

2011 Attendance Area Committee
Meeting #2
July 5, 2011

Summary

The second meeting of the 2011 Attendance Area Committee (AAC) began at 7:12 PM. Joel Gallihue Manager, School Planning, opened the meeting. There was a round of introductions.

Staff members in attendance:

Ken Roey, Executive Director, Facilities Planning and Management
Joel Gallihue, Manager of School Planning
Jennifer Bubenko, Planning Specialist

Committee members in attendance:

Frank Biro	Marc Steingesser
Kenny Kan	Shannon Taitt
Jean Parr	Thomas Tucker
Karen Rossbottom	Gay Williams
Anne Santos	

Committee members not in attendance:

Kayline Anantua	Chanelle Brawner
-----------------	------------------

Administrative

- This meeting will not be recorded, but future meetings will be recorded.
- Any citizen can make an appointment with Mr. Gallihue to discuss either projection methodology or alternative redistricting plans. Citizens will bring specific concerns (ex. move multiple polygons together, don't move a specific polygon) or potentially different redistricting plans. Citizen concerns will be shared with the AAC so the AAC can review and consider different ideas.
- There is an error on Table of Contents in AAC Binder. The last meeting date should read August 30, 2011, rather than August 31, 2011.
- In response to a concern raised in the first meeting, Mr. Gallihue noted that the Board of Education's blanket policy would cover the AAC in the event of a lawsuit.
- The next meeting will be July 12, 2011 at 7:00pm.

Handouts

Committee members received a copy of the final HCPSS FY 2012 Capital Budget and summary notes from the 6/28/11 AAC Meeting. A copy of the 2010 Projection Accuracy Report was circulated for review. The AAC members used a map of the elementary school attendance areas with polygons and a report with the number of current and projected students for a redistricting exercise.

Presentation

Mr. Gallihue presented a PowerPoint presentation to the committee.

The PowerPoint presentation included:

- Projection Method – Cohort survival method
- Attendance area adjustment tools
- Projected enrollment growth
- Synopsis of 2012-13 staff recommendation

Specific notes include:

- Emails will be received at BOE@hcpss.org
- Polygons are geographic areas used for planning purposes. Each unit varies in size and number of students. Effort was made to follow geographic boundaries (ex. streams), roads, and neighborhoods as much as possible, and to include 100 or fewer elementary students, when creating the polygon boundaries. Polygons are not based on the number of residential units. The polygons were reviewed and revised a couple of years ago in an effort to move as few students as possible.
- Remember that the projections are by grade by school, not by polygon. The projections are applied down to the polygon level based on the current student population and existing/expected housing units.
- One committee member asked about how BRAC could affect the schools. Mr. Gallihue noted that we use actual student data and housing transactions (new construction, sales and apartment turnover) to build the projections. We make choices of these factors based on five years of data for each school's geography.
- We do anticipate that the enrollment will fluctuate as the year progresses, but the data that we base the projection on is the official 9/30/11 enrollment counts as verified with the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE). State aid is also based on this official count.
- One member noted an expectation of a stronger relationship in changing trends between the three charts comparing the 2009, 2010 and 2011 projections. Note that the scales on these charts are different. The elementary, middle and high schools have six, three and four grades respectively.
- Another member asked why the elementary schools are growing faster than the middle and high schools. The specific reasons are unknown, but changes in home ownership and fewer students attending private school could have an effect on enrollment.
- Maps indicate growth in the Route 1, Emerson, Maple Lawn and Turf Valley areas.
- Removing an 'island' (non-contiguous portion of an attendance area) would be considered a positive attribute of a plan.
- Note that each move in the staff recommendation should be considered as part of the overall plan.
- The Department of Planning and Zoning's housing projection includes new permits with phasing and is included in our student enrollment projection.

Group Work:

Members of the AAC worked in groups to discuss concerns in different areas of the county. This was an exercise to learn more about the process of redistricting and see effects of various ideas.

Plan AAC_A – Group 2 – Created from 2012 Feasibility Study Plan

- Goal – bring capacity utilization of Laurel Woods ES into acceptable range
- Move polygons 1, 12, 1001, 2002 from Laurel Woods ES into Forest Ridge ES
- Move polygons 4, 206, 4047 from Forest Ridge ES to Bollman Bridge ES

Plan AAC_B – Group 1 – Created from 2012 Feasibility Study Plan

- Goal – bring capacity utilization of Atholton ES into acceptable range, remove island
- Move polygons 18, 1018 from Atholton ES to Bollman Bridge ES
(instead of Guilford in Feasibility Study)
- Move polygons 17, 1017 from Atholton ES to Hammond ES
(already moved in Feasibility Study)
- Plan removes island from Atholton ES

Plan AAC_C – Group 3 – Created from 2012 Feasibility Study Plan

- Goal – bring capacity utilization of Veterans ES into acceptable range
- Move polygons 191 and 106 from Veterans ES to St. Johns Lane ES
- Move polygon 1106 from Veterans ES to Northfield ES
- Move polygons 2161, 1162 and 162 from St. Johns ES to Waverly ES
- Additional ideas include moving the Centennial ES island to St. Johns ES, moving some students from St. Johns ES to Manor Woods ES and moving some students from Manor Woods to West Friendship ES

Homework

Mr. Gallihue asked committee members to study the 2011 Feasibility Study for future meetings. The meeting adjourned at 9:04 PM.