

## Summary of Comments Received on Second Social PinPoint Map

### Based on Boundary Options presented during Open House #3

86 comments received:

Between 3/21/2019 and 4/2/2019

#### All Comments:

- 
- High Park Way does not have a sidewalk. Students who live near High Park Way will have to access schools using Whitaker Dr. Whitaker Dr is closer to Lewis and Clark Elementary than Russel Elementary. I recommend keeping the L&C school boundary for anyone that uses High Park Way to access the Fairview area.
- 
- Many of the arguments against moving children have had to do with bus times, safe routes and neighborhood schools. The recommendation to move East Missoula to Lowell disregards all of those concerns, the only route under 15 minutes would require interstate driving for most of the trip. There would also be a great disconnect from the school community as it's halfway across town. I feel at a loss for solutions that don't displace other children but this option feels very short-sided.
- 
- Change #4 makes sense to me- many of these residents can see Russell school from their homes.
- 
- I think that 5-7 lanes of pavement on Brooks are too much for K-5 learners to cross. They should go to Franklin.
- 
- It concerns me that neighbors will send their students to 3 separate schools. As enrollment increases, hold on to Dickinson in case a school is needed again.
- 
- Crossing Russell in this area is challenging for everyone, including grades K-5.
- 
- #12: Rattlesnake has a wall. It feeling like a gate is next. Although long transit to Rattlesnake is not ideal, sending to Lowell reinforces social-economic isolation.
- 
- #1: this boundary seems a bit arbitrary. Can it be based on the topography/dead-end streets, so that neighbors can walk to school together? It is not easy to get from here to Lowell- Interstate, Railroad, etc.
- 
- #9: this is a good break and adds to economic diversity at Russell
- 
- #5,8,17: This adds socio-economic diversity to Russell.
- 
- #17: This seems like a long way to go to Russell. Perhaps speak to Target Range?
- 
- #7: this adds socio-economic diversity to Russell
- 
- It seems insane to myself and my neighbors in the lower Rattlesnake that the district is considering an option to send our kids to Lowell. Based on the demographics, attendance at Rattlesnake is going DOWN over the next several years. Making kids take a bus to a distant school would be quite cruel. They can (and do) walk and bike to Rattlesnake safely already. They would never be able to do this to get to Lowell. It would be a very counter-productive and community-destructive decision.
- 
- The Rattlesnake is a neighborhood that has always thrived on a healthy lifestyle, and families often move here for that reason. The kids around our place bike or walk to school in the Spring and Fall. This is the kind of thing that Missoula should nurture, not destroy. Why send them to a school that they can only reach by a gas guzzling, expensive bus? Healthy kids make healthy neighbors, and a decision like this defies common sense. Please consider a healthier, community minded option.
- 
- The Rattlesnake school boundary should remain the same given the projected enrollment decline in 5 years and another projected decline in 10 years.
-

- 
- Maintaining current boundaries for Lower Rattlesnake students allows for safe routes to school to be utilized. Map option #1 would remove the safe route impacting students in the Lower Rattlesnake. Those safety hazards include excessive speeds of vehicles coming down greenough hill while trying to properly access the bike lane, seasonal puddling & ice, the railroad crossing, increased traffic in downtown, navigating busy street crossings and turning lanes with no bike lanes being present.
- 
- By sending the Lower Rattlesnake children to Lowell, the children will:
    1. be separated from a school that's naturally part of their neighborhood thus creating an unnecessary divide w/in the neighborhood / community
    2. be isolated from the Lowell / Westside community geographically thus limiting any knowledge of their schools surroundings or Westside community
    3. be less likely to participate in Lowell or Westside special activities
    4. will be in a more dangerous situation to walk or bike to school
- 
- Route from the LR to Lowell is dangerous via foot, bike, car or bus. Railroad tracks, heavy traffic, dangerous crossings and traffic lights. #'s at Rattlesnake are projected to go down in the next 5 years and again in 10, eliminating issue. Lowell's numbers are projected to go up, as there are already building permits for a 200 unit family housing project. Cutting off LR from RES lowers diversity at RES, as LR more similar to EM. RES could become homogenous/attended by 1 Socio/Economic group
- 
- My son takes the bus from EMO to RE. It is no more than a 10 min bus ride, on a relatively low traffic/safe street. The bus ride from EMO to Lowell would certainly take longer and would consist of a route either through town (timely) or a longer distance on the interstate (safety concerns). Your concerns about SE isolation are valid but truly the biggest issue is the fact that sending 150 kids via bus across town doesn't make sense, not for accessibility, parent involvement or environment.
- 
- Thanks for that idea. This area is already within the MCPS Elementary District Boundary and these students currently travel to Jeannette Rankin. Target Range is a separate school district. - MCPS
- 
- This makes sense to put this area in Paxson, it seems closer for walking and biking.
- 
- I think it makes more sense to keep these students at Lewis And Clark.
- 
- Concerns include safe routes to school/keeping contiguous neighborhood intact/diversity within rattlesnake school.
- 
- The thought of East Missoula being it's own community is not being taken into consideration when taking the whole population of children and sending them further way then they already go. The children in the community of East Missoula should be thought of as as a community, not just where can we ship them next.  
Lowell school is too far away to commute them.
- 
- I've been hearing that the children from East Missoula are going to be bused to Lowell next year. I understand the Rattlesnake families don't want their children to go to another school but I feel because of where they live they are getting the upper hand on what the outcome will be. I feel like the East Missoula children are getting the shaft because of where they live. If the final decision is based this I'm very disappointed in how this is being run! Split Rattlesnake makes much more sense
- 
- Really...so the kids in East Missoula kids aren't healthy?
- 
- Unnecessarily divides the neighborhood, isolating children from their own community. Creates no safe way for students to bike/walk to school, with either a railroad crossing or two interstate access roundabouts. Enrollment will decline over this period, so the change is arbitrary and not needed.

---

Both Lower Rattlesnake & E.Missoula kids should continue at RE until MCPS decides to

---

---

re-open Mount Jumbo. But if immediate change is needed, it makes more sense for EM kids to go to Lowell until then.

- 
- Have any grandfathering options been outlined? And if so, has the option of having the grandfathering only apply to students that are currently enrolled in a school, and not to include future siblings or siblings that haven't started kindergarten yet?
- 
- Looking at the provided poverty map shows that busing the children from East Missoula to Lowell school further decreases socioeconomic diversity. Integration of children from all socioeconomic statuses benefits all of our children and should be a priority when looking at all possible changes.
- 
- I agree about where the East Missoula community is a smaller voice that is not being heard as much as the rattlesnake community. WE are still a strong community with voiced that need to be heard!
- 
- I feel like just because a basic overall look on a community should not be the overall jury on the community's culture. There are many different social economic status in a small community such as East Missoula. There is a pride and established community in East Missoula that should not be overlooked.  
It maybe small but there is a true community that cares.
- 
- The parents of East Missoula already face a challenge with school involvement. School and social events are not easy to get to. Let's not make it harder by placing these kids further away from their community.  
East Missoula is a community that remains forgotten, we love our community and the children here. Let's not make it harder for a community to gather.
- 
- This change would decrease the socioeconomic diversity of both Paxson and Lowell.
- 
- I have safety concerns regarding the option to move children in LR to the Lowell School. Th safe routes map highlight the lack of a safe route for these students to get to the Lowell School. Those hazards include railroad and interstate crossings, traffic hazards, lack of bike lanes, and winter travel concerns among others. Keeping children in the Rattlesnake school is the safest option for them. Thanks for your consideration of this important issue.
- 
- The LR has a strong geographic connection with the Rattlesnake School (RS). Keeping this connection intact by keeping the current RS boundary is supported by the Framework for Selecting Boundaries, Strategic Facilities Plan and the Additional Criteria for Guiding Boundary Changes. It allows for sustainable growth in the RS and removes the need for future RS school boundary adjustments. Study projections show that the RS school population is on track to decline.
- 
- As a parent from East Missoula I agree whole- heartedly that any change, either lower Rattlesnake or East Missoula seems like a solution to a problem that won't even be there in a year or so. This would disrupt the lives of students and families for no real reason. I would be frustrated if my child's once simple route to school was changed to something much more hazardous. I will also be upset if my child's short bus ride turns into a longer, less safe route as well.
- 
- I think that parents from both EM and LR are worried that their children will be impacted in a negative way by having to change schools to somewhere less accessible and less familiar. After demographic studies have been released it appears that there is not a significant need for any change to the RE boundaries. I agree that, as an EM parent, it can feel like many of the comments coming from the RS are directed negatively at EM families. I hope that the negativity has come from a place of fear.
-

- 
- I agree that no change is needed. I don't agree that it makes more sense for East Missoula to go to Lowell. It requires a greater commute and a more significant disconnect from school community.
- 
- Jeannette Rankin School was promoted as Cold Springs School being moved, not closed, and not a new school with a new student body. It is essential that existing students remain in their school until they move onto middle school. For the new boundaries it is important to maintain socio economic balance. Map 4 (additional potential change areas) provides the most balance in this area as it relates to JR school.
- 
- You said it not me. Don't put words in my mouth and pretend to be indignant
- 
- Quite an interesting disconnect going on here. I don't see a single comment from the Rattlesnake area asking to separate E Missoula, people just want their kids to continue going to the school in their same neighborhood instead of Lowell and most are asking for the current boundary to remain intact. Every single negative comment I can find is a defensive one from East Missoula, including this thread....
- 
- Both of those responses seem petty. Children and families in E Miss value and thrive for an active lifestyle as much as families in the RS. Both areas have a lot of similarities in terms access to outdoor recreation (Mt. Jumbo, River, trails via RS or Marshall Mt). E Miss kids cannot physically bike or walk to school, by no fault of their own. That doesn't mean that the streets of E Miss are not flooded with children and families enjoying the outdoors just like the snake. Unkindness not needed.
- 
- Many of the comments on the previous map from the Rattlesnake were very much in favor of serperating out east Missoula kids. I think that as stated in this thread the current boundaries should stay entact. I think that everyone who has seen the potential for their child to have to move schools feels worried and doesn't want to see that happen. I've seen posts from the L Rattlesnake saying E Missoula kids should go to Lowell over L Rattlesnake. I suppose it goes both ways. No one wants a change.
- 
- Original poster here. Wow, there is a tremendous amount of projection happening in this thread. Read my post word for word and realize NOT ONE SINGLE WORD has anything to do with East Missoula. I lived for years in East Missoula as a child, and my grandparents lived there for 40 years. I have a great deal of respect for that neighborhood. Please take the projection and negativity elsewhere. My opinion had ONLY to do with keeping children in my neighborhood going to my neighborhood school.
- 
- Exactly! No reason to argue when it seems that almost everyone agrees that the Rattlesnake boundary should simply remain as it is.
- 
- This is a small neighborhood with not very many kids. It would not make a very big impact on attendance numbers and would not be worth making a couple current students or even just a few future students change schools. Most importantly crossing Bancroft at the crosswalk is much safer than the uneven intersection at Stephens/McDonald/Dixon. Also, when these kids go to middle school, Washington is a 10 min walk and Meadow Hill is not a safe or realistic walk/bike option.
- 
- I am in support of options #2 & #3 that keep current boundaries at RES. I feel it is important to keep BOTH the Lower Rattlesnake and East Missoula at RES. Not only does that help keep RES economically diverse - it also is the shortest distance for both LR and EM students. With projections going down in this area, it doesn't make sense to change the boundaries only to perhaps have to adjust them again in the not-too-distant future.
- 
- Paxson school is a draw for families in this relatively affordable neighborhood. Would changing boundaries here cut out families in affordable neighborhoods from accessing good schools?
- 
- Out-of-boundary students currently enrolled at Paxson is around 15% of current enrollment (71 students). By contrast, the suggested boundary change would reduce Paxson enrollment by 11%. Boundary change does not make sense. It is probably wise to
-

---

ask -- What are the student services that out-of-boundary parents are petitioning to get their children into Paxson? Could services (teachers, programs, etc) be provided at nearby schools? Such high out-of-boundary enrollment suggests missing services.

---

- As a LR parent of two, I like Option 1. Lowell is a new construction and has free breakfast/lunch. The fact that it's class sizes are significantly smaller than at RES only makes it more attractive. RES may technically be our 'neighborhood school' but it doesn't really feel that way down in the LR.
- We live at 509 Simons. Currently Lewis and Clark Elementary and Washington Middle School. Options two and three put the line one house down from us and place our children (not in school yet) in Russell and Washington. On a map this is logical but in the real world its not. All the friends they make in elementary school would be split from them in middle school. It also cuts us off from our neighborhood. Our Neighborhood is the Fairviews Pattee Canyon, Not S 39th St and Southgate triangle.
- Also worth noting that currently Rattlesnake Elementary kids move on to Washington Middle School, while Lowell Elementary kids move to CS Porter. If any RE kids were moved to Lowell, this would create a problem for middle school attendance as well, and would have a domino effect for next year's Middle School boundary study. Busing and commuting options from either Lower Rattlesnake or East Missoula to CS Porter would be horrendous.
- Agreed, you would have EXTREMELY angry parents in that scenario. Please leave the current Rattlesnake boundary intact!
- In case there is someone you know that needs a free lunch or breakfast, RES does offer both to students.
- I agree. It is important to think about what the impact would be on the students, parents and schools after 5th grade.
- Its sad to see the formation of an unnecessary divide between EM and LR families. As one person stated, "No reason to argue when it seems that almost everyone agrees that the Rattlesnake boundary should simply remain as it is." I know no one in the LR neighborhood that thinks they are better than or deserve better than any other neighborhood does. Don't let this boundary study option create a divide between families at Rattlesnake Elementary. We have to encourage everyone to speak up.
- The school we share should be uniting us and does.
- The first question I have is how is Jeanette Rankin, a newly built school already over crowded? Now we only have one option to send our child to from a higher performing Rankin to Russell, where it seems like the more affluent neighborhoods remain unaffected by this process. To be fair in promoting economic diversity, bussing children from the more affluent neighborhoods to the "poorer schools" If overcrowding and accessibility is the issue, open more, reopen schools, or build larger schools.
- I do not want my children to attend Franklin School. We moved to this neighborhood for a reason
- Yes! I believe all University Housing should be Paxson. Currently Toole Village and part of another is not and it doesn't make much sense. We transferred from one UoM housing to another that is only half a mile away but is now zoned for Lewis and Clark.
- The best bike/walk route for these children is to Lewis and Clark. There are clear crosswalks and safe sidewalks through the residential neighborhood. The intersection at Stephens/Dixon/McDonald poses a safety risk. Keeping #4 at Lewis and Clark also keeps these students together for middle school. Washington is a short, easy route for walking/biking, whereas Meadow Hill would be a much more difficult route. Looking at forecast numbers #3 (to Paxson) and #4 are very similar.
- The proposed line on Simons Drive also divides the street. Due to a steep hill on Simons the bus has to come from the corner of high park and Simons to pick those kids up (that

---

live on Simons) at that corner and then continues down Simons. Another bus to Russell school would literally follow the bus to Lewis and Clark down Simons. It's not efficient and bus efficiency was outlined as important.

---

- 1. Asking students to cross Russell is not safe and goes against the stated principle of increasing safety for students. 2. Students already in Paxson should be grandfathered to stay in Paxson. 3. Moving students from Lewis & Clark to Paxson (creating more overcrowding) making it necessary to move Paxson students to Franklin makes absolutely no sense. My grandchildren are now enrolled at Paxson and are doing very well. One receives extra help for speech. Would he get this help at Frankli
  - I'm deeply concerned that the inclusion of East Missoula in Lowel decreases the economic diversity specifically concentrating poverty in Lowel, and concentrates more affluent students in Rattlesnake and Paxton. The redistributing process should maintain or increase socioeconomic diversity in individual schools.
  - I'm deeply concerned that the inclusion of this neighborhood in Lowel decreases the economic diversity specifically concentrating poverty in Lowel, and removes and affordable Neighborhood from the very desirable Paxton school district. The redistributing process should also strive to increase socioeconomic diversity in individual schools.
- 

Also, having young kids cross Broadway is dangerous. Both signal lights at Broadway-Russell and at California-Broadway are extremely slow and risky

---

- I would like to see the public school district consider holding a certain number of seats (say 1/3) in Paxton open for any student on a lottery basis. The Spanish language Emerson program is very desirable, but right now it is only available to children that live in one of the most affluent areas in the school district. Or, consider developing another language immersion school (any widely used language).
  - Although the California St. walking bridge may make this seem like this is a good route to Lowel, this intersection with Broadway is dangerous and very slow to cross on foot. Two separate crossings have to be made, drivers have protected right and left turns that are not obvious to pedestrians.
  - This area is in an Opportunity Zone under the new national tax law. This should greatly spur growth particularly of apartments in this area. Is this projected growth being considered?
  - Safety: Paxson is the only elementary school that is walkable and bikeable from this neighborhood. Students can safely take the Riverfront Trail east until they get to the university side streets, where there are sidewalks to get them to Paxson. Other schools have major barriers in the way such as Broadways St. (Lowell), Russell St. (Franklin and Hawthorne), and Reserve St. (Hawthorne). Also, it makes no sense to send kids in this neighborhood further west of downtown.
  - Equity: If one of the goals of the Advisory Committee and the Trustees is to keep or make the elementary schools more diverse when it comes to income, the Riverfront neighborhood should remain in the Paxson district. This neighborhood has a median household income of \$33,313 with 28.3% of residents below the poverty level compared to a median household income of \$86,950 and 19.6% of residents below the poverty level in the University neighborhood.
  - Out of District Students: If out-of-district students were not attending Paxson there would not be a capacity issue in this school. Why not start other special programs in other schools so parents weren't appealing for their kids to go to Paxson due to Spanish Immersion?
  - Growth Data: The data suggests that students in the Paxson district will slightly increase in the next 5 years and then decrease by the same 5 years after that. I see no reason to change the boundary lines for Paxson if student population will decrease in 10 years. The
-

---

school still has room for additional students and that's with out-of-district students attending.

---

- I am concerned about children getting bussed distances that would prevent biking and walking to school. My kids have always done one or the other. I would be furious to know my child would be going to a school farther away, when they can easily walk to our neighborhood school, Rattlesnake. I am definitely for grandfathering kids into current schools as well. I think moving kids to new schools should start in kindergarten and older grads by volunteer basis. People buy in areas b/c of the schools!
  - Moving the boundary to send our kids to Lowell is better for us. Many of us work at the hospital and this way we can easily walk or bike with our little ones.
  - In this scenario (#1), the lower Rattlesnake would move to Lowell, which would better balance socio-economic diversity.
  - School boundaries are typically split with major (ish) roads. Dividing a neighborhood does not make sense. You have kids that share backyards going to different schools. Why not use Cloverdale vs Briggs as the boundary to keep neighborhood groups in tack. Even 23rd. Russell really does not make sense for this area. Why not pull more L&C kids to Russell? You have kids right next door to Chief Charlo that go to L&C. They are closer to Chief Charlo or Russell yet go to L&C?
  - The current RES boundary does provide a socio economic mix with EM, LR and UR. WGM Maps #2 and #3 show RES boundary no change which supports maintaining socioeconomic diversity but also satisfies the Goals/Objectives, Guiding Principles and Additional Criteria for Guiding Boundary Change. Furthermore, EM is slated for development, is in an Opportunity Zone and will be annexed in 2021. These imminent changes could further diversify the socioeconomic mix for RES if boundaries remain the same.
  - Map with Additional Potential Change Area #12 referenced is derived from a planning and transportation standpoint. It also demonstrates the potential effect of reopening Mt. Jumbo. Maps #2 & #3 show no change to the current RES boundary which makes sense given the projected declining enrollment. However, if East Missoula sees further development Mt. Jumbo could serve future needs should elementary school need space. If RES boundary remains the same could Mt. Jumbo serve as a middle school?
  - Maintaining current Rattlesnake Elementary School boundaries allows for Lower Rattlesnake students to utilize the established Safe Route to School. Map option 1 would remove the safe route option for LR students. The Safe Routes to School map show that there is no safe route for students to go to Lowell from the LR area. This presents numerous safety hazards for students. The LR has sidewalks, protected street crossings, low-traffic neighborhood streets and given the historic nature alleys.
  - Neighborhood schools help families thrive; min. driving, encourage co-op, provide social networks to support kids K-12. They foster independence; kids know their neighborhood, walk/bike to school safe on own, play w/ neighborhood friends (getting easily to/from friends' houses on own). School boundaries should be based on geological barriers that hinder a child's safe/independent movement; RRs, highways, mountains, etc. Dividing schools w/out such barriers disrupts/undermines the neighborhood.
  - My kid walks/bikes to friends' houses throughout the Rattlesnake (RS). I don't want my kid walk/biking south of I-90/RR, it's not safe. If adopted, my child will be isolated; her closest friends won't attend her school & the kids who do attend her school are too far away to play. It creates an unnecessary burden for our family, we will no longer walk/bike to school activities but rely on automobile transport. All Lower RS families will be less involved in school-related activities.
  - If this boundary adjustment is adopted, we will lose a valuable link to our Upper RS neighbors. I argue that Lower and Upper RS neighborhoods are inextricably linked, we cooperate on a great many items/issues, and feel our children should be able to attend the neighborhood school that bears our name.
-

- 
- Neighborhood schools help families thrive; min. driving, encourage co-op, provide social networks to support kids K-12. They foster kids independence; know their neighborhood, walk/bike to school safe on own, play w/ neighborhood friends (getting easily to/from friends' houses). School boundaries should be based on geological barriers that hinder a child's safe/independent movement; RRs, highways, mountains, etc. Dividing schools w/out such barriers disrupts/undermines the neighborhood.
- 
- The best way for the Rattlesnake would be to bus the E. Missoula kids to Lowell since they are being bussed anyway. We don't use the bus because we are so close to Rattlesnake Elementary. There is no safe way for our daughter to get to Lowell without an unnecessary bus ride. We moved to the Rattlesnake neighborhood to be part of a defined community. Most of our daughters friends would be divided with this new plan. We pay higher real estate prices and taxes to be here and close to the school.
- 
- This area should stay a part of Lewis and Clark attendance boundary.
- 
- I live 5 blocks from Lewis and Clark, changing the boundary to Russel will make it very inconvenient for my family. My daughter will be ready to attend Kindergarten next year and is already familiar with the walk to school and plays on the playground at Lewis & Clark. I understand the issue of over crowding but it does not make sense to change the boundary for families that live so close to Lewis & Clark.
-