


# Henrico County Public Schools, VA Redistricting Project for 2021:

## Public Information Session Survey Report

Revised: 03/25/2020



### Project Goals

1. *Efficiently using all available space and planning for future county growth.*
2. *Determining attendance boundaries for the expanded Holladay Elementary School (7300 Galaxie Road), which will double in size when an addition opens for the 2021-22 school year.*
3. *Accounting for the increased building capacity available when replacements for Highland Springs (15 S. Oak Ave.) and J. R. Tucker (2910 Parham Rd.) high schools open on their current sites for the 2021-22 school year.*
4. *Reducing concentrations of poverty while balancing a community or neighborhood school concept.*



Cropper GIS

## Public Information Session Survey Results

### Introduction

Two Public Information Sessions were held on March 4 and March 5 2020 during which the progress of the Henrico County Public Schools (HCPS) redistricting project was shared with the public. The latest DRAFT Options developed by the committee, Options D4 and E4, were displayed on large maps along with tables indicating how each met the guiding principles issued by HCPS. Approximately 350 community members attended the Public Information Sessions. The public was encouraged to provide their feedback regarding each boundary option for the committee's consideration. These questionnaires were accepted via an online survey until March 15, 2020.

The data that is presented as a result of this Public Information Session should be used as a tool to help facilitate the redistricting project. **It should not be used ALONE as a decision-making tool for the Redistricting Project.** The committee will utilize data from the information session (in this report), and will focus on the project guidelines as the primary criteria for developing the project's plan.

### Analysis Methodology

Received online surveys were exported to an excel spreadsheet. The spreadsheet tracked the date the comment was received, the elementary school zone the respondent is associated with, and the respondent's comments on each option.

In order to gain a better understanding of the responses, respondents were asked to provide the general attitude towards a comment based on the following categories: *Approve*, *Like*, *Neutral*, *Dislike* and *Oppose*. Respondents were also asked to provide a reason for concern if they did not support an option, in order to gain a better understanding of the nature of the objection. The prominent concern themes were Enrollment, Neighborhood, Transportation, Feeder Pattern, Demographics, or N/A.

In order to gain a better understanding of where most of the respondents are coming from throughout the district, the respondents were asked "In which elementary school zone do you live?".

The table on the right reflects that there were 2,019 total respondents to the survey, and the largest share of feedback was provided by community members who live in the Crestview, Maybeury, and Short Pump Elementary school zones.

Total Respondents by Live-In Elementary School Zone		
Live-In Elementary Zone	Total Respondents	Percent of Respondents
Carver ES	28	1.43%
Chamberlayne ES	2	0.10%
Colonial Trail ES	12	0.61%
Crestview ES	517	26.38%
Davis ES	53	2.70%
Dumbarton ES	1	0.05%
Echo Lake ES	6	0.31%
Gayton ES	48	2.45%
Glen Allen ES	19	0.97%
Greenwood ES	187	9.54%
Holladay ES	1	0.05%
Johnson ES	2	0.10%
Kaechele ES	16	0.82%
Lakeside ES	6	0.31%
Longan ES	48	2.45%
Longdale ES	4	0.20%
Maybeury ES	310	15.82%
Mehfoud and Varina ES	4	0.20%
Nuckols Farm ES	10	0.51%
Pemberton ES	49	2.50%
Pinchbeck ES	8	0.41%
Ridge ES	35	1.79%
Rivers Edge ES	57	2.91%
Sandston ES	1	0.05%
Shady Grove ES	23	1.17%
Short Pump ES	232	11.84%
Skipwith ES	3	0.15%
Springfield Park ES	104	5.31%
Trevvett ES	4	0.20%
Tuckahoe ES	155	7.91%
Twin Hickory ES	10	0.51%
Ward ES	5	0.26%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,960</b>	

Note: 59 respondents did not identify with an Elementary Zone.

### Option Attitude Summary Tables for All Submitted Comments


The following provides a general summary on the respondent's overall attitude related to DRAFT Options D4 and E4. Important points to consider as you read this set of tables:

1. The majority of responses that were submitted were in regard to the most suitable Option for the respondent's particular neighborhood / subdivision.
2. As is evident in the 'Total Respondents by Live-In Elementary School Zone' table on the previous page, the geographic distribution of respondents is uneven, so these summary tables should not be used as the ONLY defining factor or indicator over which Options are best suited for the entire district.
3. The committee needs to maintain focus on building a solution that best meets the Redistricting guidelines.

### Elementary Options Attitude Summary

When asked 'What is your overall attitude toward an ES option?' the largest percentage of respondents said they approve of ES Option D4. ES Option E4 had a lower percentage of respondent support (45% approve as compared to 59.8% for Option D4) and a higher percentage of respondent opposition (33.5% as compared to 10.4% for Option D4).

Elementary Options Attitude Summary				
Option Attitude	ES Option D4		ES Option E4	
Approve	1090	59.8%	817	45.0%
Like	68	3.7%	74	4.1%
Neutral	431	23.7%	244	13.5%
Dislike	43	2.4%	71	3.9%
Oppose	190	10.4%	608	33.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,822</b>		<b>1,814</b>	



### Elementary Primary Concerns Summary Tables


The table below shows what the primary concerns were for those that opposed an option. Of the stated concerns, feeder pattern concerns represented the largest share for both Option D4 (6.0%) and for Option E4 (23.0%).

Elementary School Options Primary Concern Summary				
Primary Concern	ES Option D4		ES Option E4	
Enrollment Concern	29	2.2%	51	3.5%
Neighborhood Concern	62	4.7%	173	11.9%
Transportation Concern	29	2.2%	65	4.5%
Feeder Pattern Concern	79	6.0%	334	23.0%
Demographics Concern	55	4.2%	69	4.7%
N/A	1070	80.8%	762	52.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,324</b>		<b>1,454</b>	

### Middle School Options Attitude Summary

When asked 'What is your overall attitude toward a MS option?' the largest percentage of respondents said they approved of MS Option D4 (55.2%), but a large share of respondents also stated their opposition to MS Option D4 (32.0%). MS Option E4 had a larger percentage of opposition than MS Option D4 and had less approval, with 42.5% of respondents approving of MS Option E4 and 44.1% of respondents opposing MS Option E4.

Middle School Option Attitude Summary				
Option Attitude	MS Option D4		MS Option E4	
Approve	1071	55.2%	819	42.5%
Like	80	4.1%	41	2.1%
Neutral	126	6.5%	151	7.8%
Dislike	42	2.2%	67	3.5%
Oppose	620	32.0%	851	44.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,939</b>		<b>1929</b>	



### Middle School Primary Concerns Summary Tables


The table below show what the primary concerns were for those who opposed an option. For MS Option D4, the greatest stated concerns were for enrollment concerns (23.8%). For MS Option E4, most stated concerns were related to feeder patterns (32.9%).

Middle School Options Primary Concern Summary				
Primary Concern	MS Option D4		MS Option E4	
Enrollment Concern	376	23.8%	37	2.5%
Neighborhood Concern	72	4.6%	178	11.8%
Transportation Concern	35	2.2%	130	8.6%
Feeder Pattern Concern	117	7.4%	496	32.9%
Demographics Concern	114	7.2%	102	6.8%
N/A	863	54.7%	566	37.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1577</b>		<b>1509</b>	

### High School Options Attitude Summary

When asked 'What is your overall attitude toward a HS option?' the largest percentage of respondents said they approved of HS Option D4 (55.1%) while fewer respondents said they approved of HS Option E4 (42.9%). Similarly, a larger share of respondents opposed HS Option E4 (47.4%) as compared to HS Option D4 (36.7%).

High School Option Attitude Summary				
Option Attitude	HS Option D4		HS Option E4	
Approve	1081	55.1%	846	42.9%
Like	54	2.8%	26	1.3%
Neutral	74	3.8%	108	5.5%
Dislike	34	1.7%	56	2.8%
Oppose	720	36.7%	934	47.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,963</b>		<b>1970</b>	



### High School Primary Concerns Summary Tables

The table below shows what the primary concerns were for those who opposed an option. Transportation and feeder pattern concerns represented a large share of responses for HS Option D4. Similarly, the greatest concerns related to HS Option E4 were feeder pattern, transportation, and neighborhood concerns.

High School Options Primary Concern Summary				
Primary Concern	HS Option D4		HS Option E4	
Enrollment Concern	114	7.1%	57	3.7%
Neighborhood Concern	156	9.7%	215	13.9%
Transportation Concern	280	17.3%	219	14.2%
Feeder Pattern Concern	192	11.9%	441	28.5%
Demographics Concern	102	6.3%	122	7.9%
N/A	771	47.7%	492	31.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1615</b>		<b>1546</b>	

### **Options Attitude Summary by Respondents Live-In Elementary Zone**

The table below shows the Elementary School Option D4 attitude summaries broken down by the live-in zones of the survey respondents.

Elementary Option D4 Attitude Summary by Respondent Live-In Elementary Zone								
Live-In Zone	Approve	Like	Neutral	Dislike	Oppose	Total	Percent Approve	Percent Oppose
Carver ES	4	0	12	1	8	25	16.0%	32.0%
Chamberlayne ES	1	1	0	0	0	2	50.0%	0.0%
Colonial Trail ES	10	0	1	1	0	12	83.3%	0.0%
Crestview ES	26	1	281	15	88	411	6.3%	21.4%
Davis ES	41	3	6	0	1	51	80.4%	2.0%
Dumbarton ES	1	0	0	0	0	1	100.0%	0.0%
Echo Lake ES	4	1	0	0	1	6	66.7%	16.7%
Gayton ES	25	9	4	3	6	47	53.2%	12.8%
Glen Allen ES	13	1	4	1	0	19	68.4%	0.0%
Greenwood ES	129	16	10	8	21	184	70.1%	11.4%
Holladay ES	0	1	0	0	0	1	0.0%	0.0%
Johnson ES	1	0	0	1	0	2	50.0%	0.0%
Kaechele ES	2	0	1	0	13	16	12.5%	81.3%
Lakeside ES	2	2	2	0	0	6	33.3%	0.0%
Longan ES	46	0	1	1	0	48	95.8%	0.0%
Longdale ES	1	2	1	0	0	4	25.0%	0.0%
Maybeury ES	280	11	15	0	4	310	90.3%	1.3%
Mehfoud and Varina ES	0	0	1	0	2	3	0.0%	66.7%
Nuckols Farm ES	6	0	3	0	1	10	60.0%	10.0%
Pemberton ES	33	1	10	2	0	46	71.7%	0.0%
Pinchbeck ES	1	0	1	1	5	8	12.5%	62.5%
Ridge ES	27	2	1	1	3	34	79.4%	8.8%
Rivers Edge ES	31	5	13	2	6	57	54.4%	10.5%
Sandston ES	1	0	0	0	0	1	100.0%	0.0%
Shady Grove ES	16	1	6	0	0	23	69.6%	0.0%
Short Pump ES	219	2	10	0	0	231	94.8%	0.0%
Skipwith ES	0	0	2	1	0	3	0.0%	0.0%
Springfield Park ES	48	7	30	1	17	103	46.6%	16.5%
Trevvett ES	0	0	0	1	2	3	0.0%	66.7%
Tuckahoe ES	108	2	12	2	5	129	83.7%	3.9%
Twin Hickory ES	5	0	0	0	5	10	50.0%	50.0%
Ward ES	3	0	1	0	0	4	75.0%	0.0%

The table below shows the Elementary School Option E4 attitude summaries broken down by the live-in zones of the survey respondents.

Elementary Option E4 Attitude Summary by Respondent Live-In Elementary Zone								
Live-In Zone	Approve	Like	Neutral	Dislike	Oppose	Total	Percent Approve	Percent Oppose
Carver ES	11	0	13	1	0	25	44.0%	0.0%
Chamberlayne ES	2	0	0	0	0	2	100.0%	0.0%
Colonial Trail ES	1	0	3	0	8	12	8.3%	66.7%
Crestview ES	379	6	20	1	8	414	91.5%	1.9%
Davis ES	12	3	15	2	14	46	26.1%	30.4%
Dumbarton ES	1	0	0	0	0	1	100.0%	0.0%
Echo Lake ES	4	1	0	0	1	6	66.7%	16.7%
Gayton ES	13	7	4	5	18	47	27.7%	38.3%
Glen Allen ES	9	1	3	1	4	18	50.0%	22.2%
Greenwood ES	40	18	18	11	94	181	22.1%	51.9%
Holladay ES	0	1	0	0	0	1	0.0%	0.0%
Johnson ES	1	0	0	1	0	2	50.0%	0.0%
Kaechele ES	13	0	1	0	2	16	81.3%	12.5%
Lakeside ES	1	1	3	0	1	6	16.7%	16.7%
Longan ES	46	0	1	1	0	48	95.8%	0.0%
Longdale ES	1	2	0	0	0	3	33.3%	0.0%
Maybeury ES	47	3	45	16	198	309	15.2%	64.1%
Mehfoud and Varina ES	0	0	1	0	2	3	0.0%	66.7%
Nuckols Farm ES	5	1	3	0	1	10	50.0%	10.0%
Pemberton ES	16	1	18	0	9	44	36.4%	20.5%
Pinchbeck ES	1	0	1	1	5	8	12.5%	62.5%
Ridge ES	2	1	3	7	21	34	5.9%	61.8%
Rivers Edge ES	30	5	11	2	8	56	53.6%	14.3%
Sandston ES	1	0	0	0	0	1	100.0%	0.0%
Shady Grove ES	12	1	8	1	0	22	54.5%	0.0%
Short Pump ES	77	17	33	2	101	230	33.5%	43.9%
Skipwith ES	0	0	2	0	1	3	0.0%	33.3%
Springfield Park ES	55	4	31	3	9	102	53.9%	8.8%
Trevvett ES	0	0	0	1	2	3	0.0%	66.7%
Tuckahoe ES	19	1	5	14	94	133	14.3%	70.7%
Twin Hickory ES	5	0	1	1	3	10	50.0%	30.0%
Ward ES	3	0	1	0	0	4	75.0%	0.0%

The table below shows the Middle School Option D4 attitude summaries broken down by the live-in zones of the survey respondents.

Middle School Option D4 Attitude Summary by Respondent Live-In Elementary Zone								
Live-In Zone	Approve	Like	Neutral	Dislike	Oppose	Total	Percent Approve	Percent Oppose
Carver ES	1	0	1	0	26	28	3.6%	92.9%
Chamberlayne ES	0	1	0	1	0	2	0.0%	0.0%
Colonial Trail ES	8	0	1	0	0	9	88.9%	0.0%
Crestview ES	21	1	22	16	439	499	4.2%	88.0%
Davis ES	34	4	7	1	1	47	72.3%	2.1%
Dumbarton ES	1	0	0	0	0	1	100.0%	0.0%
Echo Lake ES	4	1	0	0	1	6	66.7%	16.7%
Gayton ES	37	4	3	0	3	47	78.7%	6.4%
Glen Allen ES	13	1	3	1	0	18	72.2%	0.0%
Greenwood ES	126	8	3	5	42	184	68.5%	22.8%
Holladay ES	0	1	0	0	0	1	0.0%	0.0%
Johnson ES	2	0	0	0	0	2	100.0%	0.0%
Kaechele ES	2	0	7	0	7	16	12.5%	43.8%
Lakeside ES	3	2	1	0	0	6	50.0%	0.0%
Longan ES	45	0	1	0	1	47	95.7%	2.1%
Longdale ES	1	1	1	0	0	3	33.3%	0.0%
Maybeury ES	288	11	4	0	5	308	93.5%	1.6%
Mehfoud and Varina ES	0	0	1	1	2	4	0.0%	50.0%
Nuckols Farm ES	3	1	0	1	5	10	30.0%	50.0%
Pemberton ES	30	1	11	1	2	45	66.7%	4.4%
Pinchbeck ES	1	0	1	3	3	8	12.5%	37.5%
Ridge ES	16	10	6	0	1	33	48.5%	3.0%
Rivers Edge ES	35	7	7	2	5	56	62.5%	8.9%
Sandston ES	0	0	0	0	1	1	0.0%	100.0%
Shady Grove ES	12	0	5	4	1	22	54.5%	4.5%
Short Pump ES	226	2	1	0	2	231	97.8%	0.9%
Skipwith ES	0	0	0	0	3	3	0.0%	100.0%
Springfield Park ES	50	7	30	3	12	102	49.0%	11.8%
Trevvett ES	0	0	1	0	3	4	0.0%	75.0%
Tuckahoe ES	96	17	3	1	35	152	63.2%	23.0%
Twin Hickory ES	3	0	5	1	0	9	33.3%	0.0%
Ward ES	0	0	0	0	5	5	0.0%	100.0%

The table below shows the Middle School Option E4 attitude summaries broken down by the live-in zones of the survey respondents.

Middle School Option E4 Attitude Summary by Respondent Live-In Elementary Zone								
Live-In Zone	Approve	Like	Neutral	Dislike	Oppose	Total	Percent Approve	Percent Oppose
Carver ES	26	0	1	0	1	28	92.9%	3.6%
Chamberlayne ES	0	1	0	1	0	2	0.0%	0.0%
Colonial Trail ES	1	0	1	0	5	7	14.3%	71.4%
Crestview ES	474	5	10	1	15	505	93.9%	3.0%
Davis ES	11	0	14	3	13	41	26.8%	31.7%
Dumbarton ES	1	0	0	0	0	1	100.0%	0.0%
Echo Lake ES	4	1	0	0	1	6	66.7%	16.7%
Gayton ES	4	0	2	3	38	47	8.5%	80.9%
Glen Allen ES	9	1	4	0	4	18	50.0%	22.2%
Greenwood ES	36	9	12	13	112	182	19.8%	61.5%
Holladay ES	0	1	0	0	0	1	0.0%	0.0%
Johnson ES	2	0	0	0	0	2	100.0%	0.0%
Kaechele ES	8	0	5	1	1	15	53.3%	6.7%
Lakeside ES	1	1	2	0	1	5	20.0%	20.0%
Longan ES	46	0	1	0	1	48	95.8%	2.1%
Longdale ES	1	1	1	0	0	3	33.3%	0.0%
Maybeury ES	6	3	7	13	278	307	2.0%	90.6%
Mehfoud and Varina ES	0	0	1	1	2	4	0.0%	50.0%
Nuckols Farm ES	7	1	0	0	2	10	70.0%	20.0%
Pemberton ES	13	1	17	2	9	42	31.0%	21.4%
Pinchbeck ES	1	1	2	2	2	8	12.5%	25.0%
Ridge ES	8	3	19	1	2	33	24.2%	6.1%
Rivers Edge ES	11	4	5	4	32	56	19.6%	57.1%
Sandston ES	0	0	0	0	1	1	0.0%	100.0%
Shady Grove ES	11	1	1	1	7	21	52.4%	33.3%
Short Pump ES	5	0	2	13	211	231	2.2%	91.3%
Skipwith ES	0	0	0	0	3	3	0.0%	100.0%
Springfield Park ES	67	5	24	3	3	102	65.7%	2.9%
Trevvett ES	1	0	1	0	2	4	25.0%	50.0%
Tuckahoe ES	42	2	15	4	88	151	27.8%	58.3%
Twin Hickory ES	3	0	4	0	2	9	33.3%	22.2%
Ward ES	5	0	0	0	0	5	100.0%	0.0%

The table below shows the High School Option D4 attitude summaries broken down by the live-in zones of the survey respondents.

High School Option D4 Attitude Summary by Respondent Live-In Elementary Zone								
Live-In Zone	Approve	Like	Neutral	Dislike	Oppose	Total	Percent Approve	Percent Oppose
Carver ES	6	1	11	0	7	25	24.0%	28.0%
Chamberlayne ES	0	1	0	0	1	2	0.0%	50.0%
Colonial Trail ES	8	0	1	0	0	9	88.9%	0.0%
Crestview ES	11	1	6	13	480	511	2.2%	93.9%
Davis ES	49	0	0	0	2	51	96.1%	3.9%
Dumbarton ES	1	0	0	0	0	1	100.0%	0.0%
Echo Lake ES	4	0	1	0	1	6	66.7%	16.7%
Gayton ES	37	4	2	1	2	46	80.4%	4.3%
Glen Allen ES	13	1	2	2	0	18	72.2%	0.0%
Greenwood ES	130	9	0	6	40	185	70.3%	21.6%
Holladay ES	1	0	0	0	0	1	100.0%	0.0%
Johnson ES	1	0	1	0	0	2	50.0%	0.0%
Kaechele ES	2	0	9	0	5	16	12.5%	31.3%
Lakeside ES	3	1	2	0	0	6	50.0%	0.0%
Longan ES	45	1	1	1	0	48	93.8%	0.0%
Longdale ES	2	0	1	0	0	3	66.7%	0.0%
Maybeury ES	288	9	5	1	4	307	93.8%	1.3%
Mehfoud and Varina ES	0	1	0	0	2	3	0.0%	66.7%
Nuckols Farm ES	7	0	1	0	2	10	70.0%	20.0%
Pemberton ES	45	1	0	1	1	48	93.8%	2.1%
Pinchbeck ES	7	0	1	0	0	8	87.5%	0.0%
Ridge ES	22	5	5	1	2	35	62.9%	5.7%
Rivers Edge ES	25	3	4	2	23	57	43.9%	40.4%
Sandston ES	0	1	0	0	0	1	0.0%	0.0%
Shady Grove ES	14	0	7	0	0	21	66.7%	0.0%
Short Pump ES	228	1	2	0	1	232	98.3%	0.4%
Skipwith ES	0	0	0	0	3	3	0.0%	100.0%
Springfield Park ES	3	0	1	4	95	103	2.9%	92.2%
Trevvett ES	0	0	1	0	3	4	0.0%	75.0%
Tuckahoe ES	97	14	5	2	34	152	63.8%	22.4%
Twin Hickory ES	4	0	4	0	0	8	50.0%	0.0%
Ward ES	4	0	0	0	0	4	100.0%	0.0%

The table below shows the High School Option E4 attitude summaries broken down by the live-in zones of the survey respondents.

High School Option E4 Attitude Summary by Respondent Live-In Elementary Zone								
Live-In Zone	Approve	Like	Neutral	Dislike	Oppose	Total	Percent Approve	Percent Oppose
Carver ES	12	0	11	0	2	25	48.0%	8.0%
Chamberlayne ES	0	1	0	1	0	2	0.0%	0.0%
Colonial Trail ES	1	0	1	0	5	7	14.3%	71.4%
Crestview ES	498	1	3	3	11	516	96.5%	2.1%
Davis ES	1	0	0	4	45	50	2.0%	90.0%
Dumbarton ES	1	0	0	0	0	1	100.0%	0.0%
Echo Lake ES	4	0	1	0	1	6	66.7%	16.7%
Gayton ES	21	4	4	2	14	45	46.7%	31.1%
Glen Allen ES	8	0	2	0	8	18	44.4%	44.4%
Greenwood ES	1	2	0	12	170	185	0.5%	91.9%
Holladay ES	0	0	0	0	1	1	0.0%	100.0%
Johnson ES	1	0	1	0	0	2	50.0%	0.0%
Kaechele ES	7	0	7	1	1	16	43.8%	6.3%
Lakeside ES	1	0	2	0	3	6	16.7%	50.0%
Longan ES	45	1	1	1	0	48	93.8%	0.0%
Longdale ES	2	0	1	0	0	3	66.7%	0.0%
Maybeury ES	11	3	8	11	272	305	3.6%	89.2%
Mehfoud and Varina ES	0	0	1	0	2	3	0.0%	66.7%
Nuckols Farm ES	7	0	0	1	2	10	70.0%	20.0%
Pemberton ES	4	0	0	2	42	48	8.3%	87.5%
Pinchbeck ES	3	0	1	3	1	8	37.5%	12.5%
Ridge ES	9	2	19	1	4	35	25.7%	11.4%
Rivers Edge ES	31	4	7	2	13	57	54.4%	22.8%
Sandston ES	0	0	0	0	1	1	0.0%	100.0%
Shady Grove ES	12	1	8	0	0	21	57.1%	0.0%
Short Pump ES	5	1	2	7	217	232	2.2%	93.5%
Skipwith ES	0	0	0	0	3	3	0.0%	100.0%
Springfield Park ES	89	5	4	0	4	102	87.3%	3.9%
Trevvett ES	1	0	1	0	2	4	25.0%	50.0%
Tuckahoe ES	44	1	17	4	86	152	28.9%	56.6%
Twin Hickory ES	1	0	5	0	2	8	12.5%	25.0%
Ward ES	4	0	0	0	0	4	100.0%	0.0%


### **Conclusion**

The data presented in this summary report will be utilized as a tool to help the committee evaluate the options as it relates to feedback provided by the public that participated in the survey. The committee will continue to be oriented on providing a recommendation to the school board that best meets the guiding principles and adheres best to the redistricting criteria.

Although the information contained in this report is certainly helpful, the results of the Public Information Session should not be the only deciding factor on determining a recommendation but will be utilized along with all of the other information and research that has been performed by the group.



# Henrico County Public Schools Public Input Survey Responses By Elementary School Zone



**Legend**

**School Type**

- Elementary
- Middle
- High



**2018-19 ES Boundaries**

- 2018-19 ES Boundaries
- County Border

**2018-19 ES Zones**

Adams	Crestview	Johnson
Ashe	Davis	Kaechele
Baker	Donahoe	Laburnum
Carver	Dumbarton	Lakeside
Chamberlayne	Echo Lake	Longan
Colonial Trail	Fair Oaks	Longdale
	Gayton	Maybeury
	Glen Allen	Mehfoud And Varina
	Glen Lea	Montrose
	Greenwood	Nuckols Farm
	Harvie	Pemberton
	Highland Springs	Pinchbeck
	Holladay	Ratcliffe

Ridge
Rivers Edge
Sandston
Seven Pines
Shady Grove
Short Pump
Skipwith
Springfield Park
Three Chopt
Trevvett
Tuckahoe
Twin Hickory
Ward




Map Note: The height of each ES zone reflects the number of survey responses from that Elementary School Zone. The grey zones had no survey responses from residents.





# Henrico County Public Schools Public Input Survey Responses ES Option D4 Approve/Like



**Legend**

**School Type**



- Elementary
- Middle
- High

**2018-19 ES Boundaries**

**County Border**

**ES Option D4 Approve**

- < 30%
- 30 - 50%
- > 50%




Map Note: The height of each ES zone reflects the number of survey responses from that Elementary School Zone. The grey zones had no survey responses from residents.





# Henrico County Public Schools Public Input Survey Responses ES Option D4 Dislike/Oppose



## Legend

- School Type**
- Elementary
  - Middle
  - High
- 2018-19 ES Boundaries**
- County Border**
- ES Option D4 Oppose**
- < 30%
  - 30% - 50%
  - > 50%


Map Note: The height of each ES zone reflects the number of survey responses from that Elementary School Zone. The grey zones had no survey responses from residents.



Data provided by HCPS and ESRI. Map developed by Cropper GIS, LLC. Cartographer: ADM, March 2020.



# Henrico County Public Schools Public Input Survey Responses ES Option E4 Approve/Like



**Legend**

**School Type**



- Elementary
- Middle
- High

**2018-19 ES Boundaries**

**County Border**

**ES Option E4 Approve**

- < 30%
- 30 - 50%
- > 50%




Map Note: The height of each ES zone reflects the number of survey responses from that Elementary School Zone. The grey zones had no survey responses from residents.





# Henrico County Public Schools Public Input Survey Responses ES Option E4 Dislike/Oppose



## Legend

### School Type



- Elementary
- Middle
- High

2018-19 ES Boundaries

County Border

### ES Option E4 Oppose

- < 30%
- 30% - 50%
- > 50%




Map Note: The height of each ES zone reflects the number of survey responses from that Elementary School Zone. The grey zones had no survey responses from residents.

CropperGIS

Data provided by HCPS and ESRI. Map developed by Cropper GIS, LLC. Cartographer: ADM, March 2020.



# Henrico County Public Schools Public Input Survey Responses MS Option D4 Approve/Like



## Legend

### School Type



- Elementary
- Middle
- High

### 2018-19 ES Boundaries

### County Border

### MS Option D4 Approve

- < 30%
- 30 - 50%
- > 50%




Map Note: The height of each ES zone reflects the number of survey responses from that Elementary School Zone. The grey zones had no survey responses from residents.

Cropper GIS

Data provided by HCPS and ESRI. Map developed by Cropper GIS, LLC. Cartographer: ADM, March 2020.

# Henrico County Public Schools Public Input Survey Responses MS Option D4 Dislike/Oppose



## Legend

### School Type



- Elementary
- Middle
- High

### 2018-19 ES Boundaries

### County Border

### MS Option D4 Oppose

- < 30%
- 30% - 50%
- > 50%




Map Note: The height of each ES zone reflects the number of survey responses from that Elementary School Zone. The grey zones had no survey responses from residents.

CropperGIS

Data provided by HCPS and ESRI. Map developed by Cropper GIS, LLC. Cartographer: ADM, March 2020.



# Henrico County Public Schools Public Input Survey Responses MS Option E4 Approve/Like



## Legend

### School Type



- Elementary
- Middle
- High

### 2018-19 ES Boundaries

### County Border

### MS Option E4 Approve

- < 30%
- 30 - 50%
- > 50%




Map Note: The height of each ES zone reflects the number of survey responses from that Elementary School Zone. The grey zones had no survey responses from residents.

Cropper GIS

Data provided by HCPS and ESRI. Map developed by Cropper GIS, LLC. Cartographer: ADM, March 2020.



# Henrico County Public Schools Public Input Survey Responses MS Option E4 Dislike/Oppose



## Legend

### School Type



- Elementary
- ▲ Middle
- ★ High

2018-19 ES Boundaries

County Border

### MS Option E4 Oppose

- < 30%
- 30% - 50%
- > 50%




Map Note: The height of each ES zone reflects the number of survey responses from that Elementary School Zone. The grey zones had no survey responses from residents.

Cropper GIS

Data provided by HCPS and ESRI. Map developed by Cropper GIS, LLC. Cartographer: ADM, March 2020.



# Henrico County Public Schools Public Input Survey Responses HS Option D4 Approve/Like



**Legend**

**School Type**



- Elementary
- Middle
- High

**2018-19 ES Boundaries**

**County Border**

**HS Option D4 Approve**


- < 30%
- 30 - 50%
- > 50%



Map Note: The height of each ES zone reflects the number of survey responses from that Elementary School Zone. The grey zones had no survey responses from residents.



# Henrico County Public Schools Public Input Survey Responses HS Option D4 Dislike/Oppose



**Legend**

**School Type**



- Elementary
- Middle
- High

**2018-19 ES Boundaries**

**County Border**

**HS Option D4 Oppose**


- < 30%
- 30% - 50%
- > 50%



Map Note: The height of each ES zone reflects the number of survey responses from that Elementary School Zone. The grey zones had no survey responses from residents.



# Henrico County Public Schools Public Input Survey Responses HS Option E4 Approve/Like



## Legend

### School Type



- Elementary
- ▲ Middle
- ★ High

### 2018-19 ES Boundaries

### County Border

### HS Option E4 Approve

- < 30%
- 30 - 50%
- > 50%




Map Note: The height of each ES zone reflects the number of survey responses from that Elementary School Zone. The grey zones had no survey responses from residents.

CropperGIS

Data provided by HCPS and ESRI. Map developed by Cropper GIS, LLC. Cartographer: ADM, March 2020.



# Henrico County Public Schools Public Input Survey Responses HS Option E4 Dislike/Oppose



## Legend

### School Type



- Elementary
- Middle
- High

### 2018-19 ES Boundaries

### County Border

### HS Option E4 Oppose

- < 30%
- 30% - 50%
- > 50%



Map Note: The height of each ES zone reflects the number of survey responses from that Elementary School Zone. The grey zones had no survey responses from residents.

Cropper GIS

Data provided by HCPS and ESRI. Map developed by Cropper GIS, LLC. Cartographer: ADM, March 2020.