Date: 12/09/2019, 1532 hrs
K. Panday

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 development currently taking place in the area is zoned for Hampton. The boundary study claims that, while the numbers aren't included in their study, it will "take into consideration" a rather clearly underestimated number of 25 kids coming from about 700 new residences. I think we can safely say that is not realistic. County planners have suggested the yield will be far greater.

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 students. 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 time,

Date: 12/09/2019, 2044 hrs
M. Fought

Hello Ms Causey, Ms. Henn, and The Boundary Study Committee,
I am greatly concerned about the very limited options the Boundary Study has to choose from. Yes, Pleasant Plains has a problems that needs immediate attention, but the solutions do not make sense:

Only 7 years ago Hampton Elementary was overcrowded. Hampton parents are already very concerned about several developments in our district that would currently allow 700 additional residences which BCPs has estimated would give us an additional 25 students. This is ridiculous. Why is it that the 9 other elementary schools between Pleasant Plains and Hampton have not been considered as potential relief for the overcrowding?? According to BCPs planning, Stoneleigh's enrollment is slated to decline in the next few years. Cromwell Valley is currently at 84% with no new developments.

Yes, Hampton would benefit from diversity but our gymnasium and cafeteria are not prepared for any further students, and are currently overflowing with students.

Please make the smart decision and vote no for all the options- A, B and C and let's find a solution that makes sense.

Thank you,

Date: 12/09/2019, 2105 hrs
J. Kurrle

Hello - I am a parent of two fourth graders at Hampton ES, one of the schools currently involved in the boundary study. I would like to voice my displeasure at the way this is playing out. I feel there is incomplete information being used to decide on a plan that will effect the lives of so many students and parents.

Hampton just recently completed a renovation and fixed the problem of overcrowding a few short years ago - I would hate to see it go back to overcrowding as a result of insufficient data being used to determine an outcome.

There are so many housing developments that are either in the works and or in plan but not fully realized yet that I find the projections of additional students to not be accurate.

In addition to all the other problems associated with moving students - bus problems, lunch overcrowding, gym overcrowding, long transportation times for students and parents. I think that more than three schools should be included in the study. There are several additional under enrollment schools that should have been considered in this study.

I hope that you will all consider these thoughts before moving forward with a vote on this issue.

Thank you for your time,
concerned parent at Hampton ES
I am a concerned citizen of Baltimore County and would like to strongly encourage the boundary study to vote NO to all of the options proposed. This boundary study is not taking into consideration many important factors. All 3 of the options presented have the same problems. NONE of them address the bigger issues. Please take the time to start the process over. Look at other possible schools IN ADDITION to Hampton, so one school is not over-loaded with new students placing that school over-capacity.

WHY were only 3 schools originally chosen for the boundary study? There are at least 9 other schools in the immediate area. Who selected Hampton and Halstead to be the only schools to absorb the over-flow students from Pleasant Plains? This first step should have been the FIRST job of the boundary committee. Clearly, someone made the important decision prior to beginning the boundary study. It severely limited the options of the boundary committee. Vote NO! Start over and look at other schools as well.

This is only a temporary band-aid for Pleasant Plains. That community deserves funding to address the overcrowding at their school. By moving 100 students away from that school, it is only reducing the over-crowding just enough. Just enough so that Pleasant Plains will not qualify for capital investments money to truly address the problem.

The Hampton boundary has over 700 (SEVEN HUNDRED) new residences under construction!! It is the only elementary school in the immediate area that is expecting an influx of students over the next several years due to this construction. The boundary study has not taken this into account. The numbers of students from these new buildings will continue to grow and lead to even further over-crowding at Hampton. Why make this problem even worse by adding 100 students from Pleasant Plains?

Buses- Some Hampton students are already on the bus for over 30 minutes. This is AFTER waiting 20 minutes for their bus to arrive at school to pick them up. The issues with the bus transportation is a whole other matter. However, by adding 100 students to the Hampton bus routes, this will only complicate the problem and these new students who are now being bused further from their community will have LENGTHY bus ride. (While driving right past other possible elementary schools!)

Please take the time to seriously consider these points. Vote NO! There must be other options.

Thank you,

Date: 12/10/2019, 1042, 1050 hrs
T. Fitzgerald

I am the parent of two children who attend Hampton Elementary School. My children are currently in kindergarten and first grade. I am emailing to strongly encourage the option to vote “NO” to the current plans presented in the boundary study. I believe that this study has attempted to force committee members to vote for one of three inadequate plans. I request a vote “NO” 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 development currently taking place in the area is zoned for Hampton. The boundary study claims that, while the numbers aren't included in their study, it will "take into consideration" a rather clearly underestimated number of 25 kids coming from about 700 new residences. I think we all know that this is not realistic, as county planners have suggested the yield will be far greater.

3) Only three schools considered - 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 also use schools closer to Pleasant Plains, such as Cromwell Valley 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 - Hampton is in full support of increased diversity in its school. It should be noted that Stoneleigh is less diverse than Hampton and should be considered as an option.

5) Cafeteria and Gymnasium - 7 years ago Hampton was at around 180% capacity when the renovation was approved and completed. 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 pm because they have so many lunch shifts to accommodate their population. This is detrimental to student well-being.

6) Maintaining Continuity of Neighborhoods - This study clearly does not maintain continuity of the Pleasant Plains neighborhood. Hampton transportation - Any of these options pushes our bus system even farther beyond its already stressed state and means far longer commutes for children. This is detrimental to student well-being.

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. This is wrong and incredibly detrimental to student well-being.

Overall, we are all aware of the intense development occurring in Towson, and it is baffling that this study does not seem to consider that this development will overwhelm Hampton Elementary all on its own, even without changing the boundaries. The options presented only shift overcrowding from one school to another as a way to avoid capital investment in our local schools. Other options must be considered, as the current options are inadequate and detrimental to student well-being. Thank you for considering the option to vote “NO.”

Sincerely,

Date: 12/10/2019, 1042, 1050 hrs
R. Wirley

I am the parent of two children who attend Hampton Elementary School. My children are currently in kindergarten and first grade. I am emailing to strongly encourage the option to vote “NO” to the current plans presented in the boundary study. I believe that this study has attempted to force committee members to vote for one of three inadequate plans. I request a vote “NO” 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 development currently taking place in the area is zoned for Hampton. The boundary study claims that, while the numbers aren't included in their study, it will "take into consideration" a rather clearly underestimated number of 25 kids coming from about 700 new residences. I think we all know that this is not realistic, as county planners have suggested the yield will be far greater.

3) Only three schools considered - 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 also use schools closer to Pleasant Plains, such as Cromwell Valley 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 - Hampton is in full support of increased diversity in its school. It should be noted that Stoneleigh is less diverse than Hampton and should be considered as an option.

5) Cafeteria and Gymnasium - 7 years ago Hampton was at around 180% capacity when the renovation was approved and completed. 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 pm because they have so many lunch shifts to accommodate their population. This is detrimental to student well-being.

6) Maintaining Continuity of Neighborhoods - This study clearly does not maintain continuity of the Pleasant Plains neighborhood. Hampton transportation - Any of these options pushes our bus system even farther beyond its already stressed state and means far longer commutes for children. This is detrimental to student well-being.

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. This is wrong and incredibly detrimental to student well-being.

Overall, we are all aware of the intense development occurring in Towson, and it is baffling that this study does not seem to consider that this development will overwhelm Hampton Elementary all on its own, even without changing the boundaries. The options presented only shift overcrowding from one school to another as a way to avoid capital investment in our local schools. Other options must be considered, as the current options are inadequate and detrimental to student well-being. Thank you for considering the option to vote “NO.”

Sincerely,
I request a "No" vote to the boundary capacity study 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 county 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 development currently taking place in the area is zoned for Hampton. The boundary study claims that, while the numbers aren't included in their study, it "take into consideration" a rather clearly underestimated number of 25 kids coming from about 700 new residences. I think we can safely say that is not realistic. County planners have suggested the yield will be far greater.

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.  ALSO, why not reopen Loch Raven Elementary in the same neighborhood as Pleasant Plains. This was proposed in years past as a solution for Halstead Academy.

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. HAVE WE THOUGHT ABOUT REOPENING LOCH RAVEN ELEMENTARY? This would allow the community to stay together and would relieve the over enrollment of Pleasant Plains Elementary. This was proposed in years past to help Halstead Academy.

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.
Dear Boundary Study Members,

As a parent at Hampton Elementary, I am concerned that this study has attempted to force the committee members to vote for one of three inadequate plans. I request and advise that the members ask for a "No Vote" be added as an option. To be clear, I am not requesting that the members abstain from their vote. 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 development currently taking place in the area is zoned for Hampton. The boundary study claims that, while the numbers aren't included in their study, it will "take into consideration" a rather clearly underestimated number of 25 kids coming from about 700 new residences. That is not realistic. County planners have suggested the yield will be far greater.

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) 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.

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

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.

With respect from a concerned parent,

N. Emerson
Please choose "no" vote tomorrow evening for the Boundary study for PPES, HES, and Halstead Academy. Furthermore, consider reopening Loch Raven Elementary School to support over-enrollment at PPES.

I am the parent of a second grader and kindergartner at Hampton Elementary. I am opposed to all three options currently on the table for a vote tomorrow. I urge the Board to consider other plans, instead of adopting one of the three proposals.

I myself am a graduate of Hampton Elementary, and I vividly recall when Hampton absorbed students from Cromwell Valley Elementary when Cromwell closed in the 1980s. Hampton’s administration and teachers coached all of us on how to be warm and inviting for our new classmates. I can attest from that experience, Hampton has always been, and will continue to be, the MOST welcoming school family any child or parent could ask for.

That said, Hampton parents’ concerns and opposition to the proposed plans are NOT about Hampton fighting with PPES or Halstead. We are fighting the proposed NUMBERS only and asking that the board explore and consider some sort of alternate plan(s) than the three options currently on the table. Hampton parents agree that the overcrowding at Pleasant Plains is unacceptable and unfortunate. As parents of young learners, we collectively empathize with the Pleasant Plains parents, as well as with the teachers and administration. Every child deserves a great education and their school population situation is dire and clearly needs a workable and fair solution. However, the proposed solutions will create YET ANOTHER dire situation at Hampton in a few short years. All three proposed boundary maps only partially solve Pleasant Plains’ problem, while creating a similar problem at Hampton, a mere six years from when Hampton required trailers as classrooms!

Hampton would receive a disproportionate number of additional students in any of the three boundary options, given the total number of new residences being built in Towson, or slated to be built within a couple of years. (Keep in mind that there are even MORE developments being proposed that could be approved within a year or two!) As has been previously stated by other HES parents, the projected number of students Hampton would receive from the new developments has been grossly underestimated. The three options are additionally short-sighted, as they do not even consider normal population growth for Hampton’s current boundary, beyond the new residences.

The situation of school overcrowding is akin to a doctor ONLY treating the symptoms of a patient, instead of the underlying cause(s). According to this September 2018 graph from BCPS and Baltimore County Government, 40% of BCPS elementary schools are ALREADY over 100% capacity. Sixty-five percent of BCPS elementary schools are at or above 95% capacity. Is BCPS working with Baltimore County government to devise workable plans address the overarching and systemic issue of school overcrowding? Just as a doctor would never use a Band-Aid to heal a broken bone, we cannot use a Band-Aid (even a temporary one!) to heal a systemic overcrowding issue. If the cause of PPES overcrowding is indeed residential density within their current boundary, then why isn’t it an option to expand PPES itself? Expanding the school itself would maintain continuity and cohesiveness within their neighborhoods. Why are other schools such as Stoneleigh and Cromwell Valley not part of this study? According to the BCPS Annual Report of Student Enrollments, School Utilization, and Enrollment Projections:

- Hampton’s student population is projected to remain relatively flat for the next 9 years. Does this projection consider the many residences being built or being planned?
- Stoneleigh Elementary is currently over capacity, but in four short years, is projected to be UNDER their state rated capacity by nearly 150 seats!
- Obviously, because Cromwell Valley is a magnet school, it takes in students differently (and I admittedly do not understand the process for this), but is this malleable? Is there any good reason BCPS should not enable PPES students from being part of THAT program, since of HES’s students. Given that HES’s current capacity is quickly approaching 90%, is it an option to divide PPES’s students among more schools (schools that would be geographically closer!) than just Hampton? I fear that unless we can come up with a long term solution, then any short term solution is bound to create similar issues at Hampton. I urge the Board to consider other plans, instead of adopting one of the three proposals.

Thank you so much for your consideration and work for Baltimore County’s students and their families.

Hello, I am writing to ask that you abstain from the vote. 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 development currently taking place in the area is zoned for Hampton. The boundary study claims that, while the numbers aren't included in their study, it will "take into consideration" a rather clearly underestimated number of 25 kids coming from about 700 new residences. I think we can safely say that is not realistic. County planners have suggested the yield will be far greater.

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?), 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.

Source: Boundary Study Inbox (boundarystudy@bcps.org) unless otherwise noted
Prepared by the Baltimore County Public Schools
Office of Strategic Planning, December 2019
To whom it may concern:

C. Evans

This study has attempted to force the committee members to vote for one of three inadequate plans. I request a "NO" vote for the following reasons:

I am writing to object to the boundary study for a multitude of reasons. Please take the time to conduct a fair and thorough assessment as our kids clearly need 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.

Greetings, I am writing to express my concern for each of the three current options offered in the Pleasant Plains Boundary Study and request that a "None of the above" response choice be made available. The three options appear to be slight variations of the same general change and 1) do not take into account current development in the current Hampton Elementary School catchment area and 2) do not take into account current 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.

Prepared by the Baltimore County Public Schools
Office of Strategic Planning, December 2019
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.

Sincerely,

M. Christopher

PLEASE VOTE NO, none of the options actually work, please ask for more solutions that don’t only involve planing 100+ kids at Hampton ES and overcrowding that school as well, a school that was previously overcrowded. PLEASE SEE POINT #5, Hampton was never designed, or redesigned at the time of the addition for more students, like the cafeteria and the gym spaces.

Please vote for a solution that actually helps Pleasant Plains in the long run, they admitted that it’s a short term, imperfect solution. So let’s come up with a better one.

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 development currently taking place in the area is zoned for Hampton. The boundary study claims that, while the numbers aren't included in their study, it will "take into consideration" a rather clearly underestimated number of 25 kids coming from about 700 new residences. I think we can safely say that is not realistic. County planners have suggested the yield will be far greater.

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 10:30 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.

Please vote NO and let’s get a better solution together, the Pleasant Plains ES community deserves an actual addition, not simply ignoring the physical limitations of the campus by moving some kids to Hampton. And the Hampton ES community deserves to not be put right back in the situation they just got out of, an overcrowded school.

Date: 12/10/2019, 1552 hrs

G. Frizzer

Hello - I am reaching out as a concerned parent and member of the community. I am deeply concerned and frustrated with the Pleasant Plains Rezoning, and the impact that it will have on the students of Hampton, Halstead Academy & Pleasant Plains Elementary schools and their communities. I feel that this study has attempted to force the committee members to vote for one of three inadequate plans. I ask that you 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 Plans 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 development currently taking place in the area is zoned for Hampton. The boundary study claims that, while the numbers aren't included in the...
Have these issues been overlooked for so long? And now we have to select from inadequate options because the situation is so drastic that we meet at Loch Raven Academy and my husband attended the most recent board of education meeting. It is sad to hear of the overcrowding we are facing now and clearly have been for some time. I have been to a few of the boundary study meetings at Loch Raven Academy and my husband attended the most recent board of education meeting. It is sad to hear of the overcrowding at Pleasant Plains, Halstead and honestly many other Baltimore County elementary schools that appear to be well over capacity. How do we meet these needs?

I am sending this email out as a concerned BCPS parent. I have a nine year old and six year old currently enrolled at Hampton Elementary. I grew up in Howard County in the 90s where education was a major focus and probably a good deal of the high taxes my parents paid contributed to this. That being said, I am more and more disappointed with the BCPS system. Maybe our family needs to move (again) as that would be a solution to the massive overcrowding issue we are facing now and clearly have been for some time. I have been to a few of the boundary study meetings at Loch Raven Academy and my husband attended the most recent board of education meeting. It is sad to hear of the overcrowding at Pleasant Plains, Halstead and honestly many other Baltimore County elementary schools that appear to be well over capacity. How have these issues been overlooked for so long? And now we have to select from inadequate options because the situation is so drastic that we need to fix it immediately. Crazy that just 4 years ago our family moved from Loch Raven Village to the Hampton school district.

I encourage the committee to examine the role that Cromwell Valley ES could play in relieving overcrowding. It seems logical to open seats at Cromwell Valley if there isn’t enough space for students that live in the area. At the very least, I feel that the committee must clearly communicate to the BOE that they’re aware that the limitations of this study will just shift the overcrowding to a different school. Thank you for your consideration,

Date: 12/10/2019, 1907 hrs
M. Kovacs

Good afternoon,

I am writing to ask that you consider rejecting all three options that were proposed to reduce overcrowding at Pleasant Plains. Simply overcrowding a different school isn’t a suitable solution. Hampton’s current enrollment is over 600 students and you’re proposing adding 90 students. Capacity at Hampton was just increased to 670 students after the study started. This leads to overcrowding at Hampton without even considering three major construction projects within the current boundary lines. Enrollment from these projects is likely significantly underestimated at this time. Hampton’s cafeteria and gymnasium aren’t large enough to support a community this large. In no way am I disputing that Pleasant Plains needs relief and support. However, I struggle to understand why there weren’t any other solutions considered. I encourage the committee to examine the role that Cromwell Valley ES could play in relieving overcrowding. It seems logical to open seats at Cromwell Valley if there isn’t enough space for students that live in the area. At the very least, I feel that the committee must clearly communicate to the BOE that they’re aware that the limitations of this study will just shift the overcrowding to a different school.

Thank you for your consideration,

Date: 12/10/2019, 1907 hrs
A. Zachmann

I am sending this email out as a concerned BCPS parent. I have a nine year old and six year old currently enrolled at Hampton Elementary. I grew up in Howard County in the 90s where education was a major focus and probably a good deal of the high taxes my parents paid contributed to this. That being said, I am more and more disappointed with the BCPS system. Maybe our family needs to move (again) as that would be a solution to the massive overcrowding issue we are facing now and clearly have been for some time. I have been to a few of the boundary study meetings at Loch Raven Academy and my husband attended the most recent board of education meeting. It is sad to hear of the overcrowding situation at Pleasant Plains, Halstead and honestly many other Baltimore County elementary schools that appear to be well over capacity. How have these issues been overlooked for so long? And now we have to select from inadequate options because the situation is so drastic that we need to fix it immediately. Crazy that just 4 years ago our family moved from Loch Raven Village to the Hampton school district. It seems this study is forcing the boundary study committee members to vote for one of three plans that will not be a permanent fix to the problem and WILL put Hampton over capacity. I have seen many emails going around with stats and points of views and I have pulled out some solid stats to support voting no for all options we have been presented. These reasons are as followed:

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 development currently taking place in the area is zoned for Hampton. The boundary study claims that, while the numbers aren’t included in their study, it will “take into consideration” a rather clearly underestimated number of 25 kids coming from about 700 new residences. I think we can safely say that is not realistic. County planners have suggested the yield will be far greater.

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 - 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
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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 time in reading this very long email. I hope you do take some of these points into consideration.

Date: 12/10/2019, 2308 hrs
E. Luzar

Dear members of the Pleasant Plains Study,

I want to express my concerns for the current study regarding the Pleasant Plains redistricting. In reviewing the plans and options set forth, I believe that there is very little variation from one option to the next. It also seems that the expectations for future students from new housing developments seem low. All of the options seem to favor a very narrow plan of transporting a large number of children across several school areas to Hampton. It seems clear to me that new capacity is needed for a growing population and there doesn't seem to be a long term plan for that. Bus transportation options are not ideal. Moving kids from one over crowded school to another school that could soon face overcrowding doesn't seem like the right path. I think we should push for a longer term plan for our children.

Date: 12/10/2019, 2347, 2352 hrs
B. Luzar

I strongly object to all proposed options in the Pleasant Plains Elementary School (PPES) Capacity Relief Boundary Study. This boundary study, if passed, will shift overcapacity to one school to avoid investment in another. All options rely on a transportation solution that ignores neighborhood continuity. All of the options will deprioritize future investment in the schools nearest to the redistricted populations. Baltimore county children deserve better. This kind of policy is unacceptable and is the reason I request that the boundary study committee members and Board of Education reject all options presented.

1. Misleading Data and Artificial Constraints

The lack of transparency and misleading data presented has been shocking. The Baltimore County Department of Planning currently projects that approved developments will add 65 students to Hampton Elementary. Certified planners at the Baltimore County Department of Planning have developed and maintained this projection over the course of the last decade. Their work is deliberate, certified, and transparent. The work of these county planners has been informed by analyses completed by Cropper GIS and Baltimore County Public Schools (BCPS). During the September 23rd Boundary Study Meeting, BCPS and Cropper GIS provided a different number to the committee; stating that student yield from these developments would be 25 students. Nevertheless, the committee is asked to consider only a baseline case that assumes ZERO additional students. In considering the best course of action for area schools, it is essential that the committee recognizes that, of the ten closest elementary schools surrounding PPES, only Hampton has approved development projects; and they are significant. The lack of foresight, transparency, and diligence by BCPS is nothing short of insulting.

The Boundary Study is arbitrarily constrained to three schools: Hampton, Pleasant Plains and Halstead. Without adequate explanation, the Committee has been directed to ignore closer and more practical solutions. Relative to the redistricted populations, the schools of Cromwell Valley, Harford Hills, Oakleigh, Rodgers Forge, Stoneleigh, and Villa Cresta are all CLOSER than Hampton. There is NO approved future development that will affect these schools.

• Cromwell Valley – Any study that aims to equitably leverage school capacity in the central zone must criticize and account for the size, location, and existence of the Cromwell Valley magnet program. It is difficult to understand how the board continues to withhold needed capacity from a school that is already overcrowded. The PPES community clearly needs capacity relief. More importantly, PPES requires immediate capital investment. The latest BCPS approved developments will add 65 students to Hampton Elementary. Certified planners at the Baltimore County Department of Planning have developed and maintained this projection over the course of the last decade. Their work is deliberate, certified, and transparent. These county planners have informed analyses completed by Cropper GIS and Baltimore County Public Schools (BCPS). During the September 23rd Boundary Study Meeting, BCPS and Cropper GIS provided a different number to the committee; stating that student yield from these developments would be 25 students. Nevertheless, the committee is asked to consider only a baseline case that assumes ZERO additional students. In considering the best course of action for area schools, it is essential that the committee recognizes that, of the ten closest elementary schools surrounding PPES, only Hampton has approved development projects; and they are significant. The lack of foresight, transparency, and diligence by BCPS is nothing short of insulting.

• Stoneleigh – Enrollment at Stoneleigh Elementary is predicted to steadily decline to be 150 students under-enrolled in 10 years with no discernible development taking place to add students.

More troublesome, the committee was shown irrelevant utilization data for all nearby schools. Among the 12 schools presented, only Hampton Elementary, Halstead Academy and Pleasant Plains Elementary School (PPES) had their State Rated Capacity (SRC) reassessed in 2019. Without adequate explanation and since other schools were excluded from the study, other SCRIs were not reassessed to determine if additional capacity is available at those schools. It appears as if the committee is uninformed or possibly being misled regarding development in Hampton and the real time enrollments and trends in other nearby schools.

2. The Study is Designed to Skillfully and Silently Avoid Capital Investment at PPES

The PPES community clearly needs capacity relief. More importantly, PPES requires immediate capital investment. The latest BCPS "Systemwide Physical Facilities Assessment" states "Core spaces are significantly undersized. Elevation changes within the building create accessibility concerns. Mechanical systems are in poor condition." Hearing the PPES principal, Mrs. Joyce Albert, describe the challenges resulting from an extremely aged infrastructure during our meetings has been heart-breaking. Our kids deserve so much better. Unfortunately, the options provided in this boundary study do not serve PPES or its students. All options will bias future capital investments in the PPES catchment as PPES’s utilization rate is temporarily driven lower. BCPS capital planning will drop PPES to the bottom of the queue for a new facility or renovation. Additionally, safeguards at the Baltimore County Department of Planning will be lifted, allowing developers to build PPES back to overcapacity levels but with the same aged school. PPES needs capital improvements now, not short-sighted, band-aid solutions.

This redistricting aims to undermine investment in PPES. PPES students will not benefit from disrupting their education by uprooting them and sending them to a school that is being overcrowded itself by development. Despite the roadblocks, excuses, and misinformation provided by BCPS, the communities have engaged in deep thinking outside of the confined boundary study process. The communities have proposed alternatives that would provide partial short-term capacity relief to PPES, avoid overcrowding Hampton Elementary, and prioritize capital expenditure at PPES going forward. These alternatives are supported by published...
County and BCPS data. Specifically, a partial redistricting of some northwestern planning blocks in the PPES catchment would satisfy these criteria. This and other alternatives have been ignored by representatives of BCPS for the last six months. Put bluntly, BCPS is NOT listening to the community. Seeing that the study is not flexible to alternatives, I am now simply rejecting the study in its entirety. The study participants and communities have requested a transparent dataset and school projections on countless occasions. BCPS has refused to provide these data and projections. BCPS representatives have led the community to believe that all schools excluded from the study are growing and are expected to continue to grow. 2019 utilization data and BCPS’s own projections suggest that these statements are blatant lies. It also appears that these constraints and exclusions were made possible when BCPS revised Rule 1280 in July 2019 after launching the PPES Capacity Relief study.

The below charts have been created using only official Baltimore County development projections, 2018 Student Counts Report data, and assumed SRC reassessments for the schools. I recognize that I am not a city planner, school capacity specialists, or school enrollment projection specialists. I don’t have access to a complete dataset. I don’t have 9 months and $125,000 to complete the required study, but I am concerned that this study has been crafted with timely rule changes, misleading analyses, data discrepancies, and false statements. Hampton Elementary School, PPES, and Halstead Academy should not be the only options considered in a redistricting study. Some schools closer to PPES but excluded from the study have expected and actual declining utilizations. Some schools excluded from the study but closer to Hampton are already over capacity and have rising utilizations.
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It is my observation that the communities of Halstead, Hampton, and Pleasant Plains have requested projections but received understated historical data. The communities have engaged in deep thinking but received shallow excuses. The communities have assumed fairness and respect but have been deliberately mislead. The communities have offered up alternatives but were ignored. All schools should be included in a redistricting study such as this. All schools should have their SRC's reassessed. Pleasant Plains should be renovated and expanded now! Our children deserve a comprehensive analysis that does not bypass the robust planning processes in Baltimore County. BCPS has left the communities no real choices. I am ready to listen, learn, and solve if you are willing to do the same.

Regards,

Date: 12/11/2019, 1109 hrs
S. Wilen

To whom it may concern,

Good morning. My name is Sarah Wilen, and I am a parent of a kindergartner at Hampton elementary. I am writing in the hopes that you vote no tonight to the available options for the pleasant plains boundary study. None of them appear to be viable options, and will only serve to put Hampton elementary into the same predicament. There is currently aggressive building occurring in the Towson area and all of the children will be zoned for Hampton. We moved to the area specifically for the schools and I worry that if the classroom sizes are over capacity, our children’s learning will suffer.

Thank you for your consideration and time,

Emails Received from Other Sources:

Date: 12/03/2019, 1449 hrs
R. Ball

Dr. Wheatley-Phillip, thanks for the detailed response to parents regarding the Pleasant Plains Capacity Relief Boundary Study. I have a few questions that I’m hoping you can clarify.

1. There seems to be a wide discrepancy between the student yield projections that the County uses and that the BCPS system uses – even though both seem to be based on the same documents/studies. Can you point me to a resource (ideally an actual person/group) that can help us understand why BCPS projections are vastly different than the County’s projections for student yields from the same developments – seemingly by a huge margin?

2. What does “the average elementary student yield for (the Quarters) between 2013 and 2015 was 15 students.” mean? It is my understanding that there are 80 students from this development currently attending Hampton, versus the 12 that were projected by BCPS. Is your letter making the point that BSPC projections are very accurate (i.e. average of 15 student versus initial projection of 12).….or is the letter saying there are not ~80 students at Hampton Elem currently from this development – that the number is much closer to 15?

3. Your letter states that Cromwell Valley is currently at 89% utilization, and that one additional fifth grade class will be enrolled next year, which “implies capacity will reach full enrollment.” The 2018 SCR is listed in the Student Count at 411 students. One additional class would seem to increase the utilization by ~6%, which implies not full capacity, but rather ~95% capacity. Is this a fair way to think about it?

4. Your letter mentions Cromwell Valley having “site limitations that do not allow for the placement of relocatable classroom units.” Can you point me to anything that can educate us on those limitations.

5. The second to last sentence of the letter states, “the annexation of gradess to another school”. Can you help clarify that sentence. Is the point that moving 23 students at random to another school is not a viable option? (Which seems very logical.)

Thanks – very much appreciate your time….and all that you do for our children!

Date: 11/15/2019, 1437 hrs
J. Jaeger

I would like to start out by thanking all those involved with the boundary study and capacity relief for Pleasant Plains Elementary school. I know it is hard work and it takes a lot of time and dedication. Many people have volunteered themselves for this effort, and I applaud that.

But when all of this is said and done, when the BCPS board has chosen what map to draw - how do we make it matter? How do we turn this into something that actually makes a difference? Because, as of now- all this hard work, redrawing lines, moving families to different schools- it is all moot if nothing is done to address the real problem here. Right now, we are looking at one tiny tree in a forest of problems.

Our real problem is that there has been a long line of very irresponsible development going on in Baltimore County and I haven’t seen any tangible evidence of fixing the current schools and infrastructure; let alone address the new problems that arise with improperly planned development. All of our schools are facing over crowding. If a school is not currently over crowded - it is at a high enough percentage that it definitely will be within the next couple of years. And this is a county wide problem. All students, no matter where they live in this county, deserve a good education. A crowded school does not provide a safe or a good education.

For the sake of this argument being about PPES, I will focus my attention there for the time being. I think it is a complete fallacy that 2018 numbers are being used in this study. Also, even though it was mentioned in the meetings that new construction was being taken into consideration- it does not seem that way in any of the options provided for new boundaries. This school year, all three schools involved in the study (Hampton Elementary, Halstead Academy, Pleasant Plains Elementary) have higher enrollment than 2018. And it will keep rising. How and when will decision-makers take into account that there are several new construction projects in the area that will likely bring a huge number of new students to Hampton’s district?

When they were building the apartment complex on the corner of Fairmount and Dulaney Valley Road, the principal of HES was told that they could expect about 12-15 new students at Hampton. HES has 80 students from that planning block. I assure you, that each and every construction project already under way will bring tenfold more students than anyone is projecting.

In addition to the lack of foresight in looking at real numbers- I want to know why Hampton and Halstead are the only schools in this study. And I want to know why more isn’t being done by BCPS and Baltimore County to alleviate this problem instead of just moving around a bunch of families and thinking they are fixing something. Oakleigh Elementary and Harford Hills are much closer to some planning blocks that go to PPES that would change to HES- which makes no sense at all. Why bus kids across the boundaries of two separate schools to get to a third school, when there is another school right down the street?
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I am also perplexed and frustrated as to why decision-makers did not consider (nor explain to the stakeholders) an expansion of Cromwell Valley Elementary outside of its magnet program. There are surrounding neighborhoods that CVES could take on that would also alleviate PPES- and it would reduce the need for extra bussing. I am also in a quandary why the old Loch Raven Elementary cannot be utilized. Why cannot that be a school once again? We obviously need it.

This is a tiny solution to an enormous problem. Not only will our population continue to grow, how will all this over crowding affect our middle schools and our high schools? We already know we are facing catastrophic overcrowding of our high schools in the next 5-10 years. Does that forecast include what is happening with our elementary schools already? Or is it yet more oversight that decision-makers are not willing to see? We need more schools. We need to expand, utilize and facilitate the use of buildings and schools that are capable of assisting this over crowding problem (like Cromwell and Loch Raven ES). But we just really need more schools. We cannot allow any more development to occur until this problem is completely addressed or our entire community will crumble. Baltimore County is building skyscrapers on sand. You cannot have a good community without good schools. And an overcrowded school is not a good school.

Let’s work together to look at the bigger picture and solve this problem before our county implodes. I know you are in it for the right reason. I am here to fight with you. Let’s do this for our kids. For our neighborhoods. For all of us.

Thank you,