided good data (table 1). Not going to get more accurate data. Make adjustments with no changes.
- 2: Not building another school. Where to start adjusting boundaries to equal # of students.
- Franklin/Paxson, Paxson, L&C, L&C and Russell. Which roads for safe route to school. Busing happening already so this trend could continue.
- Considering demographics for boundaries, Reduced Lunch #'s. Schools with higher #'s more equal.
- Stephens and Orange to river, move from Paxson to Franklin.
- Adjust socio-economic situation for both schools
- Paxson and L&C, 3 blocks away from Paxson but attend LC. From South Ave to Mt on Orange move from L&C to Paxson
- Bancroft as West boundary of L&C, west of Bancroft attend Russell, extend up in to South Hills
- Intuitively drawing boundaries using major roads. We are giving input based on local knowledge.

Table 2:

- Similar as table 1. Same on Stephens, 3 blocks from Paxson. did not do Bancroft, think it could be legit.
- East side of Russell, split on Hillview currently. Adjust to bring to 1 school
- Chief Charlo, buses already go over the top of the hill, backside of hill, students could go to Chief Charlo. A bus already is over there and almost the same distance from both schools. Area of potential development.
- How to increase Lowell by breaking into Rattlesnake. Safe route should be oval instead of circle. Anticipate significant resistant. Could be beneficial for demographics
- Hawthorne should hold boundary
- Q!: Adjustment for grandfathering policy. Problem with those adjustments because students could be grandfathered rather than adjust to new boundaries.

- Demographics, demographic data is not fine enough for data, do not know where these students live. (table 1): could look at the large trend of disparity to adjust those choices.
- Using walkability, bikeability, on map, East Missoula already getting on a bus, Lowell as space. Could go on interstate and go down Orange to Lowell.

Table 3:

- Different view on adjustments to forecast.
- Opportunity, permits, local info – 3 areas not representative are Hawthorne, Lowell, East Missoula. Higher number of building permits, space. Rattlesnake staying static – how does east Missoula population factor for school decline)
- Not looking so much at geography, but literally what might be missing from data. Building permits and Opportunity zone factoring into population forecast.
- Looked at permits in Hawthorne, could potentially increase.
- Lowell – building permits will increase with families moving in
- East Missoula included in Rattlesnake. Lots of growth and young families.
- Mark – building permits (new vs. remodel) families moving into city core.
- Perception of shifting this boundaries and MCPS communication.
- Targeted areas where areas could be moved. (ex where old cold springs was – could move those kids to Russell or Chief Charlo as they no longer can walk to school)
- Hawthorne to stay
- East Missoula? How to adjust?
- Misconceptions of poor school vs. other economic situations. Be careful how we communicate because there is a lot of emotion and loyalty to schools.
- Is re-align boundaries what we should be tackling or is the factor we should be looking at is the performance of schools?
- Lot of the comments are “I bought a house here and this is where I want my kids to go” some families have no choice because they do not have many choices to buy property.
- Speak for those families that don’t have the opportunity to afford to live in a walkable/bikeable neighborhood.
- Each family should have the opportunity to have a child in high achieving schools.
- Table 1: in cold springs neighborhood, want to be a voice because Cold Springs have already lost neighborhood school. Is it fair for neighborhood to lose school and then be asked to change?

Next Steps

- March 14 Meeting -- WGM will take ideas generated at this meeting to draft initial boundary change options

Public Comment

No comments made.