

Date	Subject	Message
10/5/18	copy of speech to SB last night	<p>Below are comments I have submitted to the School Board. I will make an additional observation that the livestream of the Getting Started and similar meetings is essentially useless to those viewing, as the actual documents and details and discussion are not accessible.</p> <p>submitted to the school board: As we begin the boundary process for south Arlington elementary schools, I'd like to bring to your attention this recent Washington Post article about Montgomery County Public Schools: https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/boundary-struggles-a-maryland-school-system-looks-for-more-diversity/2018/09/25/90436774-c05a-11e8-be77-516336a26305_story.html?utm_term=.8105ab7ec4f2</p> <p>I believe it is important to keep in mind as we move forward that other jurisdictions are facing the same challenges as Arlington, the same budget constraints, the same enrollment demands, the same academic concerns. Yet other jurisdictions have not lost sight of their values and are even reinforcing their priorities accordingly.</p> <p>As APS struggles to balance its various guiding principles for boundaries, it is evident that giving each factor equal weight is impossible in our geographically-small, high-density County. Even our current attempts to balance just three of those principles have proven problematic, and one principle may need to take lower priority in establishing an attendance zone for a given school. The principle that is typically set-aside is "demographics." Why do we not instead sacrifice "contiguity" for the sake of our core values of diversity and inclusive communities?</p> <p>I watched the livestream of the "getting started" session. I found it remarkable that a one or two percentage point decrease in the Wakefield FRL% in one of the rejected scenarios was deemed insignificant during the most recent high school boundary discussion and decision; yet that same 1-2% point difference was determined to be noteworthy during this process. Staff's explanation that the FRL% at two schools would reflect the County average while several schools' FRL% would actually "go down" sounded quite promising; but it took on quite a different look and feel when the details were revealed. And to somehow think that could justify the intentional creation of an 83% FRL school is unfathomable. Perhaps those few percentage point decreases could be significant, if they did not retain two 70-80% economically disadvantaged school communities and create a third.</p> <p>I am neither naive nor idealistic. I do not expect all schools across Arlington to reflect the demographics of our students overall. But it is time for Arlington leadership and</p>

		<p>parents to be realistic. We do not have the resources to continue as we have, and we cannot continue to cater to the individual wishes of the most outspoken self-interest groups. We all have to share in the compromises and changes. We all need to make the right sacrifices. And we need to be able to rely on your leadership to do what is right. I hope you will not fail us - or our children.</p>
<p>10/5/18</p>	<p>Engage with APS-Oakridge</p>	<p>Maura McMahon TJMS parent Name Molly Young Email mollyhyoung@gmail.com Please indicate the current topic you'd like to engage with: Fall 2018 Elementary Boundary Process Please share your comments, feedback or suggestions: I am a resident of arlington ridge/aurora highlands area. After purchasing our home in 2016 on the basis of our elementary school, we became aware of the proposal for boundaries for the 2019 school year. The aurora hills and Arlington Ridge Community groups are extremely vocal and active. I am writing to voice my SUPPORT of the proposed boundaries for these reasons (each of which have been presented to the Board) -- proximity-- my planning unit , 48130, rests next to eads on the lower east corner of the Oakridge. The option of sending our planning unit (which does not even contain a high amount of school aged children in the first place), would not comport with any of the Board's criteria. Proximity wise, you would be bussing our children PASSED our neighborhood school (we could wave hello), across Glebe and 395, to Drew. This makes little to no logical sense. you would also be dividing a subdivision and cohesive neighborhood (our kids walk to school together, play together), and turning the southern most point of our school into an ISLAND. -- Diversity -- I SUPPORT the current planning unit not just as a homeowner but as a member of a greater community. The currently proposed OAKridge planning unit is comprised of single family homes, multi family homes, and the single family homes are both rented and owned. IN short, it is a mix of many types of homes and a distribution of houses and apartments, townhomes, both rented and owned. The current northern group of residents who is AGAINST the proposed boundary changes is emphasizing that the makeup of their planning units is SOLELY apartments and multi family dwellings. This is a non sequitur as it relates to the Board's proposal-- each of the planning units is comprised of mixed income, and it is not persuasive to argue that some type of discrimination or distinction was made within that planning unit on the basis of residential makeup. The boundary the Board has developed clearly runs north (with numbers going down) from 18th street), which is a clear, linear, and logical boundary. -- contiguity -- each planning unit in the Board's current proposal has a clearly delineated neighborhood school, with a clear and logical path to that particular school from each area of the school boundaries. In effect, when one looks at the map, one sees the -- Finally, in terms of numbers, based on our community association's count, it does not appear that the number of school-aged students residing in or around 48130 and its borders is even half the makeup of the number of students comprising the current Hoffman-Boston planning units in the</p>

		northern portion of the proposed map contains over 200 students, each of whom reside closer in proximity to Hoffman Boston than our southern planning units would to Drew. I thank you for the countless hours you have spent working on this. I SUPPORT the proposed boundary map and I hope you adopt it in early December. Best, Molly Young –
10/5/2018	Ft. Meyer	Name Brian Glosch [REDACTED] Please indicate the current topic you'd like to engage with: Fall 2018 Elementary Boundary Process Please share your comments, feedback or suggestions: We are concerned that the school choice and transportation that is provided to the children at Ft. Myer's After school program will not be considered. Therefore; not allowing our son to attend school at Fleet Elementary as he is already attending Patrick Henry.
10/5/2018		Name aroun barua [REDACTED] Please indicate the current topic you'd like to engage with: Fall 2018 Elementary Boundary Process Please share your comments, feedback or suggestions: expensive and causes congestion please keep them together thank you
10/5/2018	Henry	Please indicate the current topic you'd like to engage with: Fall 2018 Elementary Boundary Process Please share your comments, feedback or suggestions: I support saving money for the county but I don't think sending two buses to the same small area will make a difference. Please include that small families with the rest of Henry families, they are within walking zone.
10/4/2018	Data	Hi, My name is Bancroft Henderson. My wife and I are south Arlington residents [REDACTED] and have a vested interest in the ongoing elementary school boundary definition process. I am emailing to request the PU level data as an excel file. Currently the file exists as a .pdf online so data manipulation is not possible. I would like the data to be able to offer potential alternatives to the current proposal. Thank you, Bancroft
10/4/2018	Penrose	I attended the APS staff open office hours about elementary boundaries last night at Kenmore, and wanted to follow up on one point. I mentioned that two of the planning units proposed to move from Fleet to Hoffman Boston are part of the Penrose housing conservation district. (See map < https://housing.arlingtonva.us/wp-content/uploads/sites/15/2018/04/HCD-Area-Penrose.jpg >.) This is a fairly recent development (announced in December 2017 < https://newsroom.arlingtonva.us/release/county-board-adopts-housing-conservation-district/ >) so wanted to be sure you're factoring this in. This district includes planning unit 46910 and almost the entirety of planning unit 46110.

As I understand it, the housing conservation district is intended to prevent teardown redevelopment in these areas and protect them as market rate affordable housing. I wonder if this might impact your demographic projections looking forward: it would seem that with this policy that the population is unlikely to change greatly since new development will be so strictly controlled. Further, if there is any new development a significant portion will be devoted to lower and moderate income households. In the long run then it seems likely that this area will trend less affluent relative to their neighbors to the west in single family homes.

From Arlington's press release last December:

The Arlington County Board voted today to establish a Housing Conservation District in 12 areas with market-rate affordable housing. In 2018, the County will be engaging with the community to develop a series of zoning and financial tools to incent affordable housing in these areas.

The district is intended to prevent the loss of market-rate affordable housing, to encourage and incent the distribution of affordable housing throughout the County, and to preserve and enhance existing apartment neighborhoods, consistent with adopted policies from both the Affordable Housing Master Plan <<https://housing.arlingtonva.us/affordable-housing-master-plan/>>* and *General Land Use Plan <<https://projects.arlingtonva.us/plans-studies/general-land-use-plan/>>.

... As envisioned, the Housing Conservation District ultimately will allow for a spectrum of development projects, ranging from renovation and minor additions to infill and redevelopment. Use of the incentives will be voluntary, yet in return for more flexible development standards, property owners and developers will be required to dedicate a share of on-site housing units for lower- and moderate-income households, earning up to 80 percent of Area Median Income. Phase II also will develop recommendations for the types of County and community review processes that would be appropriate for different incentive projects.

<https://housing.arlingtonva.us/affordable-housing/housing-conservation-district/>

<https://housing.arlingtonva.us/wp-content/uploads/sites/15/2018/04/HCD-Area-Penrose.jpg>

Thank you for your attention and for your work on this complicated process.

		Best, Jenny O'Shea
10/4/2018	Planning Units	<p>Name Thomas Patchen [REDACTED] Please indicate the current topic you'd like to engage with: Fall 2018 Elementary Boundary Process Please share your comments, feedback or suggestions: In my area, there was a single street that was divided from one side to the other (this was because of the way the planning units were laid out.) ex: South Grant Street in 22202... It was corrected by including the adjoining planning units, but when the planning units are done in the future - this would remedy the same thing happening again...I appreciate all the work you put into this project and I know you have endured long hours and lots of feedback, but stay the course!</p>
10/4/2018	Fleet	<p>Name Jennifer Everling [REDACTED] Please indicate the current topic you'd like to engage with: Fall 2018 Elementary Boundary Process Please share your comments, feedback or suggestions: When meeting with Zack and Robert on October 3, we were asked to send written feedback about a data question. These gentlemen explained that we could use the race and ethnicity data for assessing 2017 enrollment; we were informed that there is no double counting in these data (identifying 2 or more categories for race). Of concern: the 2017 enrollment for 46110 is 9 but is proposed 23 for FY 19. This seems very high. Also, part of this PU consists of affordable senior housing at 2000 5th Street, 22204 - has APS accounted for the fact that this is an age 55 and older center within the PU, and not a place where families with kids live? Similarly, 2017 data for 37041 is 21 but is proposed to decline to 10 in FY 19. As this is a PU proposed to be added to Fleet (and the exclusion of 46110, especially, and 46111), it's curious that this number is expected to decline but an existing PU has a projected increase. Thank you very much for checking into this data. Also, in looking again at the proposed map, the current Fleet boundaries have all of Arlington Heights and all of the Penrose neighborhood with the exception of small slivers - 46910, 46110 & 46111. While I understand the need to balance enrollment, including these PUs - especially 46910 and 46110 - does not put Fleet over capacity and, in fact, gets Fleet closer to 100% utilization, which maximizes the efficiency criterion. The Henry/Fleet community is fortunate in that the concentration of community locales, combined with road layout (Glebe to the west, 50 to the North, Courthouse to the East, and the horrendous Glebe/Walter Reed intersection to the south) makes for an ideal living and school community. Within these borders is where people live, learn, shop, play. By all means, add 37041 and 37042 from Barcroft if capacity allows it, but not at the</p>

		expense of creating teeny tiny islands from small PUs in Penrose. Thanks for your time and consideration.
10/4/2018	Windgate	<p>Name Erik Eckerson [REDACTED] Please indicate the current topic you'd like to engage with: Fall 2018 Elementary Boundary Process Please share your comments, feedback or suggestions: Both my wife and I grew up in Fairlington and attended Abingdon Elementary School. Part of the reason we purchased our home on George Mason Drive in 2012 was because it was zoned for Abingdon. We understand that boundary changes are necessary but we are disappointed that the current proposal puts our future children at Drew when our preference is Abingdon.</p>
10/4/2018	Randolph	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I'm one of the APS ambassadors for Randolph. I'd submitted a question to Kathy Mimberg about some of the enrollment projections for Randolph but then realized my question kind of evolved/changed. I wanted to send it here to try to find the right person.</p> <p>I should be clear that this one is a personal question from me and not a larger community question at this point, so no huge rush in answering it.</p> <p>My understanding (somewhat 3rd-hand) is that it has sometimes been challenging to predict Randolph's enrollment numbers in the past, partially because there are a lot of multi-family rental housing units in its boundaries and an increased likelihood of households moving in and out with children of different ages.</p> <p>I've been looking at the school-level data tab with current and proposed boundaries here https://www.apsva.us/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/School-Level-Data-Table-for-Existing-and-Proposed-Boundaries-Final.pdf</p> <p>The way that I'm reading footnote 5 is that the projections are based on the total number of projected students k-5 divided by planning unit. Does that mean that all planning units are assumed to have the same number of students regardless of how many homes/households they have? Almost all of the planning units that have been added to Randolph are multifamily units. I realize that the percentage of households with children varies by type of housing, but I find it hard to believe that Randolph would have fewer total students after adding more planning units and not</p>

		<p>taking any away. Last year Randolph had 49 pre-k students and 378 K-5 students. I realize that the entire system is growing and the aim is to balance capacity across the system and it's impossible to do that perfectly.</p> <p>I just want to make sure we're not making faulty assumptions about capacity utilization that will have unintended consequences later. I see that Randolph is projected to have some room even after the changes (only at 93% or 94% of capacity utilization).</p> <p>Currently students at Barcroft are allowed automatic transfers into Randolph due to the alternative calendar there. The way I read last year's transfer report <https://www.apsva.us/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/Transfer-Report-2017-18.pdf>, we had 47 students transfer in that way (I may be reading it incorrectly). I wonder if that would affect the capacity utilization numbers at all?</p> <p>Likewise I see that the overall percentage of students on free and reduced lunch is expected to stay the same. The percentage Randolph reported <https://www.apsva.us/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/FREE-REDUCED-OCTOBER-31-2017.pdf> last September is lower than the percentage of students in the current boundary (73.67% vs. 92%). It looks to me as if some of the new planning units have high free and reduced lunch numbers and I wonder if proportionally more of those students would attend Randolph instead of an option school once they have the ability to attend a school that is so close, thereby creating a higher effective rate at Randolph. We know that everyone values proximity. It's probably hard to make that kind of prediction and I realize that is not part of the current process. I am not saying this to effect change in what planning units are districted to Randolph, simply as a "what if" question when we are looking at the diversity consideration overall.</p> <p>I apologize if I'm not stating questions clearly enough. I just want to make sure I understand these numbers so that I can represent them fairly to our school community.</p> <p>Beth Posniak Fiencke</p>
10/4/2018	Fort Meyer	<p>Good Morning, I'm a concerned parent that has a child enrolled in Longbranch Elementary and I don't want to</p>

		<p>change my child's school. I'm a Soldier and single mother and I'm very worried and would like to make sure that my voice is heard with this process. I enrolled my daughter in this school of course because of the transportation to and from the Fort Meyer CDC. My son also was a student at this school as well. It's a great school and I'm not knocking any other school in the county but, I want her to stay there as well by all means possible. The convenience of the bus and her safety to and from Ft Meyer is my main concern. With me being military, I don't want to change her school because it's hard enough since the military moves us around and sends us to various trainings/schools with the time away from home and having to make adjustments as it is. So point blank period I need her to stay where she is!! Thanks for your time and have a good day.</p> <p>v/r, SFC Rachael A. Hart Protocol NCO Office of the Chief, National Guard Bureau</p>
<p>10/4/2018</p>	<p>Windgate</p>	<p>Hello: My family [REDACTED] live in the Windgate I complex. I want to express my strongest concerns with the Proposed Elementary School Boundary Change. My children are currently in 1st grade at Abingdon and they completed Kindergarten there last year. They love their school and it is our hope that they will stay there until graduation from 5th grade. We moved to the neighborhood and stayed in the neighborhood due to this school and the benefits it provides. We have lived here 9 years and love our community. We have many friends in the neighboring Fairlington Community. We attend their events and they attend ours. We are very much an intertwined community. I have no doubt that Drew will be a very good school, but the location is farther for us and much less convenient, but the more critical thing is removing my children from this school after they have formed relationships there would be detrimental to them both emotionally and intellectually. They have a comfort level at this school. At such an early age forcing them to change would be a great hardship that is beyond our control. Even more troubling is the fact that the Proposal would force the small number of families in Windgate I to remove their children from Abingdon leaving all of their friends and support behind to start at Drew. Once at Drew they will have a few short years to once again establish a community, friendships and a comfort level only to be removed from this group to go to TJ Middle School. This would defeat the County policy against isolation as there will only be a few Windgate children that will not continue to Middle School with their Drew classmates. So as proposed my children would suffer this type of transition twice in a matter of years. This cannot be healthy</p>

		<p>emotionally or intellectually for children at such a young age.</p> <p>Again, I strongly oppose this Proposal. Please let me know what else I can do to share my concerns.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter. It is of great significance to my family and to my community. I truly appreciate your time and consideration and I am hopeful these concerns will be used to inform final policy decisions.</p> <p>Very best regards, Marnie Hammel</p>
10/4/2018	Oakridge	<p>My name is Jen Rodriguez and [REDACTED] my children presently attend Oakridge [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (planning > unit 48120). I participated in a PTA sponsored gathering at Oakridge this > evening where Reid Godlstein (cc'd) presented to the group and encouraged > me to write to you. > > My children, like most of our neighbors in the apartments and condos in > Pentagon City and Crystal City, are the sons and daughters of military > officers, state department employees, and diplomats -- all highly transient > groups. The proposed boundaries will take these highly transient groups and > put them all in the same school - Hoffman-Boston - where their numbers will > be more concentrated. This concerns me greatly as my kids and several > others will lose the social capital that comes from attending school with > the many kids and families who've lived in Aurora Hills and on the Ridge > for a decade or more and have built and sustained a flourishing school > culture, traditions and community at Oakridge. My daughter's [REDACTED] friends are mostly kids who've been at Oakridge since Kindergarten. Her > troop [REDACTED] has a leader that's been active for a decade in Girl Scouts. > This is all a revelation to my daughter who has only known stability and > community for the past two years. She is thriving! > > With the proposed changes, I fear that my children and my neighbors' kids > will interact mostly with kids and families they can't even count on being > there the next year. That's a lot to ask of kids who are already going > through and giving up so much. > > Finally, I am very concerned that families like ours are *not* represented > in the discussions that lead up to these boundary decisions simply because > our lifestyle requires that we move often. We were not here 3 or 5 years > ago when the boundary discussions were starting. I'm sure that the military > and diplomatic families back then were too busy unpacking or repacking a > whole household to prioritize a PTA meeting about school boundaries. Or > single parenting while their partner was deployed or on a TDY assignment. > Sadly, some of the PTA parents at this evening's meeting mistook our > transience for silence or ambivalence when the very nature of our work and > our</p>

		<p>lives marginalizes us in these discussions. We still care and we're > looking out for each other! I worry as much about my own kids as those of > future military and diplomatic families -- all kids need and deserve that > stability at least some of their lives. > > I hope you will reconsider this plan and the social impact it will have on > our Pentagon and State Department kids. I have other misgivings about it > but chose to focus on this issue as I think it's a compelling and unique > one to consider -- one that hasn't been talked about much in the > "demographics" conversations. > > Thank you for your consideration. If you have questions or would like to > talk I am eager to do so. > > Jen Rodriguez</p>
<p>10/3/2018</p>	<p>PU 36030</p>	<p>36030 is a residential zone that is being changed to Drew as shown in Red below. 36030 shares contiguous streets and the same neighborhood configuration as 36021 which is remaining in the Abingdon zone. As shown below in the attached graphic, 10th Pl, 11th St, and 12th St all share contiguous streets and the same neighborhood configuration as 36021 which is remaining in the Abingdon zone. In fact, the Abingdon bus stop on Frederick st/12th St covers this contiguous neighborhood (36021 and 36030). I think 36021 and 36030 should not have been drawn as two different areas and together their size is less than half the size of 36130 (not shown on attached map). It is worth noting that neighborhoods 36010, 36020, and 37070 are not residential, they are apartments and they do not share the same residential pattern and the boundaries area sensible. 37071 is an odd area and should be revisited as it contains both residential and apartment complexes, see 10th Pl St.</p> <p>I am concerned and I urge the APS boundary team to allow 36030 to remain in the Abingdon zone. Adding a lower population area like 36030 will not have a big impact on the Abingdon school population and if it is a concern it can be easily offset by adding 36020 or 36010 to Drew (similar to 37070) which are higher density areas.</p> <p>Another consideration for 36030, is this area was recently re-zoned to Kenmore Middle School and may be better zoned to Barcroft ES if Abingdon ES is not an option. This change will allow more students to transition together to the newly re-zoned Middle School Kenmore which hosts many Randolph ES children. See Middle School boundary below, 36030 is outlined in Red. [image: middle_school.jpg]</p> <p>Thank you for allowing this method of input as it is easier to provide graphics. I thank you for your time and attention to my concern.</p> <p>Please acknowledge you received my email and attached graphics.</p>

		<p>Cheers, Jordan Gibb</p>
<p>10/3/2018</p>	<p>Columbia Forest</p>	<p>We are a Foreign Service family living in Columbia Forst (PU 36030). Our sons [REDACTED] are currently [REDACTED] at Abingdon. We are concerned about the school boundary proposal, which would relocate our children to Drew Model. I, along with fellow Columbia Forest residents, do not support APS's current proposal and strongly urge you to factor these concerns in advance of the October 29 publishing of the revised boundary map. I have also conveyed these concerns via the online platform.</p> <p>First, the proposed boundary line with Columbia Forest students moving to Drew stands contrary to the Board's own policy considerations of efficiency, alignment, demographics, proximity and contiguity. Currently, our neighborhood already exceeds one mile from Abingdon Elementary, and a move to Drew would further increase the distance and commute time to school – no efficiency or proximity is gained, especially as Abingdon is not yet at capacity so the reason to make our children move schools eludes us. There are literally six public schools closer to Columbia Forest than Drew Model School: Abingdon, Barcroft, Campbell, Carlin Springs, Claremont & Randolph. (For that matter, according to Google Maps, even Henry is closer at 2.2 miles away vice 2.5 miles to Drew Model!)</p> <p>Additionally, this change would haphazardly split Columbia Forest, a historic neighborhood, in two, as well as disrupt the cohesion of our community. It would separate neighbors who live across the street from each other. Frederick Street is not a major thoroughfare and should not be used as a school boundary line. Drew Model would then feed into three separate middle schools, which is contrary to the stated APS goal of alignment. Our small pocket of students within Columbia Forest would be the only ones in the County to go from Drew to Kenmore. A more sensible alignment would be to consider include us in Carlin Springs so our elementary schools would share the same middle school.</p> <p>This change would also contradict the contiguity component, largely isolating our planning unit from the rest of the current and proposed Drew attendance boundary planning units. This proposal is particularly perplexing to our community, especially given that other planning units are directly contiguous to Drew Model but included in other schools to the northwest. With the large Barcroft</p>

Park and corridor along Four Mile Run clearly separating Columbia Forest from the rest of the Drew boundaries, we feel it is disingenuous to say that the proposed boundary is contiguous. Please do not make Columbia Forest an island.

On demographics, we are disappointed to see the planners intentionally creating a school (Drew) that would have 83% F&RL students, while neighboring schools are much lower and economically diverse. We would point out that on the 'illustrative map' handed out by APS, boundary lines that take into account a target of 50% F&RL students would drastically expand the neighborhood directly surrounding Drew Model, especially to the direct north. We do not understand why the Drew lines are drawn in such an odd manner to include Columbia Forest and not closer neighboring areas. APS should strive to even the disparities between schools districtwide - not exacerbate them.

In terms of alternate solutions, I would propose the following options for consideration:

--First and foremost, Keep Columbia Forest Together. Frederick Street is not a major thoroughfare and should not be used as a school boundary. --Please delay the move of Columbia Forest planning units from Abingdon to see if the predictions for capacity at Abingdon truly materialize. If they do, you could consider our planning units in the 2020 boundary shift, which would also include Carlin Springs and other closer schools as possible options. If Abingdon remains under capacity as it is now, then we would not need to move. -- Consider moving the immersion program at Claremont to Drew Model, and making Claremont a neighborhood school. This would create walkable options near us and create additional neighborhood schools in South Arlington.

--Offer a grandfather clause starting at 4th grade (this is, frankly, tertiary, to all the above-mentioned suggestions).

Finally, my husband and I bought our home [REDACTED] in April, expressly in hopes of sending our children to Abingdon. We are a Foreign Service family, recently returned from serving five years in China. My boys started at Abingdon in May after we left China abruptly following a family medical emergency. Abingdon embraced my boys and they are doing well. While we do not fear change, our sons have already been through many school moves and the precise reason we wanted to settle down in Arlington was to provide them with a sense of grounding and continuity. [REDACTED]

The prospect of having them uproot to yet another school next

		<p>year is very, very discouraging. We are not the only Foreign Service family potentially impacted by the boundary changes, and we would hope that — if nothing else — you would consider an exemption or special considerations for Foreign Service families in the United States on short-term assignments. In our situation, we anticipate being Stateside for perhaps 2-3 more years before going abroad again. But this suggestion does not negate the above possibilities which should take precedence given the greater impact to the whole community, especially Columbia Forest.</p> <p>I am willing to work alongside my community and APS to identify better solutions than the ones currently proposed, and strongly urge you to factor these concerns into the planning process. I am happy to talk about this more in person. [REDACTED]</p> <p>Many thanks. [REDACTED]</p>
10/3/2018	PU 36061	<p>Name Janet Peterson [REDACTED] Please indicate the current topic you'd like to engage with: Fall 2018 Elementary Boundary Process Please share your comments, feedback or suggestions: I am not happy with the proposed elementary school boundary changes which would relocate the children in my community (36061) from Abingdon to Drew. We moved here in part due to our school choices, this change would effect the appeal of living in our town home community and potentially lower property values. NOT HAPPY, but no alternatives to offer either.</p>
10/3/2018	Claremont Civic Association	<p>Name monica cicchini [REDACTED] Please indicate the current topic you'd like to engage with: Fall 2018 Elementary Boundary Process Please share your comments, feedback or suggestions: I would like to say that I am happy that the planning units within the claremont neighborhood have stayed with Abingdon Elementary.</p>
10/3/2018	Ft. Meyer	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>I am emailing with a concern I have for my kids and the boundary changes as well as a couple of questions I have regarding it.</p> <p>Both of my sons are military dependents so they already change school's/daycare's almost every 2 to 3 years. I know I am not the only one in this situation but for a young elementary kid this always seems like the end of the world [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] This is detrimental to their learning and his well-being so I have a lot of</p>

		<p>worry in this process.</p> <p>My first question is if Patrick Henry become a Montessori school does this mean we now have to pay for him to stay in this school? If so is there a list of what the cost will be? My next question is if he stays and my other son [REDACTED] starts school will he be allowed to attend Patrick Henry? My last question is there any talk of Patrick Henry not becoming a Montessori school and staying a public school?</p> <p>Again, I know everyone is working hard with all the students to make this successful, but I do believe there are circumstances that needs to be considered when you are talking about the well-being of children. Military life is already hard on them. They should not have to stress about school as well, and I do want you to know my child is concerned about this. We have talked in great detail about it, but it does not bring him comfort.</p> <p>V/R, LCDR Courtney Johnson [REDACTED]</p>
10/3/2018	Ft. Meyer	<p>Name A Servidio [REDACTED] Please indicate the current topic you'd like to engage with: Fall 2018 Elementary Boundary Process Please share your comments, feedback or suggestions: Please keep Planning Unit 48990 (Ft Myer) at Long Branch Elementary for this boundary process the following reasons. -Proximity: the bus exits the Military installation on Second St S and it is approx 0.7 miles to Long Branch and 0.9 miles to Fleet versus the congested 1.3 mile traffic route proposed to Hoffman-B. The Planning Unit shares an extended border with both Long Branch and Science Focus attendance zones. Stability: Milkids on average attend 9 different schools before graduating from high school (Nat Military Family Assoc) Alignment: Ft Myer Planning Unit milkids families would be an isolated segment at the high school level at W-L. (Hoffman-Jefferson-W-L). Demographics: Please also consider military connected sub group. Contiguity: The island-like connection of 48990 using 46910 appears to not take into account where the actual housing is located on the base Master Plan. (map features should designate this entire PL with brown shading) Both Long Branch and Science Focus attendance zones have long contiguous sections with Ft Myer.</p>
10/2/2018	Oakridge	<p>My name is Jen Rodriguez and [REDACTED] my children presently attend Oakridge [REDACTED] (planning unit 48120). I participated in a PTA</p>

sponsored gathering at Oakridge this evening where Reid Godlstein (cc'd) presented to the group and encouraged me to write to you.

My children, like most of our neighbors in the apartments and condos in Pentagon City and Crystal City, are the sons and daughters of military officers, state department employees, and diplomats -- all highly transient groups. The proposed boundaries will take these highly transient groups and put them all in the same school - Hoffman-Boston - where their numbers will be more concentrated. This concerns me greatly as my kids and several others will lose the social capital that comes from attending school with the many kids and families who've lived in Aurora Hills and on the Ridge for a decade or more and have built and sustained a flourishing school culture, traditions and community at Oakridge. My daughter's [REDACTED] friends are mostly kids who've been at Oakridge since Kindergarten. Her troop [REDACTED] has a leader that's been active for a decade in Girl Scouts. This is all a revelation to my daughter who has only known stability and community for the past two years. She is thriving!

With the proposed changes, I fear that my children and my neighbors' kids will interact mostly with kids and families they can't even count on being there the next year. That's a lot to ask of kids who are already going through and giving up so much.

Finally, I am very concerned that families like ours are *not* represented in the discussions that lead up to these boundary decisions simply because our lifestyle requires that we move often. We were not here 3 or 5 years ago when the boundary discussions were starting. I'm sure that the military and diplomatic families back then were too busy unpacking or repacking a whole household to prioritize a PTA meeting about school boundaries. Or single parenting while their partner was deployed or on a TDY assignment. Sadly, some of the PTA parents at this evening's meeting mistook our transience for silence or ambivalence when the very nature of our work and our lives marginalizes us in these discussions. We still care and we're looking out for each other! I worry as much about my own kids as those of future military and diplomatic families -- all kids need and deserve that stability at least some of their lives.

I hope you will reconsider this plan and the social impact it will have on our Pentagon and State Department kids. I have other misgivings about it but chose to focus on this issue as I think it's a compelling and unique one to consider -- one that hasn't been talked about much in the "demographics" conversations.

		Thank you for your consideration. If you have questions or would like to talk I am eager to do so.
10/2/2018	Grandfathering	<p>This is Reem Ali [REDACTED]. My daughter will be in fifth Grade next year. [REDACTED] has been in Oakridge Elementary School since first grade, so it will be very difficult for her to move from oakridge to any other school. I want her to stay at Oakridge next year.</p> <p>Thank you Reem Ali</p>
10/2/2018	Windgate	<p>Name Marnie Hammel [REDACTED] Please indicate the current topic you'd like to engage with: Fall 2018 Elementary Boundary Process Please share your comments, feedback or suggestions: HI: This is my 2nd survey, but I wanted to stress that I also have serious concerns about my children violating the Arlington isolation rule against isolation. There are only a few kids in Windgate so they will have to leave their friends now and then leave them again in a few years when they graduate from Drew and are the only kids in their class to go to TJ Middle School. This seems like too much for small children. Thanks.</p>
10/2/2018	Oakridge	<p>Hello,</p> <p>My son is at Oakridge Elementary and will be continuing on in 1st grade next year. However, due to our being in planning unit *48090*, we will be pushed to send him to Hoffman-Boston next year based on the current proposed boundary changes.</p> <p>Our family is very unhappy and concerned with this change. Examination of the maps shows that proposed boundaries are essentially moving ALL apartment-living families out of Oakridge district. This appears biased and unfair.</p> <p>Additionally, forcing those of us in Pentagon City (remarkably close in geographic distance to Oakridge) to travel to another school much farther away, seems ridiculous when those people living along Jefferson Davis Highway are allowed to remain in Oakridge despite their existing distance from the school. Walkers are going to be forced to become bus-riders or drive, which sounds counter to APS's push for more biking and walking.</p> <p>We love the atmosphere at Oakridge and are less than impressed with what we can see of</p>

		<p>Hoffman-Boston. In truth, if the boundaries currently proposed are adopted, we will likely pull our son from APS and explore private school options. I would not be surprised if other affected families do the same.</p> <p>S. Yilmaz Concerned Parent</p>
10/3/2018	Immersion	<p>Name Toby Gohn [REDACTED] Please indicate the current topic you'd like to engage with: Fall 2018 Elementary Boundary Process Please share your comments, feedback or suggestions: I agree with the September 26 preliminary decision to keep planning units in the Claremont neighborhood zoned for Abingdon Elementary School. (My unit is 36051 [REDACTED]). If planning units move elementary schools, please ensure that a child can continue going to their same Spanish immersion school, regardless if the new elementary school is zoned for the other Spanish immersion school. This would help prevent disruption in a child's education and social development If planning units move elementary schools and the new elementary school is zoned for a different Spanish immersion school, please also ensure concurrent sibling preference for a Spanish immersion program (ideally, the initial one that their older sibling goes to). This is critical to provide key social and logistical support to entire families who value Spanish immersion.</p>
10/3/2018	Ft. Meyer	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>I am emailing with a concern I have for my kids and the boundary changes as well as a couple of questions I have regarding it.</p> <p>Both of my sons are military dependents so they already change school's/daycare's almost every 2 to 3 years. I know I am not the only one in this situation but for a young elementary kid this always seems like the end of the world. My son will be in [REDACTED] his 3rd elementary school. This is detrimental to their learning and his well-being so I have a lot of worry in this process.</p> <p>My first question is if Patrick Henry become a Montessori school does this mean we now have to pay for him to stay in this school? If so is there a list of what the cost will be? My next question is if he stays and my other son Abel starts school will he be allowed to attend Patrick Henry? My last question is there any talk of Patrick Henry not becoming a Montessori school and staying a public</p>

		<p>school?</p> <p>Again, I know everyone is working hard with all the students to make this successful, but I do believe there are circumstances that needs to be considered when you are talking about the well-being of children. Military life is already hard on them. They should not have to stress about school as well, and I do want you to know my child is concerned about this. We have talked in great detail about it, but it does not bring him comfort.</p> <p>V/R, LCDR Courtney Johnson [REDACTED]</p>
10/3/2018	Fleet	<p>APS Staff,</p> <p>I wanted to offer my sincere thanks for all your work on the elementary school boundary process. I have offered several pleas that the Patrick Henry community stay together when the school moves to Fleet. Separately, with my neighbors, I have advocated on behalf of my particular planning unit and adjacent units, that we be zoned for Fleet. I made those pleas for many reasons, including primarily Fleets walkability to my home, and because staying at Fleet would keep my children and our neighbors together with the diverse and inclusive school community we have come to love at Henry.</p> <p>From my perspective, the proposal for the 2019 elementary school boundaries reflects that you all heard and considered my views and the views of the many similarly situated families currently attending Henry. I recognize that the proposal reflect a complex analysis on your part to evaluate important (but imperfect) data and to do so in the context of an uncertain future. I recognize that as a result, this proposal reflects your attention to a multitude of factors, with the voices from the Henry community being but a small part. Nonetheless, I am personally extremely grateful that your proposal would keep my planning unit, and the majority of planning units at Henry together. I also believe that (speaking only to the proposed Fleet boundaries, which is the only thing I have looked at carefully), the proposal accomplishes the aims of proximity, efficiency, and demographics very well.</p> <p>So thank you. Thank you for listening. Thank you for communicating. Thank you for being public servants dedicated to one of the most important objectives of local government - the education of our children. Thank you for traipsing between our neighborhood and Fleet, Drew, and Hoffman</p>

		<p>Boston in the June heat. And thank you for a proposal that goes a very long ways towards the goals I have articulated are important to me, my family & children, my neighbors, and my community.</p> <p>I also write to ask you to please consider including planning units 46110 and 46111 within the proposed Fleet boundary. These units - and the 43 children who reside there (according to the data on your site) are the *only *students from Henry who would not move with the rest of their school community to Fleet under the current proposal. Their bus eligibility status would not change by moving to Hoffman Boston. They will have to take a bus to Hoffman Boston. There are just 43 students now, with projections fr just 68 students in 2021-22. Given the number of students and the bus eligibility situation, I don't think I understand why it is important that they go to Hoffman Boston. I recognize that you are trying to put together a very complex and constantly moving puzzle. If you could tell me a little bit more about the factors that militate in favor of moving 46110 and 46111 to Hoffman Boston, I think that would be useful in educating the Henry community, which remains interested in keeping all of its planning units together.</p> <p>Many thanks,</p> <p>Lisa Owings Columbia Heights Patrick Henry-Fleet</p>
10/1/2018	Columbia forest	<p>Dear Patrick Murphy,</p> <p>As neighbors in Columbia Forest, we all truly commune together with play dates, family walks, cookouts, community pool memberships, block parties and "Where the Sidewalk Ends" get togethers that are impromptu on beautiful days. All of the neighborhood children bring their bikes and scooters to the get togethers and they draw with chalk on the sidewalks together and all of the families bring food and music for everyone to enjoy. One of my sons asked me this morning if he would be able to go to Abingdon Elementary School with another child who lives in the 36021 planning unit and I am devastated that I currently cannot answer his question. It will be devastating to my ■ sons to be separated from their friends. The children all know each other and most importantly, they know the parents.</p> <p>I grew up in a small town in Georgia and the one thing I wanted for my children was the same neighborhood feel of safety and comfort. What we strive to do in our Columbia Forest community is</p>

create an atmosphere that is loving, supportive and strong among all families, as most of our relatives don't live in this area. We truly depend on each other for cups of sugar and an extra helping hand with our children. We all belong to the same community pool so our children spend the entire summer together and develop great relationships with each other.

I am a resident of planning unit 36030 in the Columbia Forest neighborhood. I am writing to express my serious concerns that I share with fellow residents regarding the impacts of the proposed elementary school boundary changes to our neighborhood starting in the 2019-2020 school year. I have [REDACTED] sons who will begin [REDACTED] next year and these boundary changes will determine and define [REDACTED] their elementary school experiences.

As you are aware, the proposed boundary change will relocate our children from Abingdon to Drew Model. I, along with my fellow residents, do not support APS's current proposal and strongly urge you and the Board to factor these concerns in advance of the October 29 publishing of the revised boundary map.

First, the proposed boundary line with Columbia Forest students moving to Drew stands contrary to the Board's own policy considerations of proximity and contiguity. In regard to proximity, currently our neighborhood already exceeds one mile from Abingdon Elementary and a move to Drew would further increase the distance and commute time to school from our neighborhood. With this boundary change, my children will have to cross over three (3) major thoroughfares to attend school: George Mason Drive, Four Mile Run Drive, and Walter Reed Drive which is a misalignment with keeping students close to the schools so they can walk safely or minimize bus ride times. Additionally, this change will haphazardly split our neighborhood and disrupt the cohesion of our community, separating neighbors who live in close proximity from each other.

This change would also contradict the contiguity component, largely isolating our planning unit from the rest of the current and proposed Drew attendance boundary planning units. This proposal is particularly perplexing to our community, especially given that other planning units within the proposed boundaries for other schools are directly contiguous to Drew Model.

If plans to eventually convert Claremont Immersion into a neighborhood school are viable, a boundary process that impacts Columbia Forest in 2019 would prevent our families from having a choice to attend a school that would be within a one-mile walk zone and fulfill each of APS's policy

		<p>considerations criteria. Given APS's policy of not revising boundaries every five years, our neighborhood would effectively be shut out from this process.</p> <p>I am willing to work alongside my community and APS to identify better solutions than the ones currently proposed for Columbia Forest and strongly urge you to factor these concerns into the planning process.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Jane Berry Moseley</p>
10/1/2018	Ft. Meyer	<p>Hello Sir/Ma'am, I have a question pertaining to the new elementary school boundaries. Currently, children attending the school age program/Child Development Center at Fort Meyer have an option to attend either Patrick Henry or Long Branch Elementary. Will this option still be available with the new boundary proposal? Thank you for your assistance. Respectfully, Renee Thuotte</p>
10/1/2018	Ft. Meyer	<p>*Dear Boundary Planning Committee,*</p> <p>*I am writing you to share my concerns about the proposed boundary map for the 2019-2020 school year that directly affects the children who reside on Fort Meyer, along with the children whose families utilize the before and aftercare program at the Cody Child Development Center on Fort Meyer (Planning Unit 48990). In the proposed boundary map, Fort Myer Children will be redistricted from Long Branch Elementary School to Hoffman Boston Elementary School. *</p> <p>*As many school officials know, Long Branch Elementary School and Fort Myer have had a long-standing relationship since 1973. That is a relationship that is over 45 years old. Fort Myer is a part of the culture and community present at Long Branch and Long Branch is a part of the Fort Myer community as well. These children play on the same sport teams, at the same parks, and see each other at community events. *</p> <p>*Military children experience so much change throughout their lives and they are at a higher risk overall for post-traumatic stress, anxiety, behavioral challenges, learning disabilities, and overall struggle in school. These children experience loss, long separations from parents, and multiple transitions throughout their short time as children. Creating more stress and transition for these</p>

		<p>children and their families is counterproductive and harmful to them. The culture and community at Long Branch Elementary School understands and is equipped to meet these challenges that military children face. Creating a community and support system like this does not happen overnight, this led by many years of experience.*</p> <p>*Redistricting Fort Myer will also create an issue with bussing. Buses are allowed to go in and out of the main gate of Fort Myer. Currently, the bus route from Fort Myer to Long Branch Elementary School does not include traffic lights and is a quick commute. Redistricting Fort Myer will create a longer bus ride for students that will include more stop and go traffic, traffic lights, and encountering multiple dangerous intersections. Along with this, it will double their time on the bus. The buses will also have more wear and tear on their tires and braking systems, which will cost the county more money in operating costs. *</p> <p>*Moving Fort Myer to Hoffman Boston will also create a district island. Fort Myer is contiguous with the Long Branch boundary lines. By redistricting, this will create a scenario where these children will feel disconnected from their community. Please look at changing a more contiguous planning unit instead. Planning units 46120 and 46131 are both touching Hoffman Boston lines. Redistricting these planning units makes more sense overall than redistricting Fort Myer. *</p> <p>*I ask that you exempt Fort Myer children from this boundary change and have these children and their families remain at Long Branch Elementary School. Military children need consistency in their environments. It is insensitive to think they are like any other community of children in Arlington. *</p> <p>*Sincerely,*</p> <p>* Erica Simon-Gross*</p>
10/1/2018	Barcroft	<p>Good Afternoon,</p> <p>After reviewing the proposed boundary change I see that my daughter and is slated to move from Barcroft to Drew. I am deeply disappointed as we love Barcroft and the community. [REDACTED] we often walk to and from school. I don't see why we would move from a school that we can walk to to a school where we need to be driven or</p>

		<p>take a bus. I don't have any specific issue with Drew. The principal seems lovely and I'm sure the program is great. I do have a problem with uprooting my daughter after spending 4 years in a school she loves. She is an only child and the relationships she has developed at Barcroft with students and staff are deep. My daughter plans to run for student office as a 4th grader next year. Lastly, I am the Girl Scout Troop leader for Barcroft and this move would also dissolve our troop. I know that change can be good, but in this case I just don't understand why this change. Geographically, it makes no sense. I would like more information on how this decision was made and when the decision will be finalized. I appreciate any help you can give me. Thank you, Tracey Butler-Johnson [REDACTED]</p>
<p>10/1/2018</p>	<p>Drew</p>	<p>Dear Robert,</p> <p>We met the other night at Kenmore and spoke about Drew's boundaries. Thank you for your time and effort in discussing the current proposal. As I said at the meeting, the proposal is concerning from Drew's perspective for several reasons. As you know, Drew is located in a historically underserved neighborhood in Arlington and Montessori has been co-located at Drew for many years, depriving the neighborhood of its own community school. With this process, Drew will finally be a fully neighborhood school. However, I am concerned that this current proposal has the potential to undermine the new Drew community before it even gets off the ground by failing to honor several key APS policy considerations in drawing Drew's proposed boundary.</p> <p>APS considers 6 factors in adjusting boundaries: efficiency, proximity, stability, alignment, demographics, and contiguity. As we discussed, APS has noted that stability and contiguity have "little impact" to this current process, so really only 4 factors are relevant. The current proposal for Drew's boundaries is inconsistent with 3 of these 4 factors. First, alignment, or minimizing separation of small groups of students from their classmates when moving between schools levels: Drew currently feeds into only Gunston but under this proposal, Drew students would be sent to 3 middle schools, Gunston, Jefferson, and Kenmore. I believe this would make Drew only the second elementary in the county to feed into 3 different middle schools. The current proposal therefore does not promote alignment for Drew.</p> <p>Second, demographics, or promoting demographic diversity, which I understand to generally refer to economic diversity: the current proposal makes Drew 83% FR/L. That is concentrated low-</p>

income and not diverse under any definition. Further, while I understand that the current Drew FR/L figure includes Montessori, the fact is that Drew is currently only 51.56% FR/L and this proposal increases Drew's concentration of low-income students by 30+ points. Suggesting otherwise, as APS did in its presentation, is surprising and frankly a bit offensive. At the least, the current proposal does not promote demographics for Drew.

Third, proximity, or keeping students close to schools. While proximity generally refers to whether or not students are walkers, proximity also matters for participation and cohesiveness within the school community. This elongated and oddly shaped boundary drawn for Drew and only Drew does not appear to promote proximity for Drew's community. When combined with the alignment problems discussed above, it is easy to see how those units currently zoned Abingdon that feed into Kenmore will be isolated from the rest of Drew. Further, the proposed boundary seems to undermine contiguity as well, even though APS has said that isn't an issue here. In fact, it does appear to be an issue because the proposed boundary creates an ostensibly contiguous border but actually runs through Jennie Dean Park and Barcroft Park, using a planning unit (36090) with zero students to link what would otherwise be an island. APS has previously determined that (1) "islands" in school boundaries should be eliminated and (2) "across the park" boundaries don't create contiguous borders; this proposed boundary is at odds with these principles.

I want to stress that I do understand that every boundary decision takes into account the needs and wants of various communities and attempts balance, and that APS has certain constraints and priorities that it must manage. To that end, I have tried to work within those constraints to propose a possible alternative in the attached document. The attachment suggests, in short, what you and I discussed at the meeting: moving the rest of Alcova Heights to Fleet, moving the Fleet units south of the Pike to Drew, and moving some of the Abingdon-Kenmore units to Barcroft.

This proposal is imperfect because it leaves Barcroft and Abingdon still somewhat crowded, but it potentially improves Barcroft's future congestion by rezoning the unit containing the future Gilliam Place students to slow Barcroft's future growth, and it vastly improves alignment, proximity/contiguity and (to a lesser extent) demographics for Drew. The proposal also is mainly illustrative because I couldn't exactly replicate the numbers, and was probably using tools inferior to those APS has. However, I hope it leads to further discussion and consideration of alternatives. Nauck is finally getting an elementary school to call its own. The community deserves a school that isn't burdened with problems of alignment, demographics, proximity, and contiguity right off the

		<p>bat. The needs and desires of other community schools (e.g., the need to relieve overcrowding at Abingdon, Barcroft, and Oakridge; the desire of the Henry community to remain together) are important but should be balanced with positioning the new Drew community to succeed. I am concerned that APS's current proposal does not achieve that balance.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Sincerely, Miranda Turner [REDACTED]</p>
10/1/2018	Windgate	<p>Hello:</p> <p>We live in the Windgate I complex and are strongly opposed to the proposed Elementary School Boundary Change.</p> <p>My son is [REDACTED] at Abingdon, having started there in first grade during the school renovation. His class was in a trailer that year, and while the renovations are beautiful, that was not the way we anticipated his entry into elementary school. He loves Abingdon now and the good friends he has made, and I worry what the emotional toll would be should he have to change schools.</p> <p>The Windgate neighborhood is a sought after community, and I believe we will see a drop in property values and have a harder time selling homes in the future. We have already begun to talk about moving to another neighborhood and a school change will make us move much faster.</p> <p>The school is also farther away which is an inconvenience for all of us. There is not a rational reason that the boundary was set up this way and we were put in with Drew.</p> <p>Again, I strongly oppose this Proposal and look forward to hearing from you.</p>
10/1/2018	Windgate	<p>Name Kayla Bonfilio [REDACTED] Please indicate the current topic you'd like to engage with: Fall 2018 Elementary Boundary Process Please share your comments, feedback or suggestions: I live in Windgate 1. My neighborhood has quite a few racist people who people their</p>

		property values will go down if our neighborhood is zoned for Drew Elementary. It's nonsense and should not be considered a factor when they fill out their surveys.
9/29/2018	Immersion	<p>Name Sheela Ahluwalia [REDACTED] Please indicate the current topic you'd like to engage with: Fall 2018 Elementary Boundary Process Please share your comments, feedback or suggestions: I agree with the September 26 preliminary decision to keep planning units in the Claremont neighborhood zoned for Abingdon Elementary School. (My unit is 36051 [REDACTED]). If planning units move elementary schools, please ensure that a child can continue going to their same Spanish immersion school, regardless if the new elementary school is zoned for the other Spanish immersion school. This would help prevent disruption in a child's education and social development If planning units move elementary schools and the new elementary school is zoned for a different Spanish immersion school, please also ensure concurrent sibling preference for a Spanish immersion program (ideally, the initial one that their older sibling goes to). This is critical to provide key social and logistical support to entire families who value Spanish immersion.</p>
9/29/2018	Ft. Meyer	<p>Name Rachelle Nowlin [REDACTED] Please indicate the current topic you'd like to engage with: Fall 2018 Elementary Boundary Process Please share your comments, feedback or suggestions: As a dual military parent family, our kids attend before and after school programs at Ft Myer/ Henderson Hall. We are so thankful that Long Branch accepted our family into their student body, as we live in a different Arlington County Elementary district. Having the Long Branch bus come to the child development center is crucial for us, both financially and for peace of mind. We respectfully request/suggest that if Ft Myer families are re-districted that 3 APS elementary busses pick up and drop off at the CDC. We ask that current Long Branch and Fleet Elementary students be grandfathered and remain at their school and that new to Arlington children attend Hoffman-Boston. Military kids are quite resilient and must move many times during these formative years. An additional school change during one assignment may be too much to ask of a child who already sacrifices so much. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
9/29/2018	Henry	<p>Hello APS Engage Staff,</p> <p>As a former member of the South Arlington Working Group I would like to share my account of history based on "being in the room where it happened" (yes, that is a Hamilton quote:).</p> <p>It is my understanding that members of the Henry community are referencing a promise made in</p>

		<p>the past that all of the Henry students would move to the "new school at TJ". During the SAWG meetings we did not speak to specific planning units and their potential to be boundary changed. Our charge was to recommend possible sites for a new school in South Arlington. We did this by recommending the TJ site and then by also recommending the school/program moves that would follow. We never promised to keep Henry fully intact. What we did promise was that the school at TJ would be a neighborhood school rather than a choice school. We discussed how the recommendation would allow for a total re-organization of the boundaries in South Arlington. This re-organization must align the Henry planning units with the rest of South Arlington.</p> <p>The SAWG actually recommended that Oakridge students be moved to Drew. This, as we know, is not what happened. The SAWG also recommended that APS work with the County Board to complete a Feasibility Study of the Pentagon City / Crystal City Corridor to research viability of locating a future elementary school in this area. The SAWG also specifically recommended that APS earmark a school in the CIP to be built in the Oakridge boundary after 2019. Neither of these two recommendations have taken place. And yet, despite the current proposals being vastly different from what was discussed in the SAWG, the Oakridge community is cooperating with APS to have 250 of their students boundary changed across 395 to Hoffman-Boston.</p> <p>Every school community is making sacrifices and embracing change in order to help APS grow in a positive manner. Every South Arlington school must make some changes to their boundary in order to share the capacity constraints across the schools and to prepare for the future students still to come. The Henry community must do the same as all of the other schools.</p> <p>Thank you for your time. No need to respond. I just wanted to share my thoughts.</p> <p>Shona Colglazier Oakridge parent South Arlington Working Group Committee Member</p> <p>To read the presentation given to the School Board on the SAWG, visit here https://www.apsva.us/wp-content/uploads/legacy_assets/www/412115d251-SB_Final_Update_11052015.pdf .</p>
9/28/2018	Windage	<p>Hello:</p> <p>My family [REDACTED] live in the Windgate I complex. I want to express my strongest</p>

concerns with the Proposed Elementary School Boundary Change.

My children are currently in 1st grade at Abingdon and they completed Kindergarten there last year. They love their school and it is our hope that they will stay there until graduation from 5th grade. We moved to the neighborhood and stayed in the neighborhood due to this school and the benefits it provides. We will leave this neighborhood if it passes. I know others who share this sentiment.

Removing my children from this school after they have formed relationships there would be detrimental to them both emotionally and intellectually. They have a comfort level at this school. At such an early age forcing them to change would be a great hardship that is beyond our control.

In addition the effects of this move will have a very detrimental effect on our community as a whole as I firmly believe it will drive down property values as people leave the area due to this change and others will refuse to enter it for the same reason.

Many of the families in this community waited patiently for Abingdon to be remodeled and their children went to school in trailers. Now they are repaid for this patience by removing their children from the brand new school to be moved to another school.

The school is also farther away which is an inconvenience for all of us. There is not a rational reason that the boundary was set up this way and we were put in with Drew. It just doesn't make sense.

Again, I strongly oppose this Proposal. Please let me know what else I can do to share my concerns. There was a link to speak at the next School Board Meeting. Would you suggest this is the best way to make sure our voices are heard? I want to make sure that we take advantage of every avenue to have our concerns voiced.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. It is of great significance to my family and to my community.

Marnie Hammel [REDACTED]

9/28/2018	Windgate	Name Mari Millard [REDACTED] Please indicate the current topic you'd like to engage with: Naming Process - W-L Please share your comments, feedback or suggestions: I'm very much against Wingate being redistricted. My children enjoy Abingdon and I don't want them to have to move schools. Also, I'm very concerned with how this change will impact property values.
9/28/2018	Windgate	Name Marnie Hammel Email marniehammel@gmail.com Please indicate the current topic you'd like to engage with: Fall 2018 Elementary Boundary Process Please share your comments, feedback or suggestions: I strongly strongly oppose this Boundary proposal. I came here and stayed in Windgate I because of Abingdon. My children are both at the school and moving them would be very detrimental as they love it there and have formed relationships there. In addition this will have significant effect on our property value. This is not acceptable to me or to anyone in the Windgate I community.
9/27/2018	Henry	<p>I am writing to respond to the proposed elementary school boundary map released on September 26.</p> <p>I am a parent of a third grader at Patrick Henry who loves and is deeply connected to the school and its community, one she is attending for the fourth consecutive year now.</p> <p>I live on Courthouse Road in Penrose in the area shown as unit 46100 on the map. It is nonsensical to me that the east side of our street is to be sliced off of our neighborhood; a much more logical boundary would extend the district to its natural boundary, Washington Boulevard. I live in Penrose and have no connection to the district in which my child is placed, which includes areas off limits to us (Ft. Myer) or on the other side of an interstate highway!</p> <p>Unit 46100 belongs with the rest of its neighborhood in the new Fleet district. It is a safe and easy walk or drive to Fleet. Instead, my child would have to cross Columbia Pike to get to Hoffman, which is farther away than Fleet! The change to our district is unsafe and illogical in terms of neighborhood identity and contiguity.</p>
9/27/2018	Hoffman-Boston	<p>Hello,</p> <p>Kudos to your team for a clear presentation and a productive breakout session. I have some</p>

		<p>outstanding questions regarding the proposed map.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on the planning units proposed to attend Hoffman-Boston that are in the Long Branch boundary now, does this mean that all Fort Myer military families that are on base or live near base will now attend Hoffman-Boston? 2. Based on the planning units proposed for Drew, does this mean that those students who live in the Drew boundary but currently attend Hoffman-Boston by choice must now return to their neighborhood school at Drew? There were a few planning units who were given the choice of Hoffman-Boston or Drew in the past. I would like to see these families return to Drew as a re-set of the boundaries. 3. At one time international families who attend the War College in DC were allowed to attend Oakridge. They might even have been able to attend regardless of their address. Many of these families choose to live in the apartment buildings located in the planning units being proposed to move to Hoffman-Boston. How will this new boundary impact these War College families (if in fact this policy is still in place)? <p>Thank you, Shona Colglazier Oakridge Parent Former South Arlington Working Group committee member</p>
<p>9/27/2018</p>	<p>Oakridge</p>	<p>Dear Arlington School Board Members:</p> <p>Thank you for your work and dedication to the recent boundary process. I am a resident of the aurora hills community and an active member of both the aurora hills community association and the arlington ridge community. I applaud your efforts to keep our community together at our neighborhood school Oakridge, and to respect our community's desire to maintain Oakridge as "our neighborhood school." I believe the current proposed school boundaries respect our desire to maintain this community and promotes unified and a cohesive neighborhood. I also think you did a great job of maintaining each school, from a proximity standpoint, as the "neighborhood" school that it was designed to be. I wish you the best over the next couple of months and I thank you for your continued transparency throughout this process.</p>

		Sincerely, Molly Young, Aurora Hills resident, homeowner, Oakridge PTA member, Oakridge Parent.
9/26/2018	Henry	<p>As a Patrick Henry parent and tax paying resident of Arlington County, I strongly agree with the Patrick Henry PTA that all current Patrick Henry students should stay together and move to the new South Arlington elementary school, Alice West Fleet Elementary School.</p> <p>I believe that: APS has repeatedly and publicly conveyed that the entire Henry community would move to Fleet. As a school system that prizes integrity and accountability, it should honor its representations to our community. Maintaining Patrick Henry's uniquely diverse and high-performing environment, with its special blend of families, teachers, programs, and administrators, has always been a top priority for our community and remains so as we transition to Fleet. Approximately 220 students – about a third of Henry's current population - live outside of APS's proposed walk zone for Fleet (those students are primarily in planning units south of Columbia Pike, with some east of Courthouse Road). Because APS has conveyed that walkability is a key factor as it considers redrawing boundaries, these planning units may be most at risk for redistricting out of Fleet. The students in these planning units bring with them important diversity that contributes to the uniqueness of our school. Any effort by APS to exclude the students and families of these planning units would erode Henry's special character. Particularly in light of the tumult already resulting from a move to a new building, our students' growth, progress, learning, and ultimately, academic achievement depend on maintaining friendships and learning relationships, continuing bonds with administrators and teachers, maintaining student leadership, and a sense of neighborhood cohesion, all of which would be directly undermined by moving a portion of the student body to Fleet. A new elementary school in South Arlington is overdue. To exclude South Arlington residents who are Henry students from the new school, particularly to make room for students outside South Arlington results in a disproportionate distribution of resources, and indicates preferential treatment for North Arlington (where Discovery Elementary was recently built, and where Reed Elementary will open). Fleet is the safest walking option for students south of Columbia Pike and east of Courthouse Road who currently attend Henry, many of whom already cross the Pike to walk or bike to school.</p> <p>In closing, I thank you for your attention to this matter. I am hopeful that APS staff and the School Board will serve the families of Patrick Henry and residents of South Arlington by maintaining the</p>

		<p>continuity, proximity and diversity of the Henry community at the new Fleet Elementary School. I eagerly anticipate seeing the students from all the current Henry planning units in attendance at Fleet in September 2019.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ellen Gabel Patrick Henry parent</p>
<p>9/26/2018</p>	<p>Ft. Meyer</p>	<p>Thank-you to all the APS staff members who took a tremendous amount of time working with parents tonight at the Getting Started meeting.</p> <p>I have a couple questions: - What schools will be eligible for busing from the Fort Myer Child Development Center after the boundary change initiative? - Was there specific weighting given to each of the six criteria (efficiency, proximity...)</p> <p>Thank-you!</p> <p>Meghan Ripple Patrick Henry Parent</p>