



Richard Montgomery Elementary School #5  
Boundary Study  
Comment Card  
May 9, 2017

- Can you provide the FARMS % without CI at CGES currently?  
*See [Option 5](#).*
- As a Hungerford resident, it seems to me that our neighborhood is growing more diverse as the original owner's age and sell their homes to young families. I expect the area to continue growing in diversity and keeping communities together will help us to develop real relationships across differences. I think options 1, 2, 5, and 6 would best facilitate community identity and "doing life" together. Options like 7 & 8 are not appealing at all, since they are really bizarrely shaped/disjointed. Option 4 also seems to make the RMES #5 area huge. Also, something to consider is that the number of elementary students has been increasing rapidly in Hungerford over the past 5 years (as the original owners move away)
- Thank you for MCPS staff for your work on the boundary advisory committee
- I support the CI program be moved from CGES to the new school RMES #5 to minimize current student displacement and to reduce a possible domino effect
- Only support Immersion moving to new school
- Falls Grove should not be moved to new school those kids already have a long trip to school and socially for kids will have too great a difficulty seeing friends – I do not live in Falls Grove but have a student in the GT at Barnsley. I see how the 25 minute bus ride negatively affects these young kids. We were able to accept it for 2 years but can only imagine how bad it would be for 6 year. Where we live so close to another county GT
- While no option satisfies the majority of criteria
  - Option 6 minimizes splits to community identifies by maintaining the CGES/Woodley Gardens neighborhoods
  - Minimizes travel time across the cluster
  - Considers the community support mechanisms (e.g. the Woodley Garden pool, preschool, playgrounds)
  - Promotes a diverse student body at all schools
  - Minimizes relocation of students as fewer students are moved under this option than any other
  - Provides room for growth where it is needed most – at schools along eth 355/town center corridor
  - Minimizes the domino effect
  - Minimizes displacement of students due to the CI program
  - Ensures stability over time, as capacity at Beall and RMES will support future growth
  - Option 6 provides the best cluster solution for Rockville and MCPS
- I would suggest RP2 taking bus to Ritchie Park even it looks close to RMES #5. The kids live in the apartments will not be able to go to school in bad weather due to their parents do not have a car
- I strongly oppose options #7 & #8 as a Falls Grove parent, these options would drastically increase travel times, reduce a feeling community and cause increased school disruption relative to the other options. I feel these options are not optimal from Ritchie Park perspective, moving RP2 and RP6 (as in options #1-6) at least allows them to be close to the new school/increase community with their local school. I support Options #1-#6
- I live in RP2 and I like options 1-6 because we would go to the school in our neighborhood, which would help us feel more connected to our school community and be more convenient
- I believe that option #6 meets the most criteria – more than other options for all schools. It leads to greatest community identity lowers movement, maximizes walkers and is best for most schools, especially Twinbrook and Ritchie. College Gardens will only be slightly over capacity
- It is not ok to change the social economic factors relate to Beall FARMS, ESOL that drastically as in Options 5-8 Options 1-3 is although Beall is over utilized it as acceptable

- Option 4 is one of the worst options and as a resident of CG2 I would like to oppose this option as it doesn't meet most of the criteria presented. Option 4 creates major domino effect, separates communities and increases travel times
- Could you please provide a follow-up information regarding the usage of portables if we opt for option 6 for CGES As a parent of CG2 I don't think being a little over capacity is fine and I am under the impression that portables will not be needed after CI leaves, but would like a confirmation to also appease other parents who are concerned with portables- Thanks\  
*There is not a set formula. Each year, staff in the Department of Facilities Management (DFM) compares revised enrollment projections with available space in order to assess the requirements for relocatable classrooms for the upcoming school year. In doing so the Office of School Support and Improvement and the Division of Long-range Planning (DLRP) will collaborate on issues related to programs and staffing.*
- Option 4 should not be implemented. If a zone must leave college gardens it follows the criteria that zone CG3 should be moved to Beall. Both CG2 and CG3 have virtually the identical number of students and demographics. However, CG2 is almost double the distance from Beall then CG3 is and would dramatically increase the travel time for the CG2 students. Moving CG2 would also needlessly leave that community on an island. As such, it follows the criteria that if a zone must be moved out of CG it should be CG3- Option4 ALSO MAXIMIZES the domino effect and displaces the most students among the 8 options
- I strongly oppose Option 4. It fails to meet several criteria. It fails to minimize travel time, fails to minimize relocation, fails to minimize displacement criteria and has capacity over 100% Specifically, I oppose moving CG2 to Beall. It would increase travel time significantly and leave CG 2 as an island removed from the rest of the school
- I am a fallsgrove resident with a child in 1<sup>st</sup> grade at Ritchie Park ES. I DO NOT support options 7 and 89, which move RP5 (Fallsgrove) to the new elementary school. These options deprive students who could walk to their elementary school (RP@ an RP6) if the opportunity to do so while busing the RP5 (Fallsgrove) yet further to RMES #5 The commute to Ritchie Park is far enough as it is – the even longer commute to RMES #5 would negatively affect participation in afterschool activities and time needed for homework and family/community interaction
- Thank you for your hard work. This cannot be easy and you have put a lot of thought into this process
- Regarding portables – College Gardens has a new development slated I do not consider portables a problem, but if we're already over capacity it will certainly be impacted –Derwood Technically not Rockville. Please keep Woodley gardens instead.
- The argument that physical proximity to the schools despite how 8 ES automatically increases family involvement is proven false by the experience of Twinbrook. It is the most walkable of all the 4 current schools and yet they have struggled to get enough families to form a PTA. They have extremely low family involvement despite easy access. It's not a question of proximity it's a question of will and interest
- This evening has been useful and informative I am strongly against options 7 & 8 as they; meet the least number of criteria for the RP5 (Fallsgrove) neighborhood. It increases our travel time breaks up our community and breaks up neighborhoods it makes it likely impossible to participate and attend anything at the new school and is unfair to our children from a travel time perspective. Thank you
- Options 7 & 8 do not meet many of the criteria set. Taking Fallsgrove out of Ritchie park, not only puts walkers to the new school back on a bus, it adds an unacceptable amount of time on the bus to young children it will add to their already long day and long bus ride. And is not in the best interest of the children. Isn't that why we're here? To do what is best for the kids. Options 7 & 8 don't help create a sense of community, they don't maximize walkers, and they don't minimize travel time. Thank you