

**COMMENT FORM
ATTENDANCE AREA COMMITTEE**

Name ALAN ROMACK
Address 6469 SKYWARD COURT
410-905-0348
Phone Number _____ (optional)
Email Address _____ (optional)

Comments/suggestions on the following:

A specific plan or consideration:

Comments on Plan E. REGARDING TSES.
MOVEMENT OF 59, 1059, 2059, 3059 MOVE ROUGHLY 119 STUDENTS
AS OPPOSED TO F.S MOVE OF 96 AT 160 STUDENTS. THIS "E" MOVE
DOES NOT GO FAR ENOUGH, TSES REMAINS AT 119th IN 2013 AND
GROWS TO 129th BY 2015. ALL THE WHILE STEVENS FOREST, WHICH IS
GETTING A 100 SEAT ADDITION REMAINS IN THE MID 90'S CAPACITY
THRU 2023. COLUMBIA EAST IS TOO CROWDED TO IGNORE OPEN
CAPACITY AT S. FOREST ADDITIONALLY, IT LOOKS LIKE TSES
BECOMES A SMALL FEED TO DALLARD MILLS MIDDLE AT 10.5th

What alternative can you offer the committee concerning anything you disagree with:

Poly #96 IS A HIGH POPULATION GENERATOR AT 160 STUDENTS.
MOVING IT TO STEVEN'S FOREST, LEAVES THE POLYGON AS A WALK
WHICH MEETS THE CRITERIA OF 1000, SECTION IV, B.3.
SINCE FARM, + MSA ARE NOT INCLUDED INTO THIS PROPOSAL, AS OF
7-16-12, THESE FACTORS SHOULD BE CHECKED TO ASSURE THAT
TSES IS NOT SHAVED FURTHER INTO "RED" BY MOVING THE #59 POLYGON
FAMILY OF POLYGONS.

General comments:

. PROCESS IS GREAT THANK YOU FOR ALL THE DETAIL!!

Feel free to write additional comments/suggestions on the back of this sheet.

Complete form and place in the comment form box or mail to:
Attendance Area Committee – Comment Form
HCPSS
10910 Route 108
Ellicott City, MD 21042
Attention: Jennifer Bubenko, Office of School Planning

OR EMAIL: BOE@hcpss.org

**COMMENT FORM
ATTENDANCE AREA COMMITTEE**

Name Heather Tom
Address 5446 Autumn Field Court
Ellicott City, MD 21043
Phone Number (410) 465-2172 (optional)
Email Address _____ (optional)

Comments/suggestions on the following:

A specific plan or consideration:

I support what Ken ~~sent~~ said about Plan L. To have a plan that can be put up on the website, available for public feedback is a good thing. Even if it may have some flaws a plan that has received consensus from the committee shows that effort and collaboration are resulting in a product. The feedback received may (obviously) direct attention to possible flaws and tweaks needed.

What alternative can you offer the committee concerning anything you disagree with:

| |
|--|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

General comments:

Compared to the July 3 meeting, it's very good to see the committee making so much progress toward coming up with one plan and coming to a consensus on it. On July 3, I was concerned that it seemed to take approx an hour for Mr. Gallivan and the committee to even decide how and where to start. Compliments to Ken and Joel for getting into the committee's discussion and facilitating progress toward the development of Plan L.

Feel free to write additional comments/suggestions on the back of this sheet.

Complete form and place in the comment form box or mail to:
Attendance Area Committee - Comment Form
HCPSS
10910 Route 108
Ellicott City, MD 21042
Attention: Jennifer Bubenko, Office of School Planning

OR PREFERRED METHOD - EMAIL: BOE@hcpss.org

**COMMENT FORM
ATTENDANCE AREA COMMITTEE**

Name
Address

Ginger Segala

Phone Number _____ (optional)
Email Address _____ (optional)

Comments/suggestions on the following:

A specific plan or consideration:

| |
|--|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

What alternative can you offer the committee concerning anything you disagree with:

| |
|--|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

General comments:

| |
|------------------------------|
| <u>Tough Job!</u> |
| <u>you are doing a great</u> |
| <u>job! Hang in there!</u> |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

Feel free to write additional comments/suggestions on the back of this sheet.

Complete form and place in the comment form box or mail to:
Attendance Area Committee – Comment Form
HCPSS
10910 Route 108
Ellicott City, MD 21042
Attention: Jennifer Bubenko, Office of School Planning

OR PREFERRED METHOD - EMAIL: BOE@hcpss.org



Message

Mon, Jul 16, 2012 3:28 PM

From: **Barbara A. Bowers**
To: James Kukla
Cc: BOE Email Joel Gallihue **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: Redistricting plan for 2013: Support for Plan J

James Kukla < > writes:

Hello. My name is James Kukla. My family resides in polygon 2095 from Ilchester Elementary. We are potentially affected by the 2013 redistricting plan and **we would like to show our support for Plan J.**

On a personal level, my soon-to-be-second-grade son Adam is very proud to attend Ilchester and has established ties with many of the teachers even at his young age. We would obviously prefer to stay in Ilchester until he and his two year old sister, Natalie, move to middle school, but we understand that it's about more than family preferences.

The proposed **Plan J provides several noteworthy benefits. It:**

1. Leaves Ilchester and Worthington alone, **which impacts fewer schools.**
2. Is drafted to **move approximately 375 less students** than the feasibility study plan.
3. **Avoids moving students from Rockburn to Ilchester and from Ilchester to Rockburn at the same time.**
4. **Supports opening ES 41**, which is **the primary goal** of the 2013 redistricting plan.
5. **Relieves Veterans ES**, a **secondary goal** of the 2013 redistricting plan.
6. **Avoids adding students to already-crowded eastern schools**, a **secondary goal** of the 2013 redistricting plan.

We hope that the board accepts the plan J proposal and that the county can meet its goals while still allowing my son to learn with the teachers and students that he's grown to love over the last two years.

Kindest regards,
James Kukla (and the Kukla Family)

8309 Jumping Field Court
Polygon 2095
Ellicott City, MD 21043

Dear Mr. Kukla,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your suggestions to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting



Message

Mon, Jul 16, 2012 3:29 PM

From: **Barbara A. Bowers**
To: "JASON JUICO"
Cc: BOE Email Joel Gallihue **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: Feedback for AAC Meeting

"JASON JUICO" writes:

Good Afternoon,

My son Ethan Juico lives in the Montgomery Meadows development and attends Ilchester Elementary School. It has been proposed that there might be a redistricting going into affect after the upcoming school year. We would like to show our support for the Plan J proposal. My son is a special needs student and has loved working with the special educators at Ilchester, so we would like to continue his attendance there, rather than causing him unneeded stress of a new school. Here are the points of Plan J:

"Plan J" is headed in the right direction, with key improvements over the feasibility study plan. Plan J strengths:

1. Leaves Ilchester and Worthington alone, impacting fewer schools.
2. Eliminates the cyclical shuffling of students between Ilchester and Rockburn.
3. Moves 375 less students than the feasibility study plan.
4. Supports the goal of opening ES 41, the primary goal of the 2013 redistricting plan.

5. Relieves Veterans ES, a secondary goal of the 2013 redistricting plan.

6. Supports the goal of relieving other Columbia East schools, a secondary goal of the 2013 redistricting plan.

Thank You for your consideration,
Jason Juico
5204 Spurr Terrace
Ellicott City, Md. 21043

Dear Mr. Juico,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your suggestions to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.






Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Mon, Jul 16, 2012 3:30 PM

From:  **Barbara A. Bowers**
To:  Karissa Kroll < >
Cc:  BOE Email  Joel Gallihue  **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: Redistricting Rockburn Elementary School

Karissa Kroll < > writes:

Good Afternoon,

I was looking into the redistricting plans for 2013-2014 school year. I am sure you are getting many emails about all the planned redistricting plans. We live at 6831 Montgomery Road and currently attend Rockburn Elementary. The area that is switched to Elkridge Elementary from Hunt Club to Belmont is so small and probably there are maybe 5-10 children in Elementary school that ride my children's bus in that area on that side of the road. Also I saw that an area off Belmont is still going to Rockburn Elementary. I was hoping you could keep this small area at Rockburn because there is no building able to happen so no new neighborhoods will be built any time soon. I believe we are in polygon 92 or 44, but the area on that side of Montgomery Road has very few children and seems unnecessary to change. I of course am thinking of my children but the children changing from Rockburn to Elkridge seems so very few, especially that area of Montgomery Road to the 95 overpass, and Elkridge Elementary has such a large population with a lot of areas that can be developed or are developing still.

Thank you for your time. I know you have lots to consider and plan.

Karissa Harris
Parent of children at Rockburn Elementary

Dear Ms. Harris,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your suggestions to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.

Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Tue, Jul 17, 2012 7:36 AM

From: **Barbara A. Bowers**

To: |

Cc: BOE Email **Joel Gallihue** **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: Howard County redistricting: Plan J

writes:

To whom it may concern,

My address is 8390 Glenmar Road, Ellicott City (polygon 2095).

I have 3 young children, one which just moved on to middle school (Bonnie Branch) and two that have between 2 and 6 years remaining in elementary school, currently Ilchester Elementary.

I attended the AAC meeting on July 10th and got a great understanding of what is involved and what is at stake with redistricting.

I am in support of plan J for the following reasons / plan highlights:

The current plan has students moving from Rockburn ES to Ilchester ES, as well as students from Ilchester ES to Rockburn. This inherently does not make sense to basically swap kids between the same 2 schools, disrupting their current alignment to their home elementary school.

Most of the plans I heard involved moving a large amount of students; one plan was poised to move up to nearly 3,000 students. I would hope moving the fewest students as possible is a primary goal. Plan J seems to move less students than the current redistricting plan, and seems to meet the primary objectives of the redistricting plan.

The feasibility study clearly shows that the overcrowding in our elementary schools is in the East. The current plan is moving Ilchester students to the east, contributing to future overcrowding in the East. Doing nothing with Ilchester would be a better option than moving students further to the East.

A point was made that Worthington ES currently has a small capacity of just over 500 seats, and consideration should be given to adding to Worthington's capacity to alleviate some strain in the East.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Andrew & Karen Quarm

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Quarm,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your suggestions to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.






Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary



Message

Tue, Jul 17, 2012 7:37 AM

From:  **Barbara A. Bowers**
To:  Jackie Kramer <...>
Cc:  BOE Email  Joel Gallihue  **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: Support for Plan J

Jackie Kramer ·

> writes:

Dear BOE -

We live in Montgomery Meadows and support the proposed "Plan J" over the elementary school recommendations in the feasibility study.

- We support the direction that "Plan J" is headed, because it impacts fewer schools, moves less students and supports the goals of the 2013 redistricting plan.
- A weakness of the feasibility study plan is that there are students moving out of Rockburn into Ilchester at the same time that students are moving out of Ilchester into Rockburn. This cyclical movement of students seems unnecessary and you recommend not moving any students out of Ilchester.
- A weakness of the feasibility study plan is that Ilchester students are being moved eastward, toward areas with greater capacity problems. Eastward movement may cause scenarios where the same neighborhoods have to move back westward after 5 years.

- Worthington ES is one of the smallest schools, with only a 513 student capacity. Increasing the available capacity of Worthington ES could help alleviate overcrowding issues at neighboring schools. We recommend investigating ways of adding onto Worthington capacity.

Please give Plan J your full consideration.

Jackie and Steve Kramer
8298 Elko Drive

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Kramer,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your suggestions to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.

Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Tue, Jul 17, 2012 7:38 AM

From: **Barbara A. Bowers**

To: "MARK HARTMAN"

Cc: BOE Email "Roxanne"

Joel Gallihue **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: MARK HARTMAN <mahstat@msn.com>

"MARK HARTMAN"

writes:

Dear Committee Members:

First I would like to say that the job you have before you is a difficult one to say the least. As a public servant I understand that hard decisions are often necessary and that a win-win is not always a realistic option. My family resides at 8301 Jumping Field Court in "RED SHIRT" territory (Polygons 95, 1095 and 2095). I commute daily over 40 miles each way but have never considered moving in large part because of how thrilled we are with Ilchester Elementary School. It is critically important to us and our three sons that our area continue to be part of that community. To that end, my wife and I strongly support the direction in which the new "Plan J" is headed, not only because of our personal goals but also because we think it makes good sense.

We feel this way because "Plan J" impacts fewer schools, moves fewer students and supports the overarching goals of the 2013 redistricting plans. It addresses the weakness of the feasibility study that moves students into Ilchester from Rockburn and vice-a-versa which just does not make sense. Further, it also doesn't make sense to us to move Ilchester students eastward toward the areas with the greatest capacity issues. To do so only to face the necessity of moving students back to the west in 5 years seems to be less than optimal.

Please consider this feedback as you continue with your important task and we look forward be as involved as possible in the process as it progresses. Thank you for taking the time to read this note. and see you at the July 17th meeting.

Sincerely:

Mark and Roxanne Hartman

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Hartman,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your suggestions to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.

Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Tue, Jul 17, 2012 7:39 AM

From: Barbara A. Bowers
To: "Michele Smith" < >
Cc: BOE Email Joel Gallihue Jennifer Bubenko

Subject: Re: Redistricting

"Michele Smith" < > writes:

To whom it may concern:

I am against the current plan for redistricting Ilchester Elementary and I:

- Support the direction that "Plan J" is headed, because it impacts fewer schools, moves less students and supports the goals of the 2013 redistricting plan.

- There is a weakness of the feasibility study plan is that there are students moving out of Rockburn into Ilchester at the same time that students are moving out of Ilchester into Rockburn. This cyclical movement of students seems unnecessary and you recommend not moving any students out of Ilchester.

- Another weakness of the feasibility study plan is that Ilchester students are being moved eastward, toward areas with greater capacity problems. Eastward movement may cause scenarios where the same neighborhoods have to move back westward after 5 years.

- Also Worthington ES is one of the smallest schools, with only a 513 student capacity. Increasing the available capacity of Worthington ES could help alleviate overcrowding issues at neighboring schools. You recommend investigating ways of adding onto Worthington capacity.

Thank you for your consideration,

Michele Smith

Dear Ms. Smith,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your suggestions to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.






Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Tue, Jul 17, 2012 7:40 AM

From:  **Barbara A. Bowers**
To:  marie fiorello
Cc:  BOE Email  Joel Gallihue  **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: Redistricting for 2013

marie fiorello

writes:

We are writing concerning the upcoming redistricting for school year 2013. We are residents at 8318 Glenmar Road, Ellicott City. This is Montgomery Meadows, part of Polygons 95, 1095 and 2095. In looking at the different plans put forward, we are favoring Plan J at this point. We believe it has many good points over the feasibility study plan and, in the long run, would impact fewer schools. We noticed that some ideas have students moving out of Ilchester to Rockburn and roughly the same number of students moving from Rockburn to Ilchester -- Plan J would eliminate this unnecessary shuffling of students. Plan J impacts fewer schools and moves less students -- definitely a plus for the students.

There is so much overcrowding at elementary schools in the eastern area of Howard County. We support Plan J and believe it is aiming us in the right direction and with a few improvements it is the plan that will help ease the overcrowding and give our students the best opportunity to learn. Please consider lending your support for Plan J.

--John and Marie Fiorello

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Fiorello,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your suggestions to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.

Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Tue, Jul 17, 2012 7:41 AM

From: **Barbara A. Bowers**
To: Kristen McGettigan
Cc: BOE Email Joel Gallihue **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: Redistricting Plan: Support Plan J

Kristen McGettigan < > writes:

Dear Board of Ed,

I am a resident of Polygons 95, 1095, 2095. I am writing you about the proposed redistricting of Ilchester Elementary.

I am in support of the direction of "Plan J." I like that this plan is reducing the impact of the 2014 redistricting plan. Less students will have to face the disruption of transitioning schools.

I strongly suggest leaving all students at Ilchester Elementary. I find it pointless to move students from Ilchester to Rockburn and then in return move students from Rockburn to Ilchester. It makes no sense for this cyclical movement of students. Moving our students into other prone areas for additional redistricting will have a greater negative affect.

Kristen

8306 Glenmar Rd

Dear Ms. McGettigan,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your suggestions to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.

Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Tue, Jul 17, 2012 7:42 AM

From: **Barbara A. Bowers**
To: HEATHER MURPHY
Cc: BOE Email Joel Gallihue **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: Elementary School Redistricting

HEATHER MURPHY <

writes:

Joel,

We live at 8305 Birchmere Terrace therefore are in Polygons 95, 1095, 2095. We strongly support Plan J or a close variation of this plan.

Plan J strengths include:

1. Leaves Ilchester and Worthington alone, impacting fewer schools.
2. Eliminates the cyclical shuffling of students between Ilchester and Rockburn.
3. Moves 375 less students than the feasibility study plan.
4. Supports the goal of opening ES 41, the primary goal of the 2013 redistricting plan.
5. Relieves Veterans ES, a secondary goal of the 2013

redistricting plan.

6. Supports the goal of relieving other Columbia East schools, a secondary goal of the 2013 redistricting plan.

Please convey our support for this Plan to the AAC.

Charles and Heather Murphy

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Murphy,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your suggestions to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.

Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Tue, Jul 17, 2012 7:45 AM

From: **Barbara A. Bowers**
To: "Les Schultz" < >
Cc: BOE Email Joel Gallihue **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: Plan J Redistricting

"Les Schultz" < > writes:

Ann and Les Schultz of 8378 Mitzzy Lane, Ellicott City, MD 21043 have a daughter currently attending Ilchester Elementary School. We reside in polygon 95 and are opposed to the current feasibility study. We do support the alternatives of Plan J and feel they better serve the needs of our children and our community.

- Fewer students are moved
- Eliminate the cyclical shuffling of students between Ilchester and Rockburn
- Supports the goal of opening ES 41
- Supports relieving Veterans and other Columbia East schools
- Leaves Ilchester and Worthington alone.....fewer schools impacted.
- Doesn't send students east, just to have them move west again in yet another two to three years.

A school provides a sense of community that we all want and need. More effort needs to be applied to increasing capacity rather than dividing communities on a regular basis.

Les Schultz

Dear Mr. Schultz,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your suggestions to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.

Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Tue, Jul 17, 2012 7:47 AM

From: **Barbara A. Bowers**
To: Mark Morgan <>
Cc: BOE Email Joel Gallihue **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: Attendance Area Planning Feedback

Mark Morgan <> writes:

I have been studying the plans the in the feasibility study and the proposed alternatives given at the AAC meetings. Of the plans submitted so far, I believe that plan J moves us closer to a better solution to meeting the goals set forth in the Feasibility study. The feasibility study sets forth as a goal to alleviate overcrowding at 6 elementary schools. The feasibility study actually moves students out of 13 different schools in order to meet the objective. I strongly feel that the school system should strive to meet the goals with moving a smaller number of students and that it should affect a smaller number of schools. Plan J reduces the impact on communities by reducing the number of students that will need to be moved. Also, given the projected increased growth in the eastern part of the county, it also doesn't make sense to move students east to meet short term goals when these same areas will become problematic again in a few years. Plan J focuses more on a westward movement and produces better long-term results. Plan J could also be improved further by trying to reduce the population at Waterloo by trying to take advantage of additional capacity at Jeffers Hill and possibly Thunder Hill.

Thank you for your attention.

Mark Morgan
5351 Heatherland Court
Ellicott City, MD 21043
Polygon #95

Dear Mr. Morgan,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your suggestions to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.






Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Tue, Jul 17, 2012 7:47 AM

From:  **Barbara A. Bowers**
To:  "Mark Plasterer"
Cc:  BOE Email  Joel Gallihue  **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: Howard County 2013-2014 Redistricting

"Mark Plasterer" < > writes:

Hello Redistricting Team,

My name is Mark Plasterer and I live on Elko Drive (polygon # 2095). I support the direction of Plan J as part of the Howard County Redistricting Plan. From what I've seen and heard, this plan appears to impact fewer schools and it moves and disrupts fewer students.

A weakness of one of the other feasibility study plans is that there are students moving out of Rockburn into Ilchester at the same time that students are moving out of Ilchester into Rockburn. This cyclical movement of students seems unnecessary.

Best Regards, Mark

Dear Mr. Plasterer,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your suggestions to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.

Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Tue, Jul 17, 2012 7:49 AM

From: **Barbara A. Bowers**
To: Elliot Otchet
Cc: BOE Email Joel Gallihue **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: Redistricting.

Elliot Otchet writes:

Members of the Board,

Our names are Sarah and Elliot Otchet. I have lived at 8308 Whitebark Court (polygon 2095) for the last 6 years. For the past five years, we have been actively involved in our children's education at Ilchester Elementary School. We've both been classroom volunteers and active members of the school's PTA - the kind of volunteers who get to know the faculty, staff, and students of a school.

The recent discussions and plans for redistricting have us concerned. Having been active participants in the redistricting process before, we understand the basic challenge the board faces: housing yield projections that guided capital improvement or new school construction projects were flat out wrong a decade ago. As a result, a glut of capacity exists in the western part of the county, while the eastern portion continues to face capacity problems at all grade levels.

We believe the current plan being recommended by the staff falls short of balancing redistricting in the following areas:

The housing yield projections in the east, especially in the route 1 corridor are inadequate. They significantly underestimate the student yields that will result from the current permitted and planned development. The sheer volume of land being developed for dense housing should be reflected as a significant rise of yields during the years of the projected plan, but does not seem to be accounted for. Instead, it appears that the plan only considers permitted housing starts in the projection. This has a high probability of leading to a scenario where redistricting is required again in this area within the next few years. Given these projections are low, the plan should increase the projected housing yields so that additional capacity available at the new elementary school is reserved or it will surely face the same overcrowding challenges that occurred with the opening of Veterans Elementary School.

Areas surrounding existing schools in the north east have had significant amounts of infill development occur without expanding

permanent capacity at the schools. Many of the existing elementary schools in the north east are built on campuses that have additional land which could be used for permanent classroom space. For example, Ilchester Elementary School and Bonnie Branch Middle are on a large campus with only a fraction of the land dedicated to classroom space. Since identifying land for new school seems challenging (at best), the staff is already projecting the need for additional classroom space in the out years, and the campus is located in an area where significant infill development is leading to overcrowding, the board might also consider adding additional permanent elementary and middle school classrooms to this campus as part of the redistricting plan. At Worthington Elementary School, crowding could be relieved from additional infill development. While the attendance area for this school has not changed significantly in recent years, the infill development that has taken place in the surrounding area has led to overcrowding at Veterans Elementary school. Given the land available at this school's site, the board may want to consider an expansion at this school as well.

A successful plan should aim to disrupt as few students as possible. The staff's plans needlessly performs student exchanges between neighboring schools - that is, school A is sending students to school B, while school B is sending students to school A. While doing so may marginally improve a plan's assessed score, it does so at a human cost that should not be overlooked - impact and stress on our children's lives. One concrete example of this in the staff's plan is the student exchange between Rockburn and Ilchester. The proposed plan unnecessarily moves children EAST, where a significant amount of additional development is still planned (but not permitted for) and has been shown to produce higher yields. We believe the only plan that will succeed in accomplishing the boards goals moves more children to the available capacity to the west, not the overcrowded ElkrIDGE/Jessup areas.

Finally, the plan indicates that the very same children faced with overcrowding in elementary school will face overcrowding in middle school and significant overcrowding in high school. The plan fails to address the needs for the current north east elementary school cohort with any clear recommendation other than to reserve land. Seeing how long it took to identify a location and build an elementary school, it should be clear that the board needs to get in front of this population surge and begin developing firm plans for additional capacity.

We believe the only way to achieve long term resolution in the eastern half of the county will be a plan that:
Opens the new elementary school by using more realistic, higher

student yield projections for the surrounding area;
Adds additional capacity at existing schools to accommodate the infill
development that has or is occurring;
Addresses the facilities issue for the current elementary school
cohort by building additional middle and high school capacity;
Disrupts as few students as possible.

Thank you for your time. We look forward to your debate and will
continue to offer suggestions to the staff and members of the
Attendance Area Committee.

Sarah and Elliot Otchet

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Otchet,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding
your suggestions to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting
the Board.

Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Tue, Jul 17, 2012 7:51 AM

From: **Barbara A. Bowers**
To: Raquel Formica >
Cc: BOE Email Joel Gallihue **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: Plan J

Raquel Formica > writes:

Dear Sir,

We'd like to show our support to Plan J.

We live on 8214 Elko Drive, Ellicott City and our 6 year d son attend Ilchester Elementary School. We are looking forward to have our 4 year old starting next year.

Thank you for your hard work and understanding.

Raquel and Mike Formica

Sent from my HTC

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Formica,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your email to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.

Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Tue, Jul 17, 2012 9:58 AM

From: **Barbara A. Bowers**
To: Karen Wheeler < >
Cc: BOE Email Gregory Wheeler
 Joel Gallihue **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: Feedback from Family Related to Polygons 95, 1095, and 2095 in Feasibility St

Karen Wheeler < > writes:

Hi Board of Education,

We would like to share that our family does not want to be moved from Ilchester Elementary school. We know that sometimes tough decisions have to be made and that there are other great schools in Howard County but we have invested time and energy into building relationships with the staff and other families at Ilchester. We have a rising second grader and a rising third grader and to switch schools now would be very challenging for them. Also Ilchester is a hop, skip, and a jump away so we are not sure why we would be moved to a school further away. We live at 8221 Elko Drive in area code 21043 so could be impacted based on the feasibility study that impacted Polygons 95, 1095, 2095.

I was at the Tuesday 7/10 redistricting meeting and "Plan J" was brought up and it seemed to be a plan that might cause less impact on many people because it impacted fewer schools. Please continue to focus on these types of plans.

We also were not sure why in the study there were students moving out of Rockburn into Ilchester at the same time that students are moving out of Ilchester into Rockburn. Not sure why but this seems like it might disturb two sets of children unnecessarily. Also, we thought a new school was being built that would help with any issues that would force kids out of Rockburn.

We will continue to attend the meetings and focus on 'helping' the situation in a positive way since we know that the Board of Education is just trying to do what is best across the county for all of our children.

Thank You for your consideration,

Karen and Gregory Wheeler

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Wheeler,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your suggestions to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.

Regards,



Message

Tue, Jul 17, 2012 10:00 AM

From: **Barbara A. Bowers**
To: Lori Kelly
Cc: BOE Email Joel Gallihue **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: Redistricting

Lori Kelly < > writes:

Hello my name is Lori Kelly and I live at 8375 Mitzy Lane ,
Ellicott City Md and I am in support of Plan J.

- I support the direction that "Plan J" is headed, because it impacts fewer schools, moves less students and supports the goals of the 2013 redistricting plan. The weakness of the feasibility study plan is that there are students moving out of Rockburn into Ilchester at the same time that students are moving out of Ilchester into Rockburn. This cyclical movement of students seems unnecessary and you recommend not moving any students out of Ilchester.

[Lori Kelly](#)

Dear Ms. Kelly,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your email to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.

Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Tue, Jul 17, 2012 11:26 AM

From: **Barbara A. Bowers**
To: "Tom Mullaney"
Cc: BOE Email Joel Gallihue **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: Redistricting and Worthington Elem

"Tom Mullaney" writes:

Dear Board of Ed,

My name is Tom Mullaney, father of 2 Worthington Elem students who will be entering 2nd and 4th grades this Fall. We live at 4836 Ellicott Woods Lane, Ellicott City, MD 21043, and are from Polygons 95, 1095, 2095. I am strongly against the possible redistricting of my daughters to Ilchester Elementary. I support the direction that "Plan J" is headed, because it impacts fewer schools, moves less students and supports the goals of the 2013 redistricting plan.

Thank you,

Tom Mullaney

Concerned Worthington Parent

5523 Research Park Drive

Suite 210

Baltimore, Maryland 21228

PHONE: 443 858 7736

FAX: 443 543 5178

www.Med-IQ.com

Med-IQ, 2011 recipient of the Alliance for CME's William Campbell Felch Award for Outstanding Research in CME

Med-IQ, America's most respected continuing medical education (CME) company, is an accredited provider of CME/CE that educates and inspires healthcare professionals through activities that deliver sophisticated outcomes-based educational designs with measurable results in professional competence and performance. The information being transmitted in this e-mail is intended to align with Med-IQ's commitment to compliance with industry guidelines to the greatest extent possible. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please notify the sender immediately. To learn more, visit us online: www.Med-IQ.com | [Twitter](#) | [Facebook](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [YouTube](#)

Dear Mr. Mullaney,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your email to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.

Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Tue, Jul 17, 2012 12:02 PM

From: **Barbara A. Bowers**
To: "Tonya Sigalas"
Cc: BOE Email Joel Gallihue **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: For Plan J

"Tonya Sigalas"

writes:

I am writing this letter as a parent concerned with the redistricting possibilities for the 2013-2014 school year. My name is Tonya Sigalas and we live in Montgomery Meadows at 5214 New Prospect Court as part of Polygon 95. While I see the importance of balancing the number of students attending the schools in our area, I am concerned more with the movement of children between schools and the effect it will have on their school work on an emotional, psychological, structural, and social environment. With the stress placed on our children and the amount of school work and extracurricular activities that our children are involved in, the best we can do to keep their lives stable will benefit them most in the long run. Looking at where the AAC has started with their feasibility study and the possible movement of students between schools, it seems that the least amount of students to be affected would be the best scenario. Why do we need to move students out of schools that are not at full capacity? Why would we not look toward adding additions to schools where they can be added to allow for the overflow to remain at that school? Even though there is turnover of homes in different communities, where are the projected numbers pulled from? Didn't Veterans open its first year way over its projected capacity? Where are these numbers derived from and does it take into consideration the amount of students that are homeschooled, attend catholic or attend private schools? Plan J is beginning to balance things in the right direction. Moving 375 less children overall would be a gold star from the get go. This would take into consideration that relief has been given to many schools that are over-crowded and cannot have additions built on as well as having less effect on the school community which affects the dynamics of the school as a whole. I thank you for all the time that is being put forth to make Howard County school as wonderful as they are and feel blessed that my children have been a part of them.

Sincerely,

Tonya Sigalas

Polygon 95

5214 New Prospect Ct.

Dear Ms. Sigalas,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your suggestions/questions to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.

Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Tue, Jul 17, 2012 12:44 PM

From: **Barbara A. Bowers**
To:
Cc: BOE Email Joel Gallihue **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: Plan J

writes:

Dear Board of Education:

I
We live at 8334 Elko Drive from Polygons 95. And is are in support of "Plan J" because it impacts fewer schools, moves less students and supports the goals of the 2013 redistricting plan.

Thanks,
Brian and Susanna Taylor

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Taylor,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your email to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.

Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Tue, Jul 17, 2012 12:45 PM

From: Barbara A. Bowers
To:
Cc: BOE Email Joel Gallihue Jennifer Bubenko

Subject: Re: Redistricting

writes:

Hello. My name is Amy Rice and I live at Heatherland Court. We live in Polygons 95, 1095, 2095.

- We would like to give our support to "P J" for the possible redistrict of our comm because it impacts fewer schools, moves le students and supports the goals of the 201 redistricting plan.

- A weakness of the feasibility study pla that there are students moving out of Rock into Ilchester at the same time that stude are moving out of Ilchester into Rockburn. This cyclical movement of students seems unnecessary and you recommend not moving a students out of Ilchester.

- A weakness of the feasibility study pla that Ilchester students are being moved eastward, toward areas with greater capaci problems. Eastward movement may cause scenarios where the same neighborhoods hav move back westward after 5 years.

- Worthington ES is one of the smallest

schools, with only a 513 student capacity.
Increasing the available capacity of
Worthington ES could help alleviate
overcrowding issues at neighboring schools
You recommend investigating ways of adding
Worthington capacity.

Thanks
Amy

Dear Ms. Rice,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your email to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.

Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Tue, Jul 17, 2012 12:46 PM

From: **Barbara A. Bowers**
To: Jean Bunker
Cc: BOE Email Joel Gallihue **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: our opposition

Jean Bunker writes:

To whom it may concern,

We are residents of Montgomery Meadows, and have been since late 2005. One of the reasons we selected our home was the caliber of Ilchester Elementary School, as well as Bonnie Branch. Please note that we are strongly opposed to any redistricting that will have our three young children attendin schools other than those.

It is our understanding that Plan J is strongly being considered. We support this, because it impacts fewer schools, moves less students and supports the goals of the 2013 redistricting plan.

Our research indicates a major weakness of the feasibility study plan -- that Ilchester students are being moved eastward, toward areas with greater capacity problems. Eastward movement may cause scenarios where the same neighborhoods have to move back westward after 5 years.

Worthington ES is one of the smallest schools, with only a 513 student capacity. Increasing the available capacity of Worthington ES could help alleviate overcrowding issues at neighboring schools.

We strongly oppose redistricting that will split our neighborhood. Further, we believe our children will receive the strongest education at Ilchester, which -- we reiterate -- was a major factor in our home selection.

We believe there are other options to consider, and strongly request that the Board give appropriate consideration to those options.

Thank you,

Robert and Jean Bunker

Parents of an Ilchester Student, with two more joining the Ilchester family (we hope!) in the coming years.

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Bunker,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your suggestions to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.

Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Tue, Jul 17, 2012 12:48 PM

From: **Barbara A. Bowers**
To: Peter Stephanos
Cc: BOE Email Joel Gallihue **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: Montgomery Meadows redistricting plan

Peter Stephanos writes:

To Whom it May Concern:

We live at 5157 Morningside Lane and we are from Polygons 95, 1095, 2095. We are writing to express concern with the Department of Education's Office of School Planning 2012 Feasibility Study proposal to redistrict our neighborhood from Ilchester Elementary School to Rockburn Elementary School starting the 2013-2014 school year.

Instead, we support the direction that "Plan J" is headed, because it impacts fewer schools, moves less students and supports the goals of the 2013 redistricting plan.

In our opinion, one weakness of the feasibility study plan is that there are students moving out of Rockburn into Ilchester at the same time that students are moving out of Ilchester into Rockburn. This cyclical movement of students seems unnecessary and we don't think that you should move any students out of Ilchester, especially if you are just going to replace them with students from Rockburn.

Another weakness of the feasibility study plan is that Ilchester students are being moved eastward, toward areas with greater capacity problems. Eastward movement may cause scenarios where the same neighborhoods have to move back westward after 5 years so it doesn't seem to make sense to move our children to areas that currently have capacity problems.

We also think that it may be worthwhile to investigate ways of adding onto capacity at Worthington ES which is currently one of the smallest schools, with only a 513 student capacity. Increasing the available capacity of Worthington ES could help alleviate overcrowding issues at neighboring schools.

We appreciate your consideration of Plan J and hope that you will not allow our neighborhood to be redistricted to Rockburn Elementary. Thank you.

Ann and Pete Stephanos

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Stephanos,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your suggestions to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.

Regards,


Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Tue, Jul 17, 2012 1:32 PM

From:  HCAAC

To:  Joel Gallihue  **Jennifer Whitesel**

[View in Browser](#)

Subject: Fwd: Letter to the Attendance Area Committee

Attachments:  July 16 Gallihue letter_rev3.docx (26K)

Dear Mr. Gallihue:

Attached is a letter for your consideration from citizens of Polygon 84 in the northeast corridor. We will send a hard copy of the letter with original signatures in the mail, but felt it best to submit electronically as early as possible in hopes it might be included in the materials for tonight's AAC meeting.

Best regards,

Heather Fox

July 16, 2012

Mr. Joel Gallihue, Manager
Office of School Planning
Howard County Public School System
10910 Clarksville Pike (Route 108)
Ellicott City, MD 21042

Dear Mr. Gallihue:

As citizens of Howard County's Polygon 84 in the northeast corridor, we are writing to express our full support for the 2012 feasibility study prepared by the school planning staff of the central office of Howard County Schools. It is obvious that you and the other staff for school planning have spent considerable time and effort in the preparation of a proposal that balances the student numbers for the upcoming academic year and future projections.

Our children will benefit greatly from a school environment that is not overly crowded. Not only will they receive more dedicated attention from teachers and support staff, they will have a greater likelihood of continuity in their peer group from year to year. We are also appreciative that the current proposal eliminates the small feed that was created in 2003 when Polygon 84 was moved from Rockburn Elementary to Bellows Spring Elementary. An extra benefit is that Rockburn Elementary School is closer to our neighborhood than our current school and many of our residents are familiar with the excellent staff at Rockburn ES because we used to attend the school.

We understand that some members in the community have expressed concern about proposed moves throughout the county and several alternatives have been suggested. Redistricting is an unavoidable outcome of living in a county with such a strong educational system. Many of the residents in our polygon 84 are in the same homeowners association (HOA) with residents of adjoining polygons (95/1095/2095) that go to a different elementary school. We appreciate that the county's redistricting policy takes communities into account in its deliberations, though it is not always possible to keep communities together. We are especially pleased that the current feasibility study directs polygons 84, 95, 1095, 2095 to become part of the Rockburn Elementary School community together. This proposal keeps the entire communities of Montgomery Meadows and Hunt Country Estates intact, as well as our contiguous neighbors that we see every day but are not members of the HOA.

In conclusion, the goals of the current 2012 feasibility study are consistent with our goals of having a balanced utilization of capacity, including smaller class sizes, fewer number of classrooms, decreasing single and double small feeds, closer school proximity, and most importantly to us, keeping our community together. We highlight the sections of the proposal in the feasibility study that affects our polygon in Appendix A. Should alternative proposals be considered, such as AAC-J or ILCHST2, we sincerely hope that you will move polygon 84 in conjunction with polygons 95, 1095, 2095. Appendix B highlights our recommended modification if AAC-J is put forth by the committee. We urge you to move forward with your redistricting proposal for 2013.

Sincerely,

The following citizens of Howard County in Polygon 84

Cc: Attendance Area Committee (AAC) Members (boundary@hcpss.org)

[Recipient Name]

July 17, 2012

Page 3

APPENDIX A

We support the following plan (Sections taken from 2012 Feasibility Study):

| Bellows Spring ES | Plan ID | Gain | Loss |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------------------------|
| From Deep Run ES | 80 | 95 | |
| TOTAL FROM Deep Run ES | | 95 | |
| From Waterloo ES | 1266 | 101 | |
| TOTAL FROM Waterloo ES | | 101 | |
| To New ES #41 | 33 | | (14) |
| To New ES #41 | 35 | | (1) |
| To New ES #41 | 1033 | | (67) |
| To New ES #41 | 1035 | | (16) |
| To New ES #41 | 2035 | | (34) |
| To New ES #41 | 4035 | | |
| TOTAL TO New School ES #41 | | | (132) |
| To Rockburn ES | 83 | | (1) |
| To Ilchester ES | 84 | | (47) |
| To Rockburn ES | 1083 | | (75) |
| TOTAL TO Rockburn ES | | | (76) |
| To Waterloo ES | 76 | | (121) |
| To Waterloo ES | 1076 | | (45) |
| TOTAL TO Waterloo ES | | | (166) |
| TOTALS for Bellows Spring | 196 | | (421) Net Change: (225) |

| Rockburn ES | Plan ID | Gain | Loss |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|-------------|-----------------------------|
| From Bellows Spring ES | 83 | 1 | |
| From Bellows Spring ES | 84 | 47 | |
| From Bellows Spring ES | 1083 | 75 | |
| TOTAL FROM Bellows Spring ES | | 123 | |
| From Ilchester ES | 95 | 52 | |
| From Ilchester ES | 1085 | 37 | |
| From Ilchester ES | 1095 | 28 | |
| From Ilchester ES | 2085 | 10 | |
| From Ilchester ES | 2095 | 42 | |
| From Ilchester ES | 3085 | 17 | |
| TOTAL FROM Ilchester ES | | 186 | |
| To Elkridge ES | 44 | | (24) |
| To Elkridge ES | 92 | | (3) |
| TOTAL TO Elkridge ES | | | (27) |
| To Ilchester ES | 91 | | (42) |
| TOTAL TO Ilchester ES | | | (42) |
| To New ES #41 | 37 | | (111) |
| To New ES #41 | 1037 | | (45) |
| To New ES #41 | 2037 | | |
| TOTAL TO New School ES #41 | | | (156) |
| TOTALS for Rockburn ES | 309 | | (225) Net Change: 84 |

[Recipient Name]

July 17, 2012

Page 4

APPENDIX B

We also support the following alternative plan, if submitted by the AAC, with the following modifications (Sections taken from Alternative Plan AAC-J, with Polygon 84 modifications):

| Bellows Spring ES | Plan ID | Gain | Loss | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| From Deep Run ES | 80 | 95 | | |
| TOTAL FROM Deep Run ES | | 95 | | |
| From Waterloo ES | 1266 | 101 | | |
| TOTAL FROM Waterloo ES | | 101 | | |
| To Ilchester ES | 84 | | (47) | |
| TOTAL TO Ilchester ES | | | (47) | |
| To New ES #41 | 33 | | (14) | |
| To New ES #41 | 35 | | (1) | |
| To New ES #41 | 1033 | | (67) | |
| To New ES #41 | 1035 | | (16) | |
| To New ES #41 | 2035 | | (34) | |
| To New ES #41 | 4035 | | | |
| TOTAL TO New School ES #41 | | | (132) | |
| To Rockburn ES | 83 | | (1) | |
| To Rockburn ES | 1083 | | (75) | |
| TOTAL TO Rockburn ES | | | (76) | |
| To Waterloo ES | 76 | | (121) | |
| To Waterloo ES | 1076 | | (45) | |
| TOTAL TO Waterloo ES | | | (166) | |
| TOTALS for Bellows Spring | 196 | | (421) | Net Change: (225) |

| Ilchester ES | Plan ID | Gain | Loss | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| From Bellows Spring ES | 84 | 47 | | |
| TOTAL FROM Bellows Spring ES | | 47 | | |
| TOTALS for Ilchester ES | | 47 | | Net Change: 47 |

| Rockburn ES | Plan ID | Gain | Loss | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| From Bellows Spring ES | 83 | 1 | | |
| From Bellows Spring ES | 1083 | 75 | | |
| TOTAL FROM Bellows Spring ES | | 76 | | |
| To New ES #41 | 37 | | (111) | |
| To New ES #41 | 1037 | | (45) | |
| To New ES #41 | 2037 | | | |
| TOTAL TO New School ES #41 | | | (156) | |
| TOTALS for Rockburn ES | 76 | | (156) | Net Change: (50) |



Message

Tue, Jul 17, 2012 2:14 PM

From: **Barbara A. Bowers**
To: "Jackson, George L. (GSFC-5600)"
Cc: BOE Email Laura Diltz Mark Morgan < >
 Noelle Jackson < >
 "Jackson, George L. (GSFC-5600)" < > Joel Gallihue
 Jennifer Bubenko

Subject: Re: AAC Plan J Improvement Suggestion

"Jackson, George L. (GSFC-5600)" < > writes:

Dear Attendance Area Committee,

This e-mail is to recommend a potential improvement to Plan J, presented at last week's AAC meeting. The AAC meeting notes from July 10, 2012, stated that "Waterloo ES needs more relief" in Plan J. We recommend that the AAC consider the option of moving Polygons 78 and 79 to Jeffers Hill instead of to Waterloo, for Plan J. Our calculations show that both Waterloo and Jeffers Hill would remain within the 90% to 110% policy 6010 guidance from 2013 to 2018. Thank you for considering this improvement option for Plan J.

Regards,

Laura Diltz
Mark Morgan
George Jackson
Polygons 095, 1095, 2095

Dear Mr. Jackson,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your suggestions to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.

Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Tue, Jul 17, 2012 2:15 PM

From: **Barbara A. Bowers**
To: **ROBERT GREENWALD**
Cc: **BOE Email** **Joel Gallihue** **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: Redistricting

ROBERT GREENWALD writes:

Hello.

We, like many of our neighbors, would like to express our support for Plan J.

Several valid points have been brought up including:

Overall fewer numbers of students moved and less schools involved.
Removal of the shuffling of students between Ilchester and Rockburn.
Support for the goals of ES41 and capacity goals of Veterans.
Elimination of moving Ilchester students eastward to high capacity areas, these same neighborhoods might be redistricted back westwards in a few short years.

Thank you for your consideration of our views.

Greenwald family
5116 Morningside Lane
Polygon 2095

Sent from my iPad

Dear Mr.Greenwald,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your email to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.

Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Tue, Jul 17, 2012 2:43 PM

From: **Barbara A. Bowers**

To: "Slonac, Megan" <

Cc: BOE Email Joel Gallihue **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: Redistricting concern/comment

"Slonac, Megan" <

> writes:

After reviewing the latest plans, I am concerned that only one plan keeps all of Mayfield Ave. (Polygons 1080 and 80) at one school. I feel more thought should go into keeping these Polygons together. A lot of children along this road play together and it is very convenient for walking to and from each other's houses. I know that may not mean much when you are dealing with school overcrowding issues, but a sense of community and being able to have school friends that are that close should account for something. From what I could tell only one plan AAC_E has both polygons going to Bellow Springs. I ask that you take a closer look into this.

Megan Slonac

Dear Ms. Slonac,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your suggestions to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.

Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Wed, Jul 18, 2012 7:49 AM

From: **Barbara A. Bowers**
To: "Christopher Harrsen" ·
Cc: BOE Email Joel Gallihue **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: Reference Recent AAC Meeting

"Christopher Harrsen"

writes:

Dear BOE,

I am a member of the Worthington community and I have been following the most recent AAC proposals. I believe it is very important to keep our communities in Howard County intact.

A recent proposal was put forth at the last meeting AAC meeting. I support this proposal **"Plan J"** because it impacts fewer schools, moves less students and supports the goals of the 2013 redistricting plan. Above all else it preserves the many communities that make Howard County so special.

I have lived in Howard County many years now and hope the BOE seriously considers this plan for all of its advantages.

Regards,

Christopher Harrsen

Dear Mr. Harrsen,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your email to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.

Regards,



Message

Wed, Jul 18, 2012 7:52 AM

From: **Barbara A. Bowers**
To: Eliza Lobo --
Cc: BOE Email Joel Gallihue **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: re-districting plans Waverly ES to West Friendship ES.

Eliza Lobo writes:

Dear Board members,

I had the opportunity to attend today's meeting and listened attentively to the proposals made by the committee.

My neighborhood of Taylor Farm is in area 7169 and we would very much like to continue to stay at Waverly E.S. Our homes have been built since 2000 and we are very much a part of the Waverly community.

Representative Amy Grutzik made a suggestion to keep the 7169 area feed into Waverly and gave her rationale. I highly second her recommendation and would appreciate your consideration to keep the new change recommended today.

I will not bore you with all the reasons why I think our area of 7169 should continue to stay at Waverly Elementary, but please do.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Eliza Lobo

Dear Ms. Lobo,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your suggestions to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.

Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Wed, Jul 18, 2012 7:56 AM

From: **Barbara A. Bowers**

To: "tmpjrperez"

Cc: BOE Email Joel Gallihue **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: Redistricting

"tmpjrperez" > writes:

Dear Attendance Area Committee,

My name is Ted Perez, I am from Polygons 95 and reside at 8366 Mitzty Lane, Ellicott City, MD 21043.

My six year daughter currently attends Ilchester Elementary School (IES) and we would like to keep her in IES. I have been advised of the latest plan to redistrict some school districts. I don't support the feasibility plan but I support the direction that Plan J is headed. I don't understand the logic in the feasibility study. It does not make sense to me to move students that are currently districted for IES to Rockburn Elementary School (RES) while at the same time redistricting students currently districted for RES to IES. Another weakness of the feasibility study plan is that Ilchester students are being moved eastward, toward areas with greater capacity problems. This eastward movement may cause situations in which the same neighborhoods have to move back westward after 5 years. Please keep students from Polygon 95 districted to IES.

Regards,

Ted Perez

301-440-2503

Dear Mr. Perex,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your suggestions to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.






Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Wed, Jul 18, 2012 2:32 PM

From:  **Barbara A. Bowers**
To:  Cristen Boarman
Cc:  BOE Email  Joel Gallihue  **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: Redistricting Polygon 6169

Cristen Boarman

writes:

Dear Board of Education Members, Joel Gallihue, and the Attendance Area Committee

Last night I attended the Committee meeting, I strongly support the newly created Plan L keeping Polygon 6169 and 166 in the Waverly School district. This idea agrees with the respectable thought to try to minimize the amount of children redistricted and maximize the capacity of Waverly Elementary. It also shows good insight and planning on where to place the new children from the new Turf Valley development before the proposed new school is built. Redistricting Polygon 304 to West Friendship where they have the capacity to support new growth in the Western Part of the County.

I appreciate the subjective point of views that all members present exhibited last night and true common interest to try to find a honest solution to the growth in Howard County.

Sincerely
Cristen Boarman
10745 Taylor Farm Rd
Woodstock, MD 21163
410-480-1624

Dear Ms. Boarman,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your email to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.

Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Thu, Jul 19, 2012 7:35 AM

From: Jeff and Lisa Caplan

To: **Barbara A. Bowers** Joel Gallihue **Jennifer Bubenko**

[View in Browser](#)

Subject: RE: Comments for the Attendance Area Committee

Attachments:

If you don't mind, please use the version below that corrects a mistake in the 6th paragraph.

Again, thanks for considering my input.

Jeff Caplan

Date: Thu, 19 Jul 2012 07:23:02 -0400
Subject: Re: Comments for the Attendance Area Committee
To:
CC: Joel_Gallihue@hcpss.org; Jennifer_Bubenko@hcpss.org
From: BARBARA_BOWERS@hcpss.org

Jeff and Lisa Caplan

writes:

My wife and I are extremely concerned about the staff's plan that would redistrict students from West Friendship Elementary School (WFES) to Bushy Park (BPES) and also from Mount View Middle School (MVMS) to Glenwood (GMS) in 2014. While we live in Polygon 224, many of the concerns and points made below apply to all polygons in the WFES/MVMS community, with some being applicable to only Polygon 224.

I attended the July 17th meeting of the Attendance Area Committee, and expect I will attend more meetings and write again. I recognize that Plan L (an extension of Plan J) would resolve the concerns about WFES. So the comments below focus on the middle school plan.

One of the principles that guide your committee's work is: "Educational welfare of the impacted students in both the sending and receiving schools." While both Mount View and Glenwood Middle Schools are excellent academically, consideration of "educational welfare" must include more than a school's academic performance. Consideration must also be given to the impacted students' overall well-being. It is logical, and studies also show, that longer bus rides contribute to significant

problems, including but not limited to increased bullying, and reduced time for extracurricular activities, homework, play, and/or sleep. While in some cases long bus rides are unavoidable, that is not the case for the polygons targeted to switch to BPES and GMS. And with GMS starting at 7:40 a.m., redistricting would require many children in our neighborhoods to be at bus stops well before 7:00 a.m.

West Friendship Elementary and Mount View Middle serve a very close-knit community which would be disrupted for the families affected by the staff's plan. The polygons proposed to move to BPES and GMS are not part of the BPES/GMS community now, and are too far from them to realistically ever become part of that community. For example, our son can now ride his bike to his two best friend's homes; they live in the next two eastward polygons. With the staff's plan, it's inevitable that he would lose close touch with these friends, and the ability to ride his bike to new friend's home from GMS. Also, all the boys in his Cub Scout troop would stay at MVMS – should he stay in that troop, where he'll become an outsider because he'll be in a different school, or join a new troop, where he'll start as an outsider? He won't run into new GMS friends by chance at the grocery store or other local places. The sense of community for our neighborhood would be radically changed for the worse.

On top of that, the redistricted students would then make up a very small feed (~8%) to Marriotts Ridge High School (significantly under the targeted minimum of 15%). None of this would be good for the students' welfare.

For Polygon 224, if it weren't for safety along Route 99, our children would walk to Mount View (it is between 0.5 and 1.2 miles from their homes, per Google Maps). In fact, Polygon 224 is so close to MVMS and neighboring Marriotts Ridge High School that we hear the band practices and the announcer during football games. Last year the scheduled bus ride was only 3 minutes (Bus 240). Redistricting Polygon 224 to GMS (7.5 miles direct route, per Google Maps) would increase the bus ride to (an estimated) 30 - 45 minutes, an increase of 900% or more for Polygon 224. It does not seem appropriate to bus students away from a school that is practically next door.

In addition to the negative impact on student welfare, the longer bus ride would certainly result in higher transportation costs to the school system with no apparent savings to offset. Additionally, it is possible (likely?) that the bus route would include some significant safety risks: substantial travel on Routes 97 and/or 144 during the morning rush hour – with Route 97 being one of the busiest roads in the county – and likely navigation through the heavily-trafficked intersection of Routes 99 and 32 (and/or 144 and 32).

From a capacity perspective, MVMS will not be over capacity until 2016. With the current economic climate, planned development may take longer than anticipated, and the projections may prove to be high. Therefore, it would seem more prudent to consider the plans and options, but to defer these proposed changes. There is still time to make changes before the upper capacity target is reached, and deferring action should provide more flexibility if/when that time comes.

Thank you for your time. I understand this is difficult work – it is tedious and some people will be unhappy regardless of the decisions you make. As I attend more meetings and learn more, I expect I will update these thoughts and write again.

Jeff Caplan

2127 Whitman Way

Marriottsville, MD 21104

(410) 442-9922

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Caplan,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your suggestions to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.

Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Thu, Jul 19, 2012 3:25 PM

From: **Barbara A. Bowers**
To: Eni Owoeye
Cc: BOE Email **Joel Gallihue** **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: Redistricting

Eni Owoeye

writes:

Hello Fellow Board Members!

My name is Eni Owoeye and I currently go to Patapsco Middle School as a 7th grader. I am sending this email concerning the districting of Dunloggin Middle. I have heard news that Dunloggin is overcrowded, so why not put a apartment place like Kaiser Park in the Patapsco district?! I was going to go to Dunloggin but unfortunately I moved and am now living in Town and Country, which if you don't know is 2 minutes away from Kaiser Park and seven minutes away from Patapsco. I do not see the reason why Kaiser Parks residents are carried away to a 15-20 minute bus ride when they could just be going to Patapsco, which actually has room for more students, unlike Dunloggin. My main point is that the middle school students of Dunloggin that live in Kaiser Park should be actually going to Patapsco because it make more sense because they relative nearness of the school and the class size ratio. I hope I help bring some insight to your dilemma! Contact information below and have a good summer!

Home Phone: 410-720-2179

Email: _____

Dear Eni,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your suggestions to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.

Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584



Message

Mon, Jul 23, 2012 7:15 AM

From: **Barbara A. Bowers**
To: Rebecca Struckmeier < >
Cc: BOE Email Joel Gallihue **Jennifer Bubenko**

Subject: Re: Polygon 44, Elkridge MD, Howard County

Rebecca Struckmeier < > [@aol.com](#) writes:

Good evening

Thanks for your in-depth analysis and strategic planning for our Elementary / Middle / Highschools.

As the redistricting plans progressed on the website, my neighbors and I noticed our little section 44 was flipped back & forth between Rockburn RES / Elkridge EES.

The Polygon 44 would love to stay at Rockburn Elementary and we hope that the rest of the pieces fall into place.

Thanks for your hardwork.

Kind regards

Rebecca Struckmeier

Dear Ms. Struckmeier,

Thank you for contacting the Board of Education. By copy of this email, I am forwarding your email to Mr. Gallihue and Ms. Bubenko. Once again, thank you for contacting the Board.

Regards,

Barbara Bowers
Administrative Secretary
Board of Education Office
410-313-1584