
From: Jeannie Dunning [<mailto:dunninghome@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 1:49 PM

To: Cynthia A. Armstrong <carmstro@pasco.k12.fl.us>; Alison G. Crumbley <acrumble@pasco.k12.fl.us>; Colleen Rene Beaudoin <crbeaudoin@pasco.k12.fl.us>; Allen Altman <alaltman@pasco.k12.fl.us>; James S. Luikart <jluikart@pasco.k12.fl.us>; Christopher G. Williams <cwilliam@pasco.k12.fl.us>

Cc: Elizabeth P. Kuhn <ekuhn@pasco.k12.fl.us>; Raymond E. Gadd <rgadd@pasco.k12.fl.us>

Subject: Map A

Mr. Williams and Honorable School Board Members,

Thank you so much for your reply and acknowledging suggestions, considering and sharing. I appreciate it.

When you say, "Map 11 was NOT developed by last year's boundary committee." That is a bit confusing because I thought the committee was put together to gather input from the community and the members on the committee were to present ideas. Are you saying that because it was not created by the district office that it was not developed by the committee?

Just because someone else was more boisterous and did not like this map, doesn't mean it isn't a viable solution. You are correct that it was not just one person on the committee "Map 11 was the preferred map by some citizens in last year's rezoning process." It certainly was a map that was discussed and voted upon in the boundary committee. In fact, during one of the boundary meetings I attended this map was supported by almost all community committee members, school based staff were the only ones verbally opposing this plan.

As far as the interconnected road between Asturia and Starkey Ranch I was not referring to Tower Road as you mention to me in your reply and to the board. I am aware of that future road (Tower) and it is also called Rangeland Road. It is now an approved road and you can also see it on the attachment to this email. The interconnecting road(s) I was/am addressing are actually called Long Spur Road and Gladstone Drive (I'm attaching one google satellite image that shows it already under construction and one developer map to view them on). Clearly, these two roads are under construction and will connect Asturia and Starkey Ranch. I'm once again surprised to see statements like this being made without actually going to see the developments and knowing the areas you are looking at redistricting. Isn't this an important enough decision that you would actually visit the areas you are moving and looking at for rezoning?

Without addressing previous maps and to avoid confusion by speaking of past maps I would like to refer to this proposal as Map A.

Again, my proposal (Map A):

1. Approve Superintendent Brownings current proposed map with the only following change: Trade Asturia for Longleaf neighborhoods 1, 2, 3/Ellington/Sienna Woods.

2. If you feel the need, keep Longleaf N4 and N5 slated for RR schools as those families would be purchasing their home well aware of the school it is zoned for. Longleaf neighborhood 5 is not connected to Longleaf by a road. The entrance of Longleaf neighborhood 5 is actually further away from my home than the SSMS/JWMHS campus. Yes, neighborhood 4 is currently off the table, but yes like your email it could technically be bought by a builder someday.

I would also like Mr. Gadd to continue with his process of address verification which he spoke of during the board meeting I attended. He said it would result in a 3% reduction. If you use the current enrollment projected for 2018-2019 this would result in a reduction of 50 students from SSMS and 62 students from JWMHS. Address verification alone would remove more students than if you were to move area 12.

Can you please clarify if any of the following are incorrect about my proposal and if so, how:

- Reduces the numbers at SSMS/Mitchell.
- Keeps disruption to the amount of established students to a minimum
- Keeps communities which are already established together at SSMS/JWMHS
- This plan keeps communities together that will attend Starkey K-8 in three years keeping the criteria of subdivision integrity and follows feeder pattern.
- Per the data sheet on the rezone page, River Ridge High is at 88.8% capacity and can more readily absorb the new growth of Asturia with the projection of 90.8% for 2018-2019 school year.
- Fixes the broken feeder pattern under the current proposed plan for area 13 (Fairway Springs). Under the current proposed plan area 13 would be the only neighborhood to attend LLES and then go to middle school not knowing anyone.

I do not have the means to create a professional map to compare to the current proposed map. May I please request a map to be drawn up by Mr. Williams and/or Zach with the projections on it that I have proposed and it be considered side by side to the board with the Superintendents map? I would like it to have projections on it that:

1. Include the removal of K Tech students (without using just an estimate anymore like on the projections right now, but the true count that we know for sure now).
2. Reflect the 3% reduction of students at SSMS/JWMHS per Mr. Gadd's address verification plan

Thank you for your consideration and I hope you all are able to see how Map A reduces the number of students at SSMS and Mitchell while having the least disruption on all established communities and keeping students and families together on the entire west side.

Jeannie Dunning