# Rezoning Task Force Meeting 3 Minutes

**September 22, 2026**

## Meeting Purpose

The Rezoning Task Force convened for its third meeting to review revised elementary attendance-zone scenarios developed in response to feedback from the previous meeting and to determine which scenarios should move forward for public feedback.

The committee reviewed its decision-making protocol and the expectation that a map would need support from at least **80% of participating voting members** to advance. Members were reminded that the purpose of the evening's vote was **not to select a final rezoning recommendation**, but to determine which maps should be presented to the broader community for input.

The committee was also reminded that meeting materials, minutes, and recordings would be made publicly available within 48 hours.

## Timeline and Community Engagement Process

Staff reviewed the remaining rezoning timeline. Following this meeting, the district will begin a community-engagement period that includes a public hearing, opportunities for campus and community input, and an online feedback process.

Following the public-engagement period, the task force will reconvene to review community feedback and determine what recommendation to forward to district leadership. Cabinet will consider the committee's recommendation before a final recommendation is presented to the Board of Trustees. The Board will make the final decision regarding attendance-zone changes.

Staff emphasized the importance of completing the process on the established timeline so families and employees affected by the four school closures have sufficient time to plan for the 2027–28 school year.

## Community Builder

In recognition of the first day of fall, committee members briefly discussed their favorite things about the fall season before beginning the evening's work.

# Review of Previous Meeting

The committee reviewed its work from Meeting 2, which included:

- Reviewing demographic, housing, enrollment, capacity, and program information.
- Examining three preliminary rezoning scenarios.
- Identifying strengths, concerns, questions, and potential revisions.
- Requesting that staff explore a scenario combining elements of the previous Plans 5 and 7.
- Asking staff to pay particular attention to neighborhood continuity, transportation, bilingual programming, campus utilization, and the potential impact of broader east-side boundary changes.

# Revised Attendance-Zone Scenarios

Based on committee feedback, staff presented three revised scenarios: **Map 5, Map 8, and Map 9**.

## Map 5

The revised Map 5 combined elements of the previous Plans 5 and 7. It included attendance-zone changes associated with the four closing elementary schools as well as changes to several east-side attendance zones.

Staff explained that particular attention had been given to concerns raised during the previous meeting about splitting established neighborhoods. Where possible, boundaries were adjusted to better follow major roadways and neighborhood patterns.

The revised map also reflected updated enrollment and bilingual-program data. Staff explained that updated student counts did not support maintaining a bilingual program at Northwest Elementary under this configuration; students requiring bilingual programming within that attendance area would instead receive services at River Oaks Elementary.

## Map 8

Map 8 proposed a significantly different configuration for several west-side schools, particularly Pflugerville and Windermere elementary schools.

Under this scenario, a larger portion of Pflugerville Elementary students would be assigned to Timmerman Elementary, which would support establishing bilingual programming at Timmerman. Windermere students would be concentrated primarily at Caldwell, with smaller groups assigned to other receiving campuses.

Unlike Maps 5 and 9, **Map 8 did not include additional east-side attendance-zone changes**.

Staff noted that Map 8 generally produced more consistent campus utilization across affected schools than Map 5.

### Map 9

Map 9 used the same general west-side configuration as Map 8 but incorporated the east-side attendance-zone adjustments included in Map 5.

As a result, Maps 8 and 9 allowed the committee to consider essentially the same approach to the four school closures while comparing whether additional east-side boundary adjustments should occur as part of the current rezoning process.

## Capacity and Program Considerations

Staff reviewed projected enrollment and adjusted capacity under each scenario. Committee members discussed campuses with projected utilization approaching or exceeding desired levels.

Staff clarified that adjusted capacity accounts for classroom use associated with specialized programs and that some capacity concerns may be addressed administratively through future program placement. The committee's responsibility is to recommend attendance boundaries rather than determine the placement of individual specialized programs.

The committee also discussed bilingual programming. Staff explained that bilingual-program locations must account for the number of students participating in the program, staffing needs, opportunities for teacher collaboration, and available campus capacity.

## Small-Group Scenario Review

Committee members worked in small groups to examine the proposed attendance zones for the four closing campuses and other schools affected by the scenarios.

Rather than evaluating each map only as a whole, members were asked to identify what they would keep or change about the proposed boundaries for individual school communities.

The small-group and whole-group discussions reflected several recurring considerations:

- Keeping students and established neighborhoods together when possible.
- Assigning students to geographically logical schools.
- Minimizing transportation time and unnecessary travel across major roadways.
- Balancing campus enrollment and avoiding both significant underutilization and overcrowding.
- Maintaining viable bilingual programs.
- Considering future residential growth and long-term sustainability.

- Reducing the likelihood that families will experience another rezoning process in the near future.
- Recognizing the effect of boundary changes on both students from closing campuses and students currently attending receiving campuses.

# Campus and Boundary Feedback

## Dessau Elementary

Members generally saw strengths in both approaches for assigning Dessau students. Keeping large groups of Dessau students together remained an important consideration.

Some members noted that the Map 8/9 configuration may provide greater flexibility for future residential growth. Others expressed concern that this configuration could divide the Dessau community among more campuses.

Transportation eligibility and the impact of particular neighborhood assignments were also discussed.

## Pflugerville Elementary

Committee members identified tradeoffs between proximity and community continuity.

Map 5 was viewed positively by some members because portions of the Pflugerville community would remain closer to familiar neighborhoods. Members also noted that Map 5 brought the Killingsworth-area communities together at one campus.

However, the committee discussed the additional split created when students assigned to a campus without bilingual programming must attend another school for bilingual services.

Maps 8/9 reduced some of these programmatic splits by assigning more Pflugerville students to Timmerman, where bilingual programming could be established. Members also raised concerns about distance, traffic, and transportation for students traveling to Timmerman.

## Parmer Lane Elementary and Northwest Area

Members discussed the balance between keeping Parmer Lane students together, maintaining logical boundaries around I-35, supporting viable bilingual programming, and balancing utilization at Northwest and River Oaks.

Some members favored the more balanced utilization reflected in Maps 8/9. Concern was expressed about Map 5 placing River Oaks near or above capacity while leaving other campuses significantly less utilized.

Members also discussed the transportation implications of crossing I-35 and whether portions of the proposed boundaries could be combined or adjusted to better reflect existing travel patterns.

### Windermere Elementary

Windermere continued to generate significant discussion.

Map 5 keeps a larger group of Windermere students together at Timmerman, while Maps 8/9 place a larger group at Caldwell. Members discussed community connections to Timmerman, including the placement of Windermere's former principal and staff members.

Staff also shared transfer-request information indicating that, during a special summer transfer window, a significant number of Windermere families requesting transfers selected Highland Park.

Members noted that Maps 8/9 allow a larger group of students to attend a school geographically closer to their residences and reduce the number of receiving campuses compared with some previous configurations. Concern was also expressed about the impact of additional enrollment on Caldwell.

## East-Side Boundary Discussion

A significant portion of the discussion focused on whether the district should make additional east-side boundary changes during the current rezoning process.

Some committee members expressed strong support for addressing known boundary issues now rather than conducting another rezoning process in the near future. They cited the cost of repeating the process, disruption to families, efficient use of district resources, transportation considerations, and the importance of long-term stability.

Other discussion emphasized the need to ensure that east-side families have meaningful opportunities to provide input before changes affecting their communities are finalized.

Staff noted that the utilization differences created by the proposed east-side adjustments are relatively modest in some areas. Committee members therefore emphasized the importance of clearly communicating the rationale for any east-side changes included in the final recommendation.

The committee agreed that presenting an east-side option to the public would provide an opportunity to hear directly from affected families before making a final recommendation.

## Decision-Making Process

Following the small-group and whole-group discussions, the committee considered which maps should advance to the public-engagement phase.

Members were reminded that:

- The vote was **not a selection of the final attendance-zone map**.
- Members could support more than one map.
- A map needed at least **80% support** from participating voting members to advance.
- Advancing a map meant that the committee believed it should be presented to the community for additional feedback.

Thirteen committee members participated in the final voting process.

### Voting Results

| Scenario | Members Supporting Advancement | Result |
|---|---|---|
| **Map 5** | **12 of 13** | **Advanced for public feedback** |
| **Map 8** | **5 of 13** | Did not reach consensus threshold |
| **Map 9** | **13 of 13** | **Advanced for public feedback** |

The committee therefore reached consensus to advance **Map 5 and Map 9** for public review.

Both maps include proposed east-side attendance-zone changes, while differing significantly in the configuration of several west-side attendance zones.

**No final attendance-zone recommendation was made at this meeting.**

## Public Engagement and Next Steps

The district will present Maps 5 and 9 to the community for feedback.

The public-engagement process will include:

- A public hearing with information presented in English and Spanish.
- Opportunities for public comment.
- Additional campus/community engagement as needed.
- An online survey or feedback process for families unable to attend in person.
- Publicly available information explaining the proposed maps and key differences between them.

Staff emphasized that the community-engagement process is intended to gather questions, concerns, and feedback rather than conduct a public vote on the maps.

Following the public-engagement period, the Rezoning Task Force will reconvene to review the feedback and determine its recommendation to district leadership. The recommendation and community feedback will subsequently be considered by Cabinet and the Board of Trustees.

The **Board of Trustees will make the final decision regarding attendance-zone changes.**