Dear Committee Members,

I am writing in concern for your task to vote a scenario to put forth to the board of education regarding the options on the Boundary Study that includes Hampton Elementary. I am asking you to assertively inquire of the committee if a "NO" vote is also an option. I am NOT asking that you abstain from the vote as that silences my view. I request a "NO" vote for the following reasons:

1) Pleasant Plains - The study does not genuinely aim to solve the Pleasant Plains overcrowding/infrastructure problem. Pleasant Plains Elementary School clearly needs relief. If any of the options in this study are passed, Pleasant Plains will fall towards the bottom of the queue to receive capital investment from the county. Their school will remain dilapidated and in need of BCPS funds but they will have lost their main source of justification for those funds.

2) Development - The boundary study does not take into account student yield from aggressive development taking place in Towson. ALL enrollment forecast to decline rapidly). Another bewildering aspect of this study is that, of the 12 schools that could provide relief to Pleasant Plains, only the three involved in the study had their capacities reassessed. The committee is left in the dark with respect to what additional capacities are available at the 9 other, closer schools.

3) Three schools? - The boundary study is arbitrarily constrained to three schools: Hampton, Pleasant Plains and Halstead. There are much more sensible solutions, that likely still include Hampton, but that also use schools closer to Pleasant Plains, such as Cromwell Valley (protected as a magnet school for technology-driven elementary schools students?), and Stoneleigh (no development to take place in their zone, enrollment forecast to decline rapidly). Another bewildering aspect of this study is that, of the 12 schools that could provide relief to Pleasant Plains, only the three involved in the study had their capacities reassessed. The committee is left in the dark with respect to what additional capacities are available at the 9 other, closer schools.

4) Diversity - This one I agree with. Hampton is in full support of increased diversity in its school. It should be noted however, that, again, Stoneleigh is less diverse than Hampton.

5) Cafeteria and Gymnasium - 7 years ago Hampton was at around 180% capacity when the renovation was done. Despite requesting this of BCPS, the cafeteria and gymnasium were NOT renovated. Hampton's cafeteria is overflowing with children. There is no more room. That means earlier and later lunch times if and when any of these options pass. That is currently one of the major complaints from Pleasant Plains, that their children start lunch around 10:30 and finish around 2 because they have to have so many lunch shifts to accommodate their population.

6) Maintaining Continuity of Neighborhoods - This study clearly does not maintain continuity of the Pleasant Plains neighborhood.

7) Transportation - Any of these options pushes our bus system even farther beyond its already stressed state and means far longer commutes for children.

8) Shifting problems from school to school - Current data suggest that any of the "options" proposed would make Hampton one of the largest elementary schools in the central zone at over 110% capacity, with the largest average class size. The boundary study will do nothing but shift overcrowding from one school to another to avoid capital investment in Pleasant Plains.

I also would like to request information regarding why Rule 1280 was revised after the start of this boundary study?

Thank you,

Date: 12/09/2019, 1227 hrs

M. Damareck

I am writing in concern for your task to vote a scenario to put forth to the board of education regarding the options on the Boundary Study that includes Hampton Elementary. I am asking you to assertively inquire of the committee if a "NO" vote is also an option. I'm NOT asking that you abstain from the vote as that silences my view. I request a "NO" vote for the following reasons:

1) Pleasant Plains - The study does not genuinely aim to solve the Pleasant Plains overcrowding/infrastructure problem. Pleasant Plains Elementary School clearly needs relief. If any of the options in this study are passed, Pleasant Plains will fall towards the bottom of the queue to receive capital investment from the county. Their school will remain dilapidated and in need of BCPS funds but they will have lost their main source of justification for those funds.

2) Development - The boundary study does not take into account student yield from aggressive development taking place in Towson. ALL enrollment forecast to decline rapidly). Another bewildering aspect of this study is that, of the 12 schools that could provide relief to Pleasant Plains, only the three involved in the study had their capacities reassessed. The committee is left in the dark with respect to what additional capacities are available at the 9 other, closer schools.

3) Three schools? - The boundary study is arbitrarily constrained to three schools: Hampton, Pleasant Plains and Halstead. There are much more sensible solutions, that likely still include Hampton, but that also use schools closer to Pleasant Plains, such as Cromwell Valley (protected as a magnet school for technology-driven elementary schools students?), and Stoneleigh (no development to take place in their zone, enrollment forecast to decline rapidly). Another bewildering aspect of this study is that, of the 12 schools that could provide relief to Pleasant Plains, only the three involved in the study had their capacities reassessed. The committee is left in the dark with respect to what additional capacities are available at the 9 other, closer schools.

4) Diversity - This one I agree with. Hampton is in full support of increased diversity in its school. It should be noted however, that, again, Stoneleigh is less diverse than Hampton.

5) Cafeteria and Gymnasium - 7 years ago Hampton was at around 180% capacity when the renovation was done. Despite requesting this of BCPS, the cafeteria and gymnasium were NOT renovated. Hampton's cafeteria is overflowing with children. There is no more room. That means earlier and later lunch times if and when any of these options pass. That is currently one of the major complaints from Pleasant Plains, that their children start lunch around 10:30 and finish around 2 because they have to have so many lunch shifts to accommodate their population.

6) Maintaining Continuity of Neighborhoods - This study clearly does not maintain continuity of the Pleasant Plains neighborhood.

7) Transportation - Any of these options pushes our bus system even farther beyond its already stressed state and means far longer commutes for children.

8) Shifting problems from school to school - Current data suggest that any of the "options" proposed would make Hampton one of the largest elementary schools in the central zone at over 110% capacity, with the largest average class size. The boundary study will do nothing but shift overcrowding from one school to another to avoid capital investment in Pleasant Plains.

Thank you for your consideration,

Date: 12/09/2019, 1102 hrs

J. Dyer

This study has attempted to force the committee members to vote for one of three inadequate plans. I am asking them to assertively inquire of the committee if a "NO" vote is also an option. I request a "NO" vote for the following reasons:

1) Pleasant Plains - The study does not genuinely aim to solve the Pleasant Plains overcrowding/infrastructure problem. Pleasant Plains Elementary School clearly needs relief. If any of the options in this study are passed, Pleasant Plains will fall towards the bottom of the queue to receive capital investment from the county. Their school will remain dilapidated and in need of BCPS funds but they will have lost their main source of justification for those funds.

2) Development - The boundary study does not take into account student yield from aggressive development taking place in Towson. ALL enrollment forecast to decline rapidly). Another bewildering aspect of this study is that, of the 12 schools that could provide relief to Pleasant Plains, only the three involved in the study had their capacities reassessed. The committee is left in the dark with respect to what additional capacities are available at the 9 other, closer schools.

3) Three schools? - The boundary study is arbitrarily constrained to three schools: Hampton, Pleasant Plains and Halstead. There are much more sensible solutions, that likely still include Hampton, but that also use schools closer to Pleasant Plains, such as Cromwell Valley (protected as a magnet school for technology-driven elementary schools students?), and Stoneleigh (no development to take place in their zone, enrollment forecast to decline rapidly). Another bewildering aspect of this study is that, of the 12 schools that could provide relief to Pleasant Plains, only the three involved in the study had their capacities reassessed. The committee is left in the dark with respect to what additional capacities are available at the 9 other, closer schools.

4) Diversity - This one I agree with. Hampton is in full support of increased diversity in its school. It should be noted however, that, again, Stoneleigh is less diverse than Hampton.

5) Cafeteria and Gymnasium - 7 years ago Hampton was at around 180% capacity when the renovation was done. Despite requesting this of BCPS, the cafeteria and gymnasium were NOT renovated. Hampton's cafeteria is overflowing with children. There is no more room. That means earlier and later lunch times if and when any of these options pass. That is currently one of the major complaints from Pleasant Plains, that their children start lunch around 10:30 and finish around 2 because they have to have so many lunch shifts to accommodate their population.

6) Maintaining Continuity of Neighborhoods - This study clearly does not maintain continuity of the Pleasant Plains neighborhood.

7) Transportation - Any of these options pushes our bus system even farther beyond its already stressed state and means far longer commutes for children.

8) Shifting problems from school to school - Current data suggest that any of the "options" proposed would make Hampton one of the largest elementary schools in the central zone at over 110% capacity, with the largest average class size. The boundary study will do nothing but shift overcrowding from one school to another to avoid capital investment in Pleasant Plains.

Thank you for your consideration,
As a concerned Hampton Elementary parent, I urge you to vote “NO” on the Hampton Elementary Boundary study. None of the 3 options are viable for the long-term and they all put Hampton in jeopardy of being well over capacity in 2020 and beyond.

I request a "NO" vote for the following reasons:

1) Pleasant Plains - The study does not genuinely aim to solve the Pleasant Plains overcrowding/infrastructure problem. Pleasant Plains Elementary School clearly needs relief. If any of the options in this study are passed, Pleasant Plains will fall towards the bottom of the queue to receive capital investment from the county. Their school will remain dilapidated and in need of BCPS funds but they will have lost their main source of justification for those funds.

2) Development - The boundary study does not take into account student yield from aggressive development taking place in Towson. ALL source of justification for those funds.

3) Three schools? - The boundary study is arbitrarily constrained to three schools: Hampton, Pleasant Plains and Halstead. There are much more sensible solutions, that likely still likely include Hampton, but that also use schools closer to Pleasant Plains, such as Cromwell Valley (protected as a magnet school for technology-driven elementary schools students?), and Stoneleigh (no development to take place in their zone, enrollment forecast to decline rapidly). Another bewildering aspect of this study is that, of the 12 schools that could provide relief to Pleasant Plains, only the three involved in the study had their capacities reassessed. The committee is left in the dark with respect to what additional capacities are available at the 9 other, closer schools.

4) Diversity - This one I agree with. Hampton is in full support of increased diversity in its school. It should be noted however, that, again, Stoneleigh is less diverse than Hampton.

5) Cafeteria and Gymnasium - 7 years ago Hampton was at around 180% capacity when the renovation was done. Despite requesting this of BCPS, the cafeteria and gymnasium were NOT renovated. Hampton's cafeteria is overflowing with children. There is no more room. That means earlier and later lunch times if and when any of these options pass. That is currently one of the major complaints from Pleasant Plains, that their children start lunch around 10:30am and finish around 2pm because they have to have so many lunch shifts to accommodate their population.

6) Transportation - Any of these options pushes our bus system even farther beyond its already stressed state and means far longer commutes for children.

7) Shifting problems from school to school - Current data suggest that any of the "options" proposed would make Hampton one of the largest elementary schools in the central zone at over 110% capacity, with the largest average class size. The boundary study will do nothing but shift overcrowding from one school to another to avoid capital investment in Pleasant Plains.

Thank you for your consideration and supporting all Baltimore County school students.

R. Campbell

I am opposed to all of the "options" presented in the Pleasant Plains boundary proposal. They are inadequate for the students at Pleasant Plains and will overcrowd Hampton Elementary, which my children attend.

I call upon the board of education and its individual members to initiate an alternative planning process that generates long-term solutions that serve ALL students in the area.

Finally, I attended the December 5 board meeting and was appalled by the contempt it showed for the staff and public who waited two hours for the public meeting to begin. Frankly, it revealed a troubling degree of dysfunction. I expect more of my county representatives.

V. Isaacs

Hello, I’m writing in regard to the boundary study concerning the influx of students into Hampton Elementary.

The study gives committee members only 3 options. There is no option listed to say “NO”.

The study is truly inadequate. Hampton has already been overcrowded not that long ago, and with the current and future development in our area, is bound to be overcrowded again.

The gym and cafeteria at the school were not remodeled. The cafeteria is overflowing with students to a point where some children are being forced to eat entirely too early or too late to to keep them focused on the day.

Stonleigh Elementary is not being considered in this study. They are not overcrowded and the area has no planned development. It is an easy option to move the children there. As well, Cromwell Valley has not been included. The buses are located right near CV and have to pass by there to get to Hampton.

The option of “NO” should be included for the members. The options given were unfair and not very well thought out.

Thank you,