

# Elementary Boundary Adjustment Comment Form

Do\_Not\_Reply@beaverton.k12.or.us

Tue 12/13/2016 8:42 PM

To: BSD Elementary Boundary Comments <Elementary-Boundary-Comments@beaverton.k12.or.us>;

**Name:** Archit Bhatt

**Email:** architbhatt@gmail.com

**Comment:**

Dear Mr Superintendent,

Why were Wismer parents allowed to vote if their Jacob Wismer school boundaries remained intact? MAP 3 preserves original springville neighbourhood. Keeps pirate park intact. Please donot disrupt the neighbourhood by keeping MAP 2. PLEASE CHANGE TO MAP 3.

Please do needful and change it to MAP 3 keeping springville community intact.

Regards,

Archit

# Elementary Boundary Adjustment Comment Form

Do\_Not\_Reply@beaverton.k12.or.us

Tue 12/13/2016 6:17 AM

To: BSD Elementary Boundary Comments <Elementary-Boundary-Comments@beaverton.k12.or.us>;

**Name:** chaithanya

**Email:** chaithanya.friends@gmail.com

**Comment:**

Supporting submittal map#2 as it is more appropriate to the neighborhood.

# Elementary Boundary Adjustment Comment Form

Do\_Not\_Reply@beaverton.k12.or.us

Tue 12/13/2016 6:16 AM

To: BSD Elementary Boundary Comments <Elementary-Boundary-Comments@beaverton.k12.or.us>;

**Name:** Nikhil Gupta

**Email:** nikhil.g@outlook.com

**Comment:**

Subject: BSD boundary adjustment process

Superintendent Grotting,

I am emailing you as a concerned resident of the Springville school neighborhood. I do not want the BSD school system to come up with a boundary decision where every neighborhood is going to a far away school. That would not only be inefficient and costly, but also unsafe due to the conditions on Brugger Road. Neighborhoods that are at walkable distance should be assigned to the neighborhood school.

I strongly believe that the Map Submittal #2, which was arrived at, through the BSD committee process, is the right long term solution to the current overcrowding problem. This submittal satisfies most of the criteria recommended by the BSD system and was voted 5:1 by the committee.

I sincerely hope that you will concur to the points above and choose map submittal #2 and the final boundary decision.

Thank you,

Nikhil

16988 NW Antonio St,  
Portland OR - 97229

## FW: Opposed to Pirate Park petition

Steven Sparks - Exec Admin

Mon 12/12/2016 7:39 AM

To: deborah wohlmuth <Debby\_Wohlmuth@beaverton.k12.or.us>;

[For the correspondence record.](#)

---

**From:** donald grotting

**Sent:** Friday, December 9, 2016 12:56 PM

**To:** Steven Sparks - Exec Admin <Steven\_Sparks@beaverton.k12.or.us>; david williams <David\_Williams@beaverton.k12.or.us>; robert mccracken <Robert\_Mccracken@beaverton.k12.or.us>

**Subject:** Fwd: Opposed to Pirate Park petition

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** ech <[echixson@comcast.net](mailto:echixson@comcast.net)>

**Date:** December 9, 2016 at 2:48:18 PM CST

**To:** [don\\_grotting@beaverton.k12.or.us](mailto:don_grotting@beaverton.k12.or.us)

**Subject:** Opposed to Pirate Park petition

Dear Superintendant Grotting,

By now you've received many copies of the petition circulated by the Pirate Park neighborhood advocating map submittal #1. In fact, the petition is advocating an entirely new map that has had no opportunity for public comment.

We live in the Pirate Park neighborhood and do not support the petition. If you wish to consider Map Submittal #1, then we urge you to go directly to its source and contact committee member Sarah Beachy.

Kind regards,

Earl and Karen Hixson  
16148 NW Graf Street  
Portland OR, 97229



# Elementary Boundary Adjustment Comment Form

Do\_Not\_Reply@beaverton.k12.or.us

Sat 12/17/2016 6:32 PM

To: BSD Elementary Boundary Comments <Elementary-Boundary-Comments@beaverton.k12.or.us>;

**Name:** Rahul Jadhav

**Email:** j\_rahulp@yahoo.com

**Comment:**

Hi I am from Arbor View community and my kids are part of Jacob Wismer Elementary school. Today I want to share the very recent experience for my family during inclement weather on Wednesday Dec.15th 2016, when all the roads were not good for safe driving we were able to walk the trail to school from our community and get the kids back home safely without any dependency on school bus, this is why I would repeat our request one more time in support of not to change Jacob Wismer boundary and keeping Arbor view community connected to Jacob Wismer and I think this current weather situation has reconfirmed that Arbor view kids are most safe to be in Jacob Wismer elementary and it keeps our community and school connected.

We all appreciate school staff, superintendent and School board for their tireless efforts to keep our kids safe during this challenging weather time. Let's keep our kids safe and happy.

# Fw: Support Map Submittal 1

deborah wohlmutter

Mon 12/12/2016 5:58 PM

12.12.16

To: BSD Elementary Boundary Comments <Elementary-Boundary-Comments@beaverton.k12.or.us>;

2 attachments (76 KB)

Petition supporting Map Submittal 1.docx; ATT00001.htm;

**From:** Deepa K <[deepa18.pmp@gmail.com](mailto:deepa18.pmp@gmail.com)>

**Date:** December 8, 2016 at 7:26:32 PM CST

**To:** [don\\_grotting@beaverton.k12.or.us](mailto:don_grotting@beaverton.k12.or.us)

**Subject: Support Map Submittal 1**

Fullname: Deepa Kalangi

Area#84

Dear Superintendent Don Grotting,

We the undersigned residents of various Springville communities (Arbor Oaks, Abbey creek and Pirate Park) would like to **request you to consider map submittal 1** thought out by advisory committee member Sarah Beachy for elementary school boundary change. We have attached submittal 1 in this set. This map was introduced along with other submittal maps for the first time in meeting #4 and also eliminated extremely quickly towards the end of meeting #4 not giving the public any time to possibly study this map. Springville advisory committee member Sheetal Golem was also absent at this meeting giving this map no chance for her comments which then put Springville and Kaiser schools ( 67% of area of total area under consideration) to have only 2 advisory representatives thus putting them at an immediate disadvantage at meeting #4.

1. Our belief is that Map submittal 1 is the most sustainable long term, and is not based on emotion (which Map submittal 3 is being tagged as) or based off of treating children as mere numbers by acquiring children from way down south to be able to start the new North Bethany school Kaiser at a healthy number of ~500. (which Map submittal 2 is doing).

2. Map 1 delivers both objectives outlined by the school board -- relieving overcrowding at Springville ES (SV) & Jacob Wismer ES (JW) and starting Kaiser K-5 with ~500 students. Map submittal 1 can be slightly modified to retain areas 84 and 14 along with its neighbors 18 and 1 and have those families continue at Springville. This requires the larger Pirate Park neighborhood to be split along the green corridor but we, the Pirate Park residents are agreeable to that solution for the sake of continuity and stability of education for all the families involved so as not have to revisit this process in another 3 years. The resulting projected enrollment graph is shown in **Graph 1** below.

3. The Committee's recommended option, map #2 had several problems (details below) as acknowledged by the committee members themselves, most important amongst them being: Kaiser goes over capacity within 2 years of inception needing portables and it progressively gets worse till 2023. Overcrowding of the schools needs to be balanced out by all the 3 schools. Total expected enrollment in 2021 for all three schools is 2353. Even with all the pre-approved portables that we were told can be put at Kaiser the total capacity for the schools is 2428. So all schools will need to be at 97% capacity in that year for the numbers to be shared. We cannot expect only Kaiser and Springville to carry that burden. Map submittals 2 and 3 under-utilize Jacob Wismer while over burden Kaiser and Springville. **(see Table 1: Projected % Capacity Utilization)**

		Map submittal 1*	Map submittal 1*	Map submittal #2	Map submittal #2	Map submittal #3	Map submittal #3
school	total capacity	2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021	2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021	2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021
jacob wismer	749	753	101%	656	88%	656	88%
springville	790	820	104%	777	98%	686	87%
kaiser	769	780	101%	920	120%	1010	131%

\* additionally retains area 84 and 14 with springville in Map submittal 1

**Table 1 : Projected % Capacity Utilization comparing Map submittal 1,2,3**

4. Map 1 is the only map that addresses growth that is happening north by drawing boundaries east-west, as opposed to north-south (map 2), therefore allowing better long term stability. It also maintains proximity, continuity of education and neighborhood unity, by keeping whole physical neighborhoods intact and in one school for the next 7 years without having them be redrawn prior to 2023 which is the absolute earliest date that the

new east BSD property can be opened as an elementary school per Mr. Steve Sparks in meeting #5.

### **Details:**

#### **Why Map submittal #1 works better than map submittal #2:**

##### **Map 1 addresses proximity to school while map 2 does not:**

Neighborhoods that are closer to JW will be retained at JW. South Pirate Park below green corridor-(areas 91, 18, 57, 9) plus areas (41, 12, and 60). Neighborhoods that are closer to SV will remain at SV: Abbey Creek- (area 93, 9), low income housing off of 185<sup>th</sup> – (area 39, 68) and north pirate park – (area 1, 18, 84, 14). Neighborhoods closer to Kaiser (Arbor view – (areas 61, 55, 74, 15) including all new growth areas, will be directed to Kaiser ES.

In Map 2, children from far south pirate park are being pulled way up north to just make up numbers for Kaiser while areas 61, 55, 74, 15 which are more proximate to Kaiser are better doing that. Also this area naturally delineates well into Kaiser due to the new high school boundary and hence should be considered for Kaiser Enrollment. When the current zero enrollment neighborhoods next to Kaiser start to fill up, Southern most pirate park is the most obvious candidate for being rezoned.

##### **Map 1 addresses overcrowding problem and balances student population distribution among all 3 schools better for both the short term and long term until, while map 2 does not:**

Map 1 will cause JW to go over capacity by ~45 students for the first 3 years. This is possibly a 2 classroom size increase over the first 3 years. SV has been running at 119% capacity for past ~2 years and to be fair has done an excellent job at it. Moreover JW elementary projected enrollment trend is a declining curve which statistically suggests Map1 will do well even by allocating 45 more at the beginning which would even out this declining curve.

Map 2 on the other hand will cause Kaiser to start the school with a projection of 600 students rather than 500 and go overcapacity from 2019, just 2 years after its inception putting it at 837 students in 2019 which is well over ~80 students over its capacity of 769. This is while JW operates at 92% capacity in 2019 (691/749). Hence map 2 does not balance out the student population evenly between 3 schools and is a solution that is short sighted.

##### **Map 2 does not meet BSD's criteria for boundary change**

Map 2 does not meet BSD's criteria for the change of boundaries because JW's boundaries remain unchanged and therefore Jacob Wismer is a mere spectator with a right to 50% vote on the advisory committee while overcrowding continues to persist at Kaiser and Springville. So it defies the criteria of resolving overcrowding.

Map 2 requires the North and South Pirate Park communities to move to a new elementary school for the 4th time in 15 years never affording its children a stable neighborhood school. Pirate park started out at Bethany elementary, then were moved to Jacob Wismer, moved in 2009 to Springville, and moved again in 2016 to Kaiser. If Map Submittal #1 is accepted it would offer continuity to north Pirate Park to continue at Springville and again move south pirate park but this time rightly to the most proximate neighborhood school which is Jacob Wismer rather than pulling up children all the way north to a not so proximate school.

### **Map 2 requires over ~70% of Springville school to move**

Map 2 requires over ~70% of Springville families to move to the new school Kaiser and 90% of the PTO to move to the new school. Starting next year Springville will have moved over most of its PTO supporting families to Kaiser if map submittal #2 is approved. Shouldn't that ring a warning that boundary lines are being drawn incorrectly?

### **Map submittal #1 has the lowest Transportation costs**


Map submittal #2 forces more school busses to go north on the already busy and narrow one lane Bethany Boulevard causing long term congestion for all the communities and affecting the safety of everyone.

On the other hand, Map submittal #1 would direct South pirate park traffic areas (60, 41, 12, 57, 9, 18, and 91) east to Jacob Wismer across Bethany Boulevard and not north onto Bethany Boulevard. Transportation costs chart provided by BSD at the 14<sup>th</sup> November meeting#4 (**see attached Table 2**) states that the total annual route cost of transportation for BSD for map submittal #1 is \$81,462 while for map submittal #2 it is \$82,451. Map submittal #1 has also proved itself to be the cheapest option for transportation when compared to both Map submittal #2 and #3.

### **Mode of teaching**

All schools follow the common core syllabus but have different approaches of teaching it. Springville uses expeditionary learning (EL) and Kaiser will use STEAM. It would work well if Jacob Wismer could adopt one of the newer learning models like the ones above.

On reviewing the testimony of all the committee members at meeting #5, they seem to have accepted map submittal #2 as it worked logically with numbers than did map submittal #3, but Map submittal #1 was not even given a chance for discussion in meeting #5 with all committee members being present. Hence we have garnered support for map submittal #1.



**Graph 1: Projected Enrollment capacity –Map submittal 1\***

**\*Retains areas 84, 14 with Springville**

# Elementary Boundary Adjustment Comment Form

Do\_Not\_Reply@beaverton.k12.or.us

Tue 12/13/2016 6:16 AM

12.12.16

To: BSD Elementary Boundary Comments <Elementary-Boundary-Comments@beaverton.k12.or.us>;

**Name:** krishna

**Email:** krishnamca20@yahoo.co.in

**Comment:**

Supporting committee recommendation of submittal Map#2

**From:** Anandha Krishnan H <[hanandhakrishnan@gmail.com](mailto:hanandhakrishnan@gmail.com)>

**Date:** December 13, 2016 at 9:11:54 PM PST

**To:** [don\\_grotting@beaverton.k12.or.us](mailto:don_grotting@beaverton.k12.or.us)

**Subject:** Reg., Springville Elementary school boundary adjustment

Hi,

I would like to vote for map submittal 2 since i m moving to 7116 NW Abigail Terrace, Portland.  
Also,

Map Submittal 2 was arrived after a lot of debates and discussions and serves the needs of majority population . This proposal has a very balanced approach towards solving current overcrowding of Springville and selecting neighborhoods for new Kaiser Rd school.

Thanks and regards

Anandha Krishnan H



## Fw: Support Map submittal 1

deborah wohlmutter

Mon 12/12/2016 6:03 PM

12.12.16

To: BSD Elementary Boundary Comments <Elementary-Boundary-Comments@beaverton.k12.or.us>;

2 attachments (76 KB)

Petition supporting Map Submittal 1.docx; ATT00001.htm;

Debby Wohlmutter  
Beaverton School District

Administrative Assistant to:

- Carl Mead, Deputy Superintendent for Operations and Support Services
- Dick Steinbrugge, Executive Administrator for Facilities
- Steven Sparks, Executive Administrator for Long-Range Planning

503-356-4395

503-356-4484 Fax

[debby\\_wohlmutter@beaverton.k12.or.us](mailto:debby_wohlmutter@beaverton.k12.or.us)

District Goal:

WE empower all students to achieve post-high school success.

---

**From:** Steven Sparks - Exec Admin

**Sent:** Monday, December 12, 2016 7:36 AM

**To:** deborah wohlmutter

**Subject:** FW: Support Map submittal 1

[For the correspondence record.](#)

---

**From:** donald grotting  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 8, 2016 10:54 AM  
**To:** david williams <David\_Williams@beaverton.k12.or.us>; Steven Sparks - Exec Admin  
<Steven\_Sparks@beaverton.k12.or.us>; robert mccracken <Robert\_Mccracken@beaverton.k12.or.us>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Support Map submittal 1

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Archana Kumar <[archkum@gmail.com](mailto:archkum@gmail.com)>  
**Date:** December 8, 2016 at 12:53:07 PM CST  
**To:** [don\\_grotting@beaverton.k12.or.us](mailto:don_grotting@beaverton.k12.or.us)  
**Subject:** Support Map submittal 1

We support Map submittal 1  
Name : Archana Kumar  
Area : 84

Dear Superintendent Don Grotting,

We the undersigned residents of various Springville communities (Arbor Oaks, Abbey creek and Pirate Park) would like to **request you to consider map submittal 1** thought out by advisory committee member Sarah Beachy for elementary school boundary change. We have attached submittal 1 in this set. This map was introduced along with other submittal maps for the first time in meeting #4 and also eliminated extremely quickly towards the end of meeting #4 not giving the public any time to possibly study this map. Springville advisory committee member Sheetal Golem was also absent at this meeting giving this map no chance for her comments which then put Springville and Kaiser schools ( 67% of area of total area under consideration) to have only 2 advisory representatives thus putting them at an immediate disadvantage at meeting #4.

1. Our belief is that Map submittal 1 is the most sustainable long term, and is not based on emotion (which Map submittal 3 is being tagged as) or based off of treating children as mere numbers by acquiring children from way down south to be able to start the new North Bethany school Kaiser at a healthy number of ~500. (which Map submittal 2 is doing).

2. Map 1 delivers both objectives outlined by the school board -- relieving overcrowding at Springville ES (SV) & Jacob Wismer ES (JW) and starting Kaiser K-5 with ~500 students. Map submittal 1 can be slightly modified to retain areas 84 and 14 along with its neighbors 18 and 1 and have those families continue at Springville. This requires the larger Pirate Park neighborhood to be split along the green corridor but we, the Pirate Park residents are agreeable to that solution for the sake of continuity and stability of education for all the families involved so as not have to revisit this process in another 3 years. The resulting projected enrollment graph is shown in **Graph 1** below.

3. The Committee's recommended option, map #2 had several problems (details below) as acknowledged by the committee members themselves, most important amongst them being: Kaiser goes over capacity within 2 years of inception needing portables and it progressively gets worse till 2023. Overcrowding of the schools needs to be balanced out by all the 3 schools. Total expected enrollment in 2021 for all three schools is 2353. Even with all the pre-approved portables that we were told can be put at Kaiser the total capacity for the schools is 2428. So all schools will need to be at 97% capacity in that year for the numbers to be shared. We cannot expect only Kaiser and Springville to carry that burden. Map submittals 2 and 3 under-utilize Jacob Wismer while over burden Kaiser and Springville. **(see Table 1: Projected % Capacity Utilization)**

		Map submittal 1*	Map submittal 1*	Map submittal #2	Map submittal #2	Map submittal #3	Map submittal #3
school	total capacity	2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021	2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021	2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021
jacob wismer	749	753	101%	656	88%	656	88%
springville	790	820	104%	777	98%	686	87%
kaiser	769	780	101%	920	120%	1010	131%

\* additionally retains area 84 and 14 with springville in Map submittal 1

**Table 1 : Projected % Capacity Utilization comparing Map submittal 1,2,3**

4. Map 1 is the only map that addresses growth that is happening north by drawing boundaries east-west, as opposed to north-south (map 2), therefore allowing better long term stability. It also maintains proximity, continuity of education and neighborhood unity, by keeping whole physical neighborhoods intact and in one school for the next 7 years without having them be redrawn prior to 2023 which is the absolute earliest date that the

new east BSD property can be opened as an elementary school per Mr. Steve Sparks in meeting #5.

### **Details:**

#### **Why Map submittal #1 works better than map submittal #2:**

##### **Map 1 addresses proximity to school while map 2 does not:**

Neighborhoods that are closer to JW will be retained at JW. South Pirate Park below green corridor-(areas 91, 18, 57, 9) plus areas (41, 12, and 60). Neighborhoods that are closer to SV will remain at SV: Abbey Creek- (area 93, 9), low income housing off of 185<sup>th</sup> – (area 39, 68) and north pirate park – (area 1, 18, 84, 14). Neighborhoods closer to Kaiser (Arbor view – (areas 61, 55, 74, 15) including all new growth areas, will be directed to Kaiser ES.

In Map 2, children from far south pirate park are being pulled way up north to just make up numbers for Kaiser while areas 61, 55, 74, 15 which are more proximate to Kaiser are better doing that. Also this area naturally delineates well into Kaiser due to the new high school boundary and hence should be considered for Kaiser Enrollment. When the current zero enrollment neighborhoods next to Kaiser start to fill up, Southern most pirate park is the most obvious candidate for being rezoned.

##### **Map 1 addresses overcrowding problem and balances student population distribution among all 3 schools better for both the short term and long term until, while map 2 does not:**

Map 1 will cause JW to go over capacity by ~45 students for the first 3 years. This is possibly a 2 classroom size increase over the first 3 years. SV has been running at 119% capacity for past ~2 years and to be fair has done an excellent job at it. Moreover JW elementary projected enrollment trend is a declining curve which statistically suggests Map1 will do well even by allocating 45 more at the beginning which would even out this declining curve.

Map 2 on the other hand will cause Kaiser to start the school with a projection of 600 students rather than 500 and go overcapacity from 2019, just 2 years after its inception putting it at 837 students in 2019 which is well over ~80 students over its capacity of 769. This is while JW operates at 92% capacity in 2019 (691/749). Hence map 2 does not balance out the student population evenly between 3 schools and is a solution that is short sighted.

##### **Map 2 does not meet BSD's criteria for boundary change**

Map 2 does not meet BSD's criteria for the change of boundaries because JW's boundaries remain unchanged and therefore Jacob Wismer is a mere spectator with a right to 50% vote on the advisory committee while overcrowding continues to persist at Kaiser and Springville. So it defies the criteria of resolving overcrowding.

Map 2 requires the North and South Pirate Park communities to move to a new elementary school for the 4th time in 15 years never affording its children a stable neighborhood school. Pirate park started out at Bethany elementary, then were moved to Jacob Wismer, moved in 2009 to Springville, and moved again in 2016 to Kaiser. If Map Submittal #1 is accepted it would offer continuity to north Pirate Park to continue at Springville and again move south pirate park but this time rightly to the most proximate neighborhood school which is Jacob Wismer rather than pulling up children all the way north to a not so proximate school.

### **Map 2 requires over ~70% of Springville school to move**

Map 2 requires over ~70% of Springville families to move to the new school Kaiser and 90% of the PTO to move to the new school. Starting next year Springville will have moved over most of its PTO supporting families to Kaiser if map submittal #2 is approved. Shouldn't that ring a warning that boundary lines are being drawn incorrectly?

### **Map submittal #1 has the lowest Transportation costs**


Map submittal #2 forces more school busses to go north on the already busy and narrow one lane Bethany Boulevard causing long term congestion for all the communities and affecting the safety of everyone.

On the other hand, Map submittal #1 would direct South pirate park traffic areas (60, 41, 12, 57, 9, 18, and 91) east to Jacob Wismer across Bethany Boulevard and not north onto Bethany Boulevard. Transportation costs chart provided by BSD at the 14<sup>th</sup> November meeting#4 (**see attached Table 2**) states that the total annual route cost of transportation for BSD for map submittal #1 is \$81,462 while for map submittal #2 it is \$82,451. Map submittal #1 has also proved itself to be the cheapest option for transportation when compared to both Map submittal #2 and #3.

### **Mode of teaching**

All schools follow the common core syllabus but have different approaches of teaching it. Springville uses expeditionary learning (EL) and Kaiser will use STEAM. It would work well if Jacob Wismer could adopt one of the newer learning models like the ones above.

On reviewing the testimony of all the committee members at meeting #5, they seem to have accepted map submittal #2 as it worked logically with numbers than did map submittal #3, but Map submittal #1 was not even given a chance for discussion in meeting #5 with all committee members being present. Hence we have garnered support for map submittal #1.



**Graph 1: Projected Enrollment capacity –Map submittal 1\***

**\*Retains areas 84, 14 with Springville**

# FW: Support Map Submittal #1: BSD School Elementary Schools Boundary Change

Steven Sparks - Exec Admin

Mon 12/12/2016 7:35 AM

To: deborah wohlmut <Debby\_Wohlmut@beaverton.k12.or.us>;

2 attachments (490 KB)

Support Map Submittal 1 for BSD Elementary Boundary Change.pdf; ATT00001.htm;

[For the correspondence record.](#)

---

**From:** donald grotting

**Sent:** Thursday, December 8, 2016 6:47 PM

**To:** david williams <David\_Williams@beaverton.k12.or.us>; Steven Sparks - Exec Admin  
<Steven\_Sparks@beaverton.k12.or.us>

**Subject:** Fwd: Support Map Submittal #1: BSD School Elementary Schools Boundary Change

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Chun Lee <[leechun2000@gmail.com](mailto:leechun2000@gmail.com)>

**Date:** December 8, 2016 at 7:19:04 PM CST

**To:** [don\\_grotting@beaverton.k12.or.us](mailto:don_grotting@beaverton.k12.or.us)

**Subject: Support Map Submittal #1: BSD School Elementary Schools Boundary Change**

Dear Superintendent Don Grotting,

The elementary school boundary proposal "Map submittal #2" is short-sighted. In few years when Kaiser school gets over-crowded due to urban development in north bethany, my area (area 91 - south pirate park) being far from Kaiser school would be moved out again. Our area had been subjected to such a change recently in 2010 when we were moved from Jacob Wismer to Springville.

I would like to support "Map submittal #1" instead. This proposal would provide much

needed continuity and stability for families in my area.

Regards,  
Chun Lee  
Area 91 - South Pirate Park



Dear Superintendent Don Grotting,

We the undersigned residents of various Springville communities would like to **request you to consider map submittal 1** thought out by advisory committee member Sarah Beachy for elementary school boundary change. We have attached submittal 1 in this set. This map was introduced along with other submittal maps for the first time in meeting #4 and also eliminated extremely quickly towards the end of meeting #4 not giving the public any time to possibly study this map. Springville advisory committee member Sheetal Golem was also absent at this meeting giving this map no chance for her comments which then put Springville and Kaiser schools ( 67% of area of total area under consideration) to have only 2 advisory representatives thus putting them at an immediate disadvantage at meeting #4.

1. Our belief is that Map submittal 1 is the most sustainable long term, and is not based on emotion (which Map submittal 3 is being tagged as) or based off of treating children as mere numbers by acquiring children from way down south to be able to start the new North Bethany school Kaiser at a healthy number of ~500. (which Map submittal 2 is doing).

2. Map 1 delivers both objectives outlined by the school board -- relieving overcrowding at Springville ES (SV) & Jacob Wismer ES (JW) and starting Kaiser K-5 with ~500 students. Map submittal 1 can be slightly modified to retain areas 84 and 14 along with its neighbors 18 and 1 and have those families continue at Springville. This requires the larger Pirate Park neighborhood to be split along the green corridor but we, the Pirate Park residents are agreeable to that solution for the sake of continuity and stability of education for all the families involved so as not have to revisit this process in another 3 years. The resulting projected enrollment graph is shown in **Graph 1** below.

3. The Committee's recommended option, map #2 had several problems (details below) as acknowledged by the committee members themselves, most important amongst them being: Kaiser goes over capacity within 2 years of inception needing portables and it progressively gets worse till 2023. Overcrowding of the schools needs to be balanced out by all the 3 schools. Total expected enrollment in 2021 for all three schools is 2353. Even with all the pre-approved portables that we were told can be put at Kaiser the total capacity for the schools is 2428. So all schools will need to be at 97% capacity in that year for the numbers to be shared. We cannot expect only Kaiser and Springville to carry that burden. Map submittals 2 and 3 under-utilize Jacob Wismer while over burden Kaiser and Springville. (**see Table 1**)

		Map submittal 1*	Map submittal 1*	Map submittal #2	Map submittal #2	Map submittal #3	Map submittal #3
school	total capacity	2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021	2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021	2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021
jacob wismer	749	753	101%	656	88%	656	88%
springville	790	820	104%	777	98%	686	87%
kaiser	769	780	101%	920	120%	1010	131%
* additionally retains area 84 and 14 with springville in Map submittal 1							

**Table 1 : Projected % Capacity Utilization comparing Map submittal 1,2,3**

4. Map 1 is the only map that addresses growth that is happening north by drawing boundaries east-west, as opposed to north-south (map 2), therefore allowing better long term stability. It also maintains proximity, continuity of education and neighborhood unity, by keeping whole physical neighborhoods intact and in one school for the next 7 years without having them be redrawn prior to 2023 which is the absolute earliest date that the

new east BSD property can be opened as an elementary school per Mr. Steve Sparks in meeting #5.

## **Details:**

### **Why Map submittal #1 works better than map submittal #2:**

#### **A. Map 1 addresses proximity to school while map 2 does not:**

Neighborhoods that are closer to JW will be retained at JW. South Pirate Park below green corridor-(areas 91, 18, 57, 9) plus areas (41, 12, and 60). Neighborhoods that are closer to SV will remain at SV: Abbey Creek- (area 93, 9), low income housing off of 185<sup>th</sup> – (area 39, 68) and north pirate park – (area 1, 18, 84, 14).

Neighborhoods closer to Kaiser (Arbor view – (areas 61, 55, 74, 15) including all new growth areas, will be directed to Kaiser ES.

In Map 2, children from far south pirate park are being pulled way up north to just make up numbers for Kaiser while areas 61, 55, 74, 15 which are more proximate to Kaiser are better doing that. Also this area naturally delineates well into Kaiser due to the new high school boundary and hence should be considered for Kaiser Enrollment. When the current zero enrollment neighborhoods next to Kaiser start to fill up, Southern most pirate park is the most obvious candidate for being rezoned.

#### **B. Map 1 addresses overcrowding problem and balances student population distribution among all 3 schools better for both the short term and long term until, while map 2 does not:**

Map 1 will cause JW to go over capacity by ~45 students for the first 3 years. This is possibly a 2 classroom size increase over the first 3 years. SV has been running at 119% capacity for past ~2 years and to be fair has done an excellent job at it.

Moreover JW elementary projected enrollment trend is a declining curve which statistically suggests Map1 will do well even by allocating 45 more at the beginning which would even out this declining curve.

Map 2 on the other hand will cause Kaiser to start the school with a projection of 600 students rather than 500 and go overcapacity from 2019, just 2 years after its inception putting it at 837 students in 2019 which is well over ~80 students over its capacity of 769. This is while JW operates at 92% capacity in 2019 (691/749). Hence map 2 does not balance out the student population evenly between 3 schools and is a solution that is short sighted.

#### **C. Map submittal #2 does not meet BSD's criteria for boundary change**

Map 2 does not meet BSD's criteria for the change of boundaries because JW's boundaries remain unchanged and therefore Jacob Wismer is a mere spectator with a right to 50% vote on the advisory committee while overcrowding continues to persist at Kaiser and Springville. So it defies the criteria of resolving overcrowding. Map 2 requires the North and South Pirate Park communities to move to a new elementary school for the 4th time in 15 years never affording its children a stable neighborhood school. Pirate park started out at Bethany elementary, then were moved to Jacob Wismer, moved in 2009 to Springville, and moved again in 2016 to

Kaiser. If Map Submittal #1 is accepted it would offer continuity to north Pirate Park to continue at Springville and again move south pirate park but this time rightly to the most proximate neighborhood school which is Jacob Wismer rather than pulling up children all the way north to a not so proximate school.

**D. Map submittal #2 requires over ~70% of Springville school to move**

Map 2 requires over ~70% of Springville families to move to the new school Kaiser and 90% of the PTO to move to the new school. Starting next year Springville will have moved over most of its PTO supporting families to Kaiser if map submittal #2 is approved. Shouldn't that ring a warning that boundary lines are being drawn incorrectly?

**E. Map submittal #1 has the lowest Transportation costs and # of bus routes**

Map submittal #2 forces more school busses to go north on the already busy and narrow one lane Bethany Boulevard causing long term congestion for all the communities and affecting the safety of everyone.

On the other hand, Map submittal #1 would direct South pirate park traffic areas (60, 41, 12, 57, 9, 18, and 91) east to Jacob Wismer across Bethany Boulevard and not north onto Bethany Boulevard. Transportation costs chart provided by BSD at the 14<sup>th</sup> November meeting#4 (**see below Table 2**) states that the total annual route cost of transportation for BSD for map submittal #1 is \$81,462 while for map submittal #2 it is \$82,451. Map submittal #1 has also proved itself to be the cheapest option for transportation when compared to both Map submittal #2 and #3.


**F. Mode of teaching**

All schools follow the common core syllabus but have different approaches of teaching it. Springville uses expeditionary learning (EL) and Kaiser will use STEAM. It would work well if Jacob Wismer could adopt one of the newer learning models like the ones above.

**G. Equal distribution of economically disadvantaged population**


Finally the economically disadvantaged share of student population are distributed most equally only and only in this Map submittal 1.

On reviewing the testimony of all the committee members at meeting #5, they seem to have accepted map submittal #2 as it worked logically with numbers than did map submittal #3, but Map submittal #1 was not even given a chance for discussion in meeting #5 with all committee members being present. Hence we have garnered support for map submittal #1.



**Graph 1: Projected Enrollment capacity –Map submittal 1\***

**\*Retains areas 84, 14 with Springville**



Map Submittal 1\* : Map submittal 1 plus retains areas 84 & 14 with Springville



	Current Boundary Routes (SPR and JW only)	Modified Scenario 3 (current Tentative Proposal)	Modified Scenario 3 with Island	Map Submittal #1	Map Submittal #2	Map Submittal #3
Annual Operational Cost	\$ 27,139	\$ 11,902	\$ 12,145	\$ 7,792	\$ 7,347	\$ 19,459
Annual Wage & Benefit Cost	\$ 30,037	\$ 12,342	\$ 12,752	\$ 7,785	\$ 6,933	\$ 21,873
<b>Total Annual Route Cost</b>	<b>\$ 57,176</b>	<b>\$ 24,244</b>	<b>\$ 24,897</b>	<b>\$ 15,577</b>	<b>\$ 14,280</b>	<b>\$ 41,332</b>
Total Number of Routes	7	3	3	2	2	5
Avg Route Time	22:06	21:12	21:54	20:00	17:48	22:30
Avg Route Mileage	4.62	4.73	4.83	4.65	4.38	4.64
Average Miles from Center Point	1.1	0.8	1.0	0.6	0.8	0.9

KAISER						
	Current Boundary Routes (SPR and JW only)	Modified Scenario 3 (current Tentative Proposal)	Modified Scenario 3 with Island	Map Submittal #1	Map Submittal #2	Map Submittal #3
Annual Operational Cost	\$ -	\$ 20,457	\$ 18,427	\$ 12,288	\$ 25,137	\$ 13,269
Annual Wage & Benefit Cost	\$ -	\$ 20,923	\$ 19,232	\$ 11,802	\$ 26,161	\$ 11,976
<b>Total Annual Route Cost</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 41,380</b>	<b>\$ 37,659</b>	<b>\$ 24,089</b>	<b>\$ 51,298</b>	<b>\$ 25,246</b>
Total Number of Routes	0	5	5	3	7	3
Avg Route Time	0	21:30	19:48	20:12	19:12	20:30
Avg Route Mileage	0.00	4.88	4.39	4.88	4.28	5.27
Average Miles from Center Point	0.0	1.1	1.5	1.2	1.4	1.7

JACOB WISMER						
	Current Boundary Routes (SPR and JW only)	Modified Scenario 3 (current Tentative Proposal)	Modified Scenario 3 with Island	Map Submittal #1	Map Submittal #2	Map Submittal #3
Annual Operational Cost	\$ 6,995	\$ 6,995	\$ 6,995	\$ 19,576	\$ 6,995	\$ 6,995
Annual Wage & Benefit Cost	\$ 9,877	\$ 9,877	\$ 9,877	\$ 22,219	\$ 9,877	\$ 9,877
<b>Total Annual Route Cost</b>	<b>\$ 16,873</b>	<b>\$ 16,873</b>	<b>\$ 16,873</b>	<b>\$ 41,796</b>	<b>\$ 16,873</b>	<b>\$ 16,873</b>
Total Number of Routes	4	4	4	5	4	4
Avg Route Time	12:42	12:42	12:42	22:54	12:42	12:42
Avg Route Mileage	2.09	2.09	2.09	4.67	2.09	2.09
Average Miles from Center Point	0.9	0.9	0.9	1.0	0.9	0.88

TOTALS						
	Current Boundary Routes (SPR and JW only)	Modified Scenario 3 (current Tentative Proposal)	Modified Scenario 3 with Island	Map Submittal #1	Map Submittal #2	Map Submittal #3
<b>Total Annual Route Cost</b>	<b>\$ 74,048</b>	<b>\$ 82,496</b>	<b>\$ 79,429</b>	<b>\$ 81,462</b>	<b>\$ 82,451</b>	<b>\$ 83,450</b>
Total Number of Routes	11	12	12	10	13	12
Total Route Time	3:25:24	3:42:00	3:35:24	3:35:06	3:41:05	3:44:59
Total Route Mileage	40.7	46.9	44.8	47.3	47.1	47.4
Total Avg Mi from Center Point	1.1	0.9	1.2	0.9	1.0	1.2

Table 2: BSD Transportation costs distributed at Meeting #4

# Fw: Choose Map Submittal #1: BSD School Elementary Schools Boundary Change

deborah wohlmut

Mon 12/26/2016 8:04 PM

Inbox

To: BSD Elementary Boundary Comments <Elementary-Boundary-Comments@beaverton.k12.or.us>;

4 attachments (561 KB)

Map1\_submittal.pdf; ATT00001.htm; Petition\_For\_MapSubmittal\_1\_BSD\_ES\_BoundaryChange.docx; ATT00002.htm;

---

**From:** "Kanchan Pattani" <[kanchan.pattani@gmail.com](mailto:kanchan.pattani@gmail.com)>  
**To:** "donald grotting" <[Don\\_Grotting@beaverton.k12.or.us](mailto:Don_Grotting@beaverton.k12.or.us)>, "Anne Bryan" <[Anne\\_Bryan@beaverton.k12.or.us](mailto:Anne_Bryan@beaverton.k12.or.us)>, "Eric Simpson" <[Eric\\_Simpson@beaverton.k12.or.us](mailto:Eric_Simpson@beaverton.k12.or.us)>  
**Subject:** Choose Map Submittal #1: BSD School Elementary Schools Boundary Change

Dear Superintendent Grotting & Respected Board Members,

I am a resident of the Pirate Park Neighborhood and my son is a first grader at Springville Elementary. My daughter will be a kindergartner in Fall 2018. I have attended the Elementary schoolboundary committee meetings, and I don't feel like the concerns of a majority of my neighbors are reflected in the final proposal that was adopted by the Elementary Boundary Committee.

I have a very unbiased opinion of the situation given that any plan adopted by the School Board is going force my family to move to a new school. The current options (map submittal #2 and map submittal #3) are very short sighted and dont address the over-crowding issue long term. As a result I am standing behind map submittal #1 which splits the larger Pirate Park neighborhood to be split up but address all the over-crowding, transportation, congestion and safety issues long term. So as a resident of the Pirate Park neighborhood, I am in favor of Map Submittal #1.

I list out the reason for my decision in great detail in the attached documents.

Thank you for this opportunity to present my case.

--

Kanchan.Pattani

Dear Superintendent Don Grotting,

We the undersigned residents of various Springville communities (Arbor Oaks, Abbey creek and Pirate Park) would like to **request you to consider map submittal 1** thought out by advisory committee member Sarah Beachy for elementary school boundary change. We have attached submittal 1 in this set (Figure 1 at the end and also as attachment). This map was introduced along with other submittal maps for the first time in meeting #4 and also eliminated in a hurry towards the end of meeting #4 not giving the public enough time to study this map.

1. Map 1 delivers both objectives outlined by the school board -- relieving overcrowding at Springville ES (SV) & Jacob Wismer ES (JW) and starting Kaiser K-5 with ~500 students. Map submittal 1 can be slightly modified to retain areas 84 and 14 along with its neighbors 18 and 1 and have those families continue at Springville. This brings SV and JW both to at or below their capacity for foreseeable future. **It requires that the larger Pirate Park neighborhood would need to be split but we, the Pirate Park residents are agreeable to that solution to help maintain long term stability for all the kids involved and not have to revisit this process in another 3-4 years.** The resulting projected enrollment graph is shown in **Graph 1** (attached at the end).

2. Total expected enrollment in 2021 for all three schools is 2353. Even with all the pre-approved portables that we were told can be put at Kaiser the total capacity for the schools is 2428. So all schools will need to be at 97% capacity. We cannot expect only Kaiser and Springville to shoulder that burden. Map submittals 2 and 3 under-utilize Jacob Wismer while over burden Kaiser and Springville. All 3 schools should be part of the solution space (see **Table 1: Projected % Capacity Utilization**).

		Map submittal 1*	Map submittal 1*	Map submittal #2	Map submittal #2	Map submittal #3	Map submittal #3
school	total capacity	2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021	2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021	2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021
jacob wismer	749	753	101%	656	88%	656	88%
springville	790	820	104%	777	98%	686	87%
kaiser	769	780	101%	920	120%	1010	131%

\* additionally retains area 84 and 14 with springville in Map submittal 1

**Table 1: Projected % Capacity Utilization comparing Map submittal 1, 2, 3.**

3. The Committee's recommended option, map #2 had several problems (details below) as acknowledged by the committee members themselves, most important amongst them being: Kaiser goes over capacity within 2 years of inception needing portables and it still progressively gets worse till 2023. Overcrowding of the schools needs to be solved by looking at all 3 schools, instead of artificially creating constraints by limiting it to only 2 schools.

4. Map 1 is the only map that addresses growth that is happening north by drawing boundaries east-west, as opposed to north-south (map 2), therefore allowing better long term stability. It also addresses proximity to school, continuity of education and neighborhood unity, by keeping whole physical neighborhoods intact and in one school. As such, it will prevent any boundary adjustment process for the next 7 years (2023) which is the absolute earliest date that the new east BSD property can be opened as an elementary school per Mr. Steve Sparks in meeting #5.

**Details:**



## **Why map submittal #1 works better than map submittal #2:**

### **A. Map 1 addresses overcrowding problem and balances student population distribution among all 3 schools for both the short term and long term, while map 2 does not:**

Map 1 will cause JW to go over capacity by ~45 students for the first 3 years. This small increase for such a short term can be easily managed. SV has been operating at 119% of capacity for past ~2 years. Moreover JW elementary projected enrollment trend is a declining curve which statistically suggests Map1 will do well even by allocating 45 more at the beginning which would even out this declining curve.

Map 2 on the other hand will cause Kaiser to start the school with a projection of 600 students rather than 500 and go overcapacity from 2019, just 2 years after its inception putting it at 837 students in 2019 which is well over its capacity of 769. This is while JW operates at 92% capacity in 2019 (691/749). Hence map 2 does not balance out the student population evenly between 3 schools and is a solution that is short sighted.

### **B. Map 1 addresses proximity to school while map 2 does not:**

Neighborhoods that are closer to JW will be retained at JW: South Pirate Park below green corridor- (areas 91, 18, 57, 9) plus areas (41, 12, and 60). Neighborhoods that are closer to SV will remain at SV: Abbey Creek- (area 93, 9, 72), low income housing off of 185<sup>th</sup> – (area 39, 68) and north pirate park – (area 1, 18, 84, 14). Neighborhoods closer to Kaiser (Arbor view – (areas 61, 55, 74, 15) including all new growth areas, will be directed to Kaiser ES.

In Map 2, children from far south pirate park are being pulled way up north to just make up numbers for Kaiser while areas 61, 55, 74, 15 which are more proximate to Kaiser really should move to Kaiser ES. Also this area naturally delineates well into Kaiser due to the new high school boundary and hence should be considered for Kaiser Enrollment. When the current zero enrollment neighborhoods next to Kaiser start to fill up, Southern most pirate park (areas 91, 18, 41, 12, 60, 57, 9, 0) would be the most obvious candidate for rezoning.

### **C. Map 2 does not meet BSD's criteria for boundary change:**

Map 2 does not meet BSD's criteria for the change of boundaries because JW's boundaries remain unchanged and therefore Jacob Wismer is a mere spectator with a right to 50% vote on the advisory committee while overcrowding continues to persist at Kaiser and Springville. So it defies the criteria of resolving overcrowding.

Map 2 requires the North and South Pirate Park communities to move to a new elementary school for the 4th time in 15 years never affording its children a stable neighborhood school. Pirate park started out at Bethany elementary, then were moved to Jacob Wismer, moved in 2009 to Springville, and with map 2, will be moved again in 2016 to Kaiser ES. If Map Submittal #1 is accepted it would offer continuity to north Pirate Park to continue at Springville and again move south pirate park but this time rightly to the most proximate neighborhood school which is Jacob Wismer rather than pulling up children all the way north to a not so proximate school.

### **D. Map 2 requires over ~70% of Springville school to move:**

Map 2 requires over ~70% of Springville families to move to the new school Kaiser and 90% of the PTO to move to the new school. Starting next year Springville will have moved

over most of its PTO supporting families to Kaiser if map submittal #2 is approved. Shouldn't that ring a warning that boundary lines are being drawn incorrectly?

**E. Map submittal #1 addresses safety while map submittal #2 does not and map submittal #1 has the lowest transportation costs:**

Map submittal #2 forces BSD to route busses on the already busy and narrow Bethany Boulevard causing long term congestion for all the communities and compromises the safety of the kids and everyone in the community.


On the other hand, Map submittal #1 would direct South pirate park traffic areas (60, 41, 12, 57, 9, 18, and 91) east to Jacob Wismer across Bethany Boulevard and not north onto Bethany Boulevard.

Transportation costs chart provided by BSD at the 14<sup>th</sup> November meeting#4 (**see attached Table 2**) states that the total annual route cost of transportation for BSD for map submittal #1 is \$81,462 while for map submittal #2 it is \$82,451. Map submittal #1 has also proved itself to be the cheapest option for transportation when compared to both Map submittal #2 and #3.

**F. Mode of teaching**

All schools follow the common core syllabus but have different approaches of teaching it. Springville uses expeditionary learning (EL) and Kaiser will use STEAM. It would work well if Jacob Wismer could adopt one of the newer learning models like the ones above.

On reviewing the testimony of all the committee members at meeting #5, they seem to have accepted map submittal #2 as it worked logically with numbers than did map submittal #3, but Map submittal #1 was not even given a chance for discussion in meeting #5 with all committee members being present. Hence we have garnered support for map submittal #1.




**Graph 1: Projected Enrollment capacity –Map submittal 1\***


**\*Retains areas 84, 14 with Springville**

Kaiser ES population explodes starting 2019

### Resulting Projected Enrollment




**Graph 2: Projected Enrollment capacity –Map submittal 2**



**Figure 1: Map submittal 1\* (Map submittal 1 + Retains areas 84, 14 with Springville).**

# Kaiser Road K-5 Elementary Boundary Adjustment: Map Submittal #1

November 15, 2016



School	Permanent Capacity*	Capacity Provided by Portables	Total Capacity Available in 2016 K-5 Enrollment	2016 % Utilization of Capacity	Notes
Jacob Warner K-5	723	38	761	94%	2 portable classrooms onsite
Springville K-5**	676	114	790	115%	4 portable classrooms onsite, neither were classroom spaces have been converted
Kaiser Road K-5	769	0	769		No portable classrooms

\*All capacity figures are for the general student population; specialized education and/or classroom spaces have been deducted.

\*\*Springville's capacity is stated for K-5 only. BSO seats for K-5 special students, who will attend in 2017, have been deducted.



Hello Mr.Grotting ,

We the undersigned residents of various Springville communities would like to **request you to consider map submittal 1\*** thought out by advisory committee member Sarah Beachy for elementary school boundary change. This map was introduced along with other submittal maps for the first time in meeting #4 and also eliminated extremely quickly towards the end of meeting #4 not giving the public any time to possibly study this map. Springville advisory committee member Sheetal Golem was also absent at this meeting giving this map no chance for her comments which then put Springville and Kaiser schools ( 67% of area of total area under consideration) to have only 2 advisory representatives thus putting them at an immediate disadvantage at meeting #4.

Currently we have 160 signatures from concerned community members in support of Map submittal 1\*. Please find them in the file.

Map submittal 1\* is the only map that distributes overcrowding equally among all 3 schools and actually meets the BSD criteria to relieve overcrowding at all schools involved. We have attached submittal 1\* in this set.

Map1\* also sets the best stage for passing the future bond for the new BSD North Bethany property since all 3 schools are bursting at the seams rather than just one school.  
The school board has a stronger case for it since more people (from all 3 schools) will need it.

Map submittals 2 and 3 make the capacity distributions extremely uneven and puts Kaiser at 120% to 130% which is way over its capacity. In another 3 years. It will put Kaiser in the same situation as Springville is today.

This **table 1** below shows the projected capacity utilization for all 3 schools for the year 2021.

school	total capacity	Map submittal 1*	Map submittal 1*	Map submittal #2	Map submittal #2	Map submittal #3	Map submittal #3
		2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021	2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021	2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021
jacob wismer	749	753	101%	656	88%	656	88%
springville	790	820	104%	777	98%	686	87%
kaiser	769	780	101%	920	120%	1010	131%

\* additionally retains area 84 and 14 with springville in Map submittal 1


**Table 1 : Projected % Capacity Utilization comparing Map submittal 1,2,3**

#### **Map submittal 1\* - Retains areas 84 and 14 with Springville**


Petitions aside please make a fair decision considering the sustainability of all 3 schools until 2023 which is the absolute earliest that the new BSD property could be an elementary school.

The graphs below show the % under/overcapacity of each school for all the Map submittals 1, 1\*, 2 ,3.


**KAISER IS 15% OVER CAPACITY, SPRINGVILLE  
9% UNDER CAPACITY  
(MAP SUBMITTAL #1)**




**ALL SCHOOLS AT CAPACITY IN 2021  
(MODIFIED MAP SUBMITTAL #1)  
(MAP#1 WITH AREAS 84, 0, 14 IN SPRINGVILLE)**



**KAISER IS 20% OVER CAPACITY,  
JACOB WISMER IS 12% UNDER CAPACITY  
(MAP SUBMITTAL #2)**




**KAISER IS 31% OVER CAPACITY, REMAINING  
ARE 12% UNDER CAPACITY  
(MAP SUBMITTAL #3)**





## Kaiser Road K-5 Elementary Boundary Adjustment: Map Submittal #1

November 15, 2016



School	Permanent Capacity*	Capacity Provided by Portables	Total Capacity Available in 2017	2016 K-5 Enrollment	2020 % Utilization of Capacity	Notes
Jacob Warner K-5	711	18	729	703	96%	2 portable classrooms onsite
Springville K-5**	676	114	790	944	119%	6 portable classrooms onsite, some non-classroom spaces have been converted
Kaiser Road K-5	769	0	769			No portable classrooms

\*No capacity figures are for the general student population, vaccinated children and ill children are not included.  
\*\*Springville's capacity is stated as 676 only, 100 seats for 6-8 year olds, who will remain in BSD, have been subtracted.

**Map submittal 1\* - Retains areas 84 and 14 with Springville**

Dear Superintendent Don Grotting,

We the undersigned residents of various Springville communities (Arbor Oaks, Abbey creek and Pirate Park) would like to **request you to consider map submittal 1** thought out by advisory committee member Sarah Beachy for elementary school boundary change. We have attached submittal 1 in this set. This map was introduced along with other submittal maps for the first time in meeting #4 and also eliminated extremely quickly towards the end of meeting #4 not giving the public any time to possibly study this map. Springville advisory committee member Sheetal Golem was also absent at this meeting giving this map no chance for her comments which then put Springville and Kaiser schools ( 67% of area of total area under consideration) represented by 3 advisory members at an immediate disadvantage at meeting #4.

1. Our belief is that Map submittal 1 is the most sustainable long term, and is not based on emotion (which Map submittal 3 is being tagged as) or based off of treating children as mere numbers by acquiring children from way down south to be able to start the new North Bethany school Kaiser at a healthy number of ~500.(which Map submittal 2 is doing).

2. Map 1 delivers both objectives outlined by the school board -- relieving overcrowding at Springville ES (SV) & Jacob Wismer ES (JW) and starting Kaiser K-5 with ~500 students. Map submittal 1 can be slightly modified to retain areas 84 and 14 along with its neighbors 18 and 1 and have those families continue at Springville. This requires the larger Pirate Park neighborhood to be split along the green corridor but we, the Pirate Park residents are agreeable to that solution for the sake of continuity and stability of education for all the families involved so as not have to revisit this process in another 5 years. The resulting projected enrollment graph is shown in **Graph 1** below.

3. The Committee's recommended option, map #2 had several problems (details below) as acknowledged by the committee members themselves, most important amongst them being: Kaiser goes over capacity within 2 years of inception needing portables and it progressively gets worse till 2023. Overcrowding of the schools needs to be balanced out by all the 3 schools. Total expected enrollment in 2021 for all three schools is 2353. Even with all the pre-approved portables that we were told can be put at Kaiser the total capacity for the schools is 2428. So all schools will need to be at 97% capacity in that year for the numbers to be shared. We cannot expect only Kaiser and Springville to carry that burden. Map submittals 2 and 3 under-utilize Jacob Wismer while over burden Kaiser and Springville. (**see Table 1: Projected % Capacity Utilization**)

4. Map 1 is the only map that addresses growth that is happening north by drawing boundaries east-west, as opposed to north-south (map 2), therefore allowing better long term stability. It also maintains proximity, continuity of education and neighborhood unity, by keeping whole physical neighborhoods intact and in one school for the next 5 years without having them be redrawn prior to 2023 which is the absolute earliest date that the new east BSD property can be opened as an elementary school per Mr. Steve Sparks in meeting #5.

**Details:**

## **Why Map submittal #1 works better than map submittal #2:**

### **Map 1 addresses proximity to school while map 2 does not:**

Neighborhoods that are closer to JW will be retained at JW. South Pirate Park below green corridor-(areas 91, 18, 57, 9) plus areas (41, 12, and 60). Neighborhoods that are closer to SV will remain at SV: Abbey Creek- (area 93, 9), low income housing off of 185<sup>th</sup> – (area 39, 68) and north pirate park – (area 1, 18, 84, 14). Neighborhoods closer to Kaiser (Arbor view – (areas 61, 55, 74, 15) including all new growth areas, will be directed to Kaiser ES.

In Map 2, children from far south pirate park are being pulled way up north to just make up numbers for Kaiser while areas 61, 55, 74, 15 which are more proximate to Kaiser are better doing that. Also this area naturally delineates well into Kaiser due to the new high school boundary and hence should be considered for Kaiser Enrollment. When the current zero enrollment neighborhoods next to Kaiser start to fill up, Southern most pirate park is the most obvious candidate for chop off.

### **Map 1 addresses overcrowding problem and balances student population distribution among all 3 schools better for both the short term and long term until, while map 2 does not:**

Map 1 will cause JW to go over capacity by ~45 students for the first 3 years. This is possibly a 2 classroom size increase over the first 3 years. SV has been running at 119% capacity for past ~2 years and to be fair has done an excellent job at it. Moreover JW elementary projected enrollment trend is a declining curve which statistically suggests Map1 will do well even by allocating 45 more at the beginning which would even out this declining curve.

Map 2 on the other hand will cause Kaiser to start the school with a projection of 600 students rather than 500 and go overcapacity from 2019, just 2 years after its inception putting it at 837 students in 2019 which is well over ~80 students over its capacity of 769. This is while JW operates at 92% capacity in 2019 (691/749). Hence map 2 does not balance out the student population evenly between 3 schools and is a solution that is short sighted.

### **Map 2 does not meet BSD's criteria for boundary change**

Map 2 does not meet BSD's criteria for the change of boundaries because JW's boundaries remain unchanged and therefore Jacob Wismer is a mere spectator with a right to 50% vote on the advisory committee while overcrowding continues to persist at Kaiser and Springville. So it defies the criteria of resolving overcrowding.

Map 2 requires the North and South Pirate Park communities to move to a new elementary school for the 4th time in 15 years never affording its children a stable neighborhood school. Pirate park started out at Bethany elementary, then were moved to Jacob Wismer, moved in 2009 to Springville, and moved again in 2016 to Kaiser. If Map Submittal #1 is accepted it would offer continuity to north Pirate Park to continue at Springville and again move south

pirate park but this time rightly to the most proximate neighborhood school which is Jacob Wismer rather than pulling up children all the way north to a not so proximate school.

### **Map 2 requires over ~70% of Springville school to move**

Map 2 requires over ~70% of Springville families to move to the new school Kaiser and 90% of the PTO to move to the new school. Starting next year Springville will have moved over most of its PTO supporting families to Kaiser if map submittal #2 is approved. Shouldn't that ring a warning that boundary lines are being drawn incorrectly?

### **Map submittal #1 has the lowest Transportation costs**


Map submittal #2 forces more school busses to go north on the already busy and narrow one lane Bethany Boulevard causing long term congestion for all the communities and affecting the safety of everyone.

On the other hand, Map submittal #1 would direct South pirate park traffic areas (60, 41, 12, 57, 9, 18, and 91) east to Jacob Wismer across Bethany Boulevard and not north onto Bethany Boulevard. Transportation costs chart provided by BSD at the 14<sup>th</sup> November meeting#4 (**see attached Table 2**) states that the total annual route cost of transportation for BSD for map submittal #1 is \$81,462 while for map submittal #2 it is \$82,451. Map submittal #1 has also proved itself to be the cheapest option for transportation when compared to both Map submittal #2 and #3.

### **Mode of teaching**

All schools follow the common core syllabus but have different approaches of teaching it. Springville uses expeditionary learning (EL) and Kaiser will use STEAM. It would work well if Jacob Wismer could adopt one of the newer learning models like the ones above.

On reviewing the testimony of all the committee members at meeting #5, they seem to have accepted map submittal #2 as it worked logically with numbers than did map submittal #3, but Map submittal #1 was not even given a chance for discussion in meeting #5 with all committee members being present. Hence we have garnered support for map submittal #1.



**Graph 1: Projected Enrollment capacity –Map submittal 1\***

**\*Retains areas 84, 14 with Springville**

school	total capacity	Map submittal 1*		Map submittal #2		Map submittal #3	
		2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021	2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021	2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021
jacob wismer	749	753	101%	656	88%	656	88%
springville	790	820	104%	777	98%	686	87%
kaiser	769	780	101%	920	120%	1010	131%

\* additionally retains area 84 and 14 with springville in Map submittal 1

**Table 1 : Projected % Capacity Utilization comparing Map submittal 1,2,3**

11/14/2016

Comparative Transportation Cost Evaluation						
SPRINGVILLE						
	Current Boundary Routes (SPR and JW only)	Modified Scenario 3 (current Tentative Proposal)	Modified Scenario 3 with Island	Map Submittal #1	Map Submittal #2	Map Submittal #3
Annual Operational Cost	\$ 27,139	\$ 11,902	\$ 12,145	\$ 7,792	\$ 7,347	\$ 19,459
Annual Wage & Benefit Cost	\$ 30,037	\$ 12,342	\$ 12,752	\$ 7,785	\$ 6,933	\$ 21,873
Total Annual Route Cost	\$ 57,176	\$ 24,244	\$ 24,897	\$ 15,577	\$ 14,280	\$ 41,332
Total Number of Routes	7	3	3	2	2	5
Avg Route Time	22:06	21:12	21:54	20:00	17:48	22:30
Avg Route Mileage	4.62	4.73	4.83	4.65	4.38	4.64
Average Miles from Center Point	1.1	0.8	1.0	0.6	0.8	0.9























KAISER						
	Current Boundary Routes (SPR and JW only)	Modified Scenario 3 (current Tentative Proposal)	Modified Scenario 3 with Island	Map Submittal #1	Map Submittal #2	Map Submittal #3
Annual Operational Cost	\$ -	\$ 20,457	\$ 18,427	\$ 12,288	\$ 25,137	\$ 13,269
Annual Wage & Benefit Cost	\$ -	\$ 20,923	\$ 19,232	\$ 11,802	\$ 26,161	\$ 11,976
Total Annual Route Cost	\$ -	\$ 41,380	\$ 37,659	\$ 24,089	\$ 51,298	\$ 25,246
Total Number of Routes	0	5	5	3	7	3
Avg Route Time	0	21:30	19:48	20:12	19:12	20:30
Avg Route Mileage	0.00	4.88	4.39	4.88	4.28	5.27
Average Miles from Center Point	0.0	1.1	1.5	1.2	1.4	1.7

JACOB WISMER						
	Current Boundary Routes (SPR and JW only)	Modified Scenario 3 (current Tentative Proposal)	Modified Scenario 3 with Island	Map Submittal #1	Map Submittal #2	Map Submittal #3
Annual Operational Cost	\$ 6,995	\$ 6,995	\$ 6,995	\$ 19,576	\$ 6,995	\$ 6,995
Annual Wage & Benefit Cost	\$ 9,877	\$ 9,877	\$ 9,877	\$ 22,219	\$ 9,877	\$ 9,877
Total Annual Route Cost	\$ 16,873	\$ 16,873	\$ 16,873	\$ 41,796	\$ 16,873	\$ 16,873
Total Number of Routes	4	4	4	5	4	4
Avg Route Time	12:42	12:42	12:42	22:54	12:42	12:42
Avg Route Mileage	2.09	2.09	2.09	4.67	2.09	2.09
Average Miles from Center Point	0.9	0.9	0.9	1.0	0.9	0.88

TOTALS						
	Current Boundary Routes (SPR and JW only)	Modified Scenario 3 (current Tentative Proposal)	Modified Scenario 3 with Island	Map Submittal #1	Map Submittal #2	Map Submittal #3
Total Annual Route Cost	\$ 74,048	\$ 82,496	\$ 79,429	\$ 81,462	\$ 82,451	\$ 83,450
Total Number of Routes	11	12	12	10	13	12
Total Route Time	3:25:24	3:42:00	3:35:24	3:35:06	3:41:05	3:44:59
Total Route Mileage	40.7	46.9	44.8	47.3	47.1	47.4
Total Avg Mi from Center Point	1.1	0.9	1.2	0.9	1.0	1.2



# Petition: Support Map ~~1~~ BSD ES boundar


Name	Neighborhood	E-mail	Signature
Aakanksha B	Arbor Ridge	bhateradag@gmail.com	
Sushama P.	Arbor View	Sjadhav422@gmail.com	
Rupali N.	Bethany creek	Shivroop2002@yahoo.com	
Shivaji N.	"	Shivaji_Nimare@yahoo.co.uk	
Pranjakta S.	Bethany	PranjaktaSoman9@gmail.com	
Rahul	Bethany Creek	swiss_24_nar@yahoo.com	
Anand	Arbor oaks	anandamarathe@yahoo.com	
Ashutosh Ghavi	Arbor Oaks	ashutosh.ghavi@gmail.com	
Shilpa Lal.	Arbor oaks	shilpalal2005@gmail.com	
Mrudula Ch.	Arbor Oaks	mrudula.chandra@gmail.com	
Veena Kulkarni	Arbor oaks	veenavk2008@gmail.com	
Vidyanand	Arbor oaks	Vidyanandk@yahoo.com	
Hitenendra	Hititi@yahoo.com	ARBOR OAKS	
Anju	Arbor Oaks	anju.babaria@gmail.com	
Shivani	Arbor Oaks	shivani_marathe@yahoo.com	
Ajit	South Parc	ajitdsin@yahoo.com	
Veera	Arbor oaks	Sasi.Tarigopula@gmail.com	
Satish	Arbor Oaks	gannam77@gmail.com	
Pratyusha	Arbor Oaks	pratyusha.janga@gmail.com	
Priyanka L	Arbor Oaks	priyanka2603@gmail.com	
RAHUL A	Arbor Oaks	radokar@gozuti.com	
Asawari Kulkarni	Arbor Oaks	kulkarni.asawari@gmail.com	

# Petition Signatures: Support Map 1\* BSD ES Boundary

Name	Neighborhood	E-mail	Signature
Gauri Sathaye	Pirate Park	gauri1105@gmail.com	<u>Gathaye</u>
Abhijit Sathaye	Pirate Park	abhijitsathaye@gmail.com	<u>Abhaye</u>
Alpesh Rodage	Pirate Park	alpeshrodage@gmail.com	<u>Alp</u>
Harsha Rodage	Pirate Park	harsha.patil@gmail.com	<u>Patil</u>
Sujay Pattani	Pirate Park	sujay.pattani@gmail.com	<u>Sujay</u>
Kanchan Pattani	Pirate Park	kanchan.pattani@gmail.com	<u>Kattani</u>



# SUPPORT FOR MAP SUBMITTAL #1\*

Name	<del>A Area</del> Area	Email	Phone	Sign
Yang Zou	91	yang82208@hotmail.com		
Haiyan Wu	91	haiyanballet@hotmail.com		HU
Balita Benegal	222	balita.benegal@gmail.com		BS
SHYAM Benegal	222	shyam.benegal@gmail.com		Shyam
Deepa. K	84	deepa.18.pmp@gmail.com		DK
A. Shastri	91	asundhats34@gmail.com		AS
Zee Chun	91	leechun2000@gmail.com		LG
ARCHANA. K	84	archkum@gmail.com		AK
Nanya J	59	nanyej8@gmail.com		NJ
Anil J	59	anil1121@yahoo.com		AJ
H. Thatikonda	84	hanshthatikonda@gmail.com		HT
Amit K.	84	amit SK 1974@gmail.com		AK
<del>Chetana S</del> 4920 B	91	Lyn @ blue ridge farm . com		<del>Chetana</del> LB
Ramnath. R	91	ramnath.raju@gmail.com		R. R
N. Prudhvi	91	narina prudhvi@gmail.com		NP
M. Guraji	91	mv.guraji@hotmail.com		MT
Phani. G.	91	phani8@yahoo.com		PG
Dasaka. S	42	dasaka@gmail.com		DS
Padmini.		reach padmini@gmail.com		Admini
Chetana S.	91	chetana.singh@gmail.com		Chetana S.
Kris. Bedcaill	91	Kris @ blue ridge farm . com		K.B.

Laura Manuel 222

laura.t.manuel@gmail.com h.M.

Brad Manuel 222

bradmanuel@gmail.com E.M.

Carin Thuesen 3

carinthuesen@gmail.com






















Musli Krishna S 34

nutanki.musli.krishna@gmail.com

# Petition Signatures: Support Map \* BSD ES Boundary

Name	Neighborhood	E-mail	Signature
Gauri	Arbor oaks		Gauri
Shubha	Arbor oaks		Shubha
Rama	Arbor Oaks		Rama
Vasudevan	Arbor Oaks		Vasudevan
Seema	Arbor Oaks		Seema
Aseem	Arbor Oaks		Aseem
Amruta	Arbor Oaks	aparicharak@gmail.com	Amruta
Santosh	Arbor Oaks	Santosh.Paricharak@gmail.com	Santosh
Medha	Arbor Oaks		Medha
Girish	Arbor Oaks		Girish
Pratibha	Arbor Oaks	MADHU. PRATIBHA @GMAIL.COM	Pratibha
Amity	Arbor Oaks	amityoverallaib@gmail.com	Amity
Overall-aiB	Arbor Oaks	amityoverallaib@gmail.com	Overall-aiB
Rebecca Peil	Arbor Oaks	rwpeil@yahoo.com	Rebecca Peil
Neerav	Arbor Oaks	neerav.parikh@gmail.com	Neerav
RAJASEKHAR ANUMULA	ARBOR OAKS	vsred428@gmail.com	Rajasekhara
Manuel Prince Castillo	Pirate Park	manuel.prince@gmail.com	Manuel Prince
Hsin-Tzuc Hou	Pirate Park	hsin-tzuc@hotmail.com	Hsin-Tzuc

# Petition: Support Map 1\*BSD ES boundar

Name	Neighborhood	E-mail	Signature
RAVI IYER	PIRATE PARK	RAVI IYER20@GMAIL.COM	
USHA KRISHNAMURTHY	PIRATE PARK	DEVIUSHA K@GMAIL.COM	
Andrew Richardson	Pirate Park	andrew@andrewrichardson.com	
Paige Richardson	Pirate Park	paige@paigerichardson.com	
Joanne Lee		joannelee@yahoo.com	
Evan Yonge		EYOUN24691@GMAIL.COM	
AHMAD S MAZUMDER		sahukzarif@gmail.com	
Jay Lind	Wister Ridge		
Qimanda Lee	PIRATE PARK	alee20@gmail.com	
Nathan Benannon	Pirate Park	GHSB@yahoo.com	
HEMA ANYAGARI	PIRATE PARK	HAYYAGARI2014@GMAIL.COM	
Wenki Anyagari	Pirate Park	wanyagari2000@gmail.com	
ROBERT CHAN			
Joyce Brizendine	Westview	jimbrize@frontier.com	
Dan Brizendine	Westview	blucherongreenheron@yahoo.com	
Melissa Pollard	Pirate & Park	Melpollard4@hotmail.com	
Brogan Pierce	Pirate Park	brogan44@gmail.com	
Penny Pierce	Westfield	penny.amick@hotmail.com	
Neha Urrutia	Pirate Park	agrawal.neha10@gmail.com	
Tony Urrutia	Pirate Park	tonyurrutia79@gmail.com	
BLAKEMEL	CLOSEENOUGH	bmend72@gmail.com	

Petition: Support Map 1\* BSD ES Boundar

[illegible]

We support modified map #1 proposal as proposed by the members of the Springville community.

Name	Address	Signature
Craig Larimer	16193 NW Graf St. Portland 97229	Craig Larimer
Christian Larimer	"	Christian Larimer
DEEKSHA GROVER	16229 NW Graf St Portland 97229	Deeksha Grover
Kym Camp	5927 NW Scheel Ter Portland OR 97229	Kym Camp
JEFF CARLSON	5950 NW SCHEEL ST	Jeff Carlson
David Castleton	6011 NW Scheel Ter	David Castleton
GARY SHEPERD	6029 NW Scheel Ter Portland, OR	Gary Sheperd
Andrew Riedi	6024 NW Scheel Ter. Portland OR 97229	Andrew Riedi
Jeff Sponsel	16322 NW CIDER LN Portland, OR 97229	Jeff Sponsel
Melinda Sponsel	16322 NW Cider Ln Portland, OR 97229	Melinda Sponsel
Brian Hixson	16148 NW Graf St	Brian Hixson
Janeth Hever	16294 NW Cider Ln	Janeth Hever
Jacy Morin	6035 NW 163RD PL. Portland OR 97229	Jacy Morin
Scott Morin	6035 NW 163RD PL. Portland OR 97229	Scott Morin
Tracey Hammar	nw 163rd PL Portland	Tracey Hammar
Bettina Rebaun	16272 NW Cider Ln Portland OR	Bettina Rebaun
Rebecca Vaughn	16231 NW Cider Ln Portland, OR 97229	Rebecca Vaughn

503  
964-2180

Christine Viveros	16226 NW Ciderlane Portland OR 97229	Christine Viveros
Lisa Johnson	16091 NW Graf St Portland OR 97229	Lisa Johnson
Gree Johnson	16091 NW Graf St Portland OR 97229	Guy John
Soumya Jayachandran	16090 NW Graf St. Portland OR 97229	②ing



We support modified map #1 proposal as proposed by the members of the Springville community.

Name	Address	Signature
DEEPIKA KRISHNASWAMY	16094 NW GRAF ST.	K. Deepika
RAGURAMAN VENKATESAN	16094 NW Graf St.	V. Ragan
SURESH RANGARAJU	16090 NW GRAF ST	R. Suresh
Lori Tewksbury	16093 NW Graf St	Lori Tewksbury
Dave Tewksbury	16093 NW Graf St	David Tewksbury
Sara Manthe	16098 NW Graf St.	Sara Manthe
Steve Manthe	16098 NW Graf St	Steve Manthe
Jim Williamson	16166 NW Graf St	Jim Williamson
Kathryn Bowden	16196 NW Graf St	Kathryn Bowden
SANDHYA SUBRAMANIAN	16240 NW GRAF ST.	Sandhya Subramanian
Margie Satterwhite	16306 NW Graf St	Margie Satterwhite
Bill Scheer	16328 NW Graf	Bill Scheer
Anne Hendrix	16339 NW Graf St	Anne Hendrix
Michael I. Hodge	16368 NW GRAF ST <sup>PORT</sup> <sub>OR</sub> <sub>GREEN</sub>	Michael I. Hodge
Nathan Weddle	16414 NW Graf St	Nathan Weddle
Linda Conn	16460 NW Graf St.	Linda Conn
Jan Yates	16528 NW Graf St.	Jan Yates



We support modified map #1 proposal as proposed by the members of the Springville community.

Name	Address	Signature
Mary Conner	16350 NW Cider Ln Portland, OR 97229	Mary L Conner
W. Steven Conner	16350 NW Cider Ln Portland, OR 97229	W. Steven Conner
Lateefuddin Syed	16085 NW Graf St Portland, OR 97229	Lateef
Deborah Gibbs	16029 NW Graf St Portland OR 97229	Deborah Gibbs
Mega Kilad	15917 NW Graf St Portland, OR 97229	Mega Kilad
ANDY JAMESON	15819 NW Graf St Portland, OR 97229	Andy Jameson
Jany Napp	15807 NW Graf	Jany Napp
Debby Hammonck	15794 NW Graf	Debby Hammonck
Heather Schroeder	15786 NW Graf	Heather Schroeder
Ellen Jordan	15816 NW Graf	Ellen D Jordan
Moniqueka Trump	15890 NW Graf	Moniqueka Trump
BRUCE NELSON	15940 NW GRAF	Bruce Nelson
Enka Williamson	15968 NW Graf St	Enka Williamson
G. J. Gulley	16086 NW Graf	G. J. Gulley
Kendra Gulley	16086 NW Graf	Kendra Gulley
Jeannie McGuire	16088 NW Graf	Jeannie McGuire
Mike McGuire	16088 NW Graf St	Mike McGuire
HARYN MAHESH	16089 NW Graf St	Haryn Mahesh

We support modified map #1 proposal as proposed by the members of the Springville community.

[illegible]

# Elementary Boundary Adjustment Comment Form

Do\_Not\_Reply@beaverton.k12.or.us

Tue 12/13/2016 6:15 AM

To: BSD Elementary Boundary Comments <Elementary-Boundary-Comments@beaverton.k12.or.us>;

**Name:** Prasanth posam

**Email:** prasanth\_digital@yahoo.co.in

**Comment:**

I am supporting the committee decision of submittal #2 because of below reasons

1. Proximity
2. Neighborhood
3. low bus cost'
4. safety (walkable to school)

**From:** April Powers <[powers.vmd@gmail.com](mailto:powers.vmd@gmail.com)>

**Date:** December 10, 2016 at 11:20:18 PM PST

**To:** [Don\\_Grotting@beaverton.k12.or.us](mailto:Don_Grotting@beaverton.k12.or.us), [Anne\\_Bryan@beaverton.k12.or.us](mailto:Anne_Bryan@beaverton.k12.or.us)

**Subject:** Petition for Map Submittal #3

Dear Superintendent Grotting:

We, parents of both Springville K-8 and Jacob Wismer elementary schools, have collaborated and joined together in support of Map Submittal #3. We have started an online petition that explains our cause and outlines our arguments against both Map Submittal #2 (the Elementary Boundary Committee's recommendation to you) and a previously dismissed scenario referred to as Map Submittal #1 (which was the most disruptive boundary adjustment suggested). You can view the petition below to read our position and comments from supporters. The number of supporters continues to grow as word gets around our neighborhoods. Please take the time to read and consider our points when you are making your decision and recommendation to the School Board.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

View the petition here: [https://www.change.org/p/superintendent-grotting-please-keep-our-children-in-our-neighborhood-elementary-schools?recruiter=269860296&utm\\_source=share\\_petition&utm\\_medium=copylink](https://www.change.org/p/superintendent-grotting-please-keep-our-children-in-our-neighborhood-elementary-schools?recruiter=269860296&utm_source=share_petition&utm_medium=copylink)

- Parents of Jacob Wismer and Springville K-8 -

***"As a collective group of Jacob Wismer and Springville K-8 parents and community members we would like to request in the strongest possible terms that Map Submittal #3 is given strong consideration due to the disruption Map Submittal #2 creates at Springville K-8. It is not reasonable to move over 70% of the founding community at Springville K-8 to a school that is located the farthest away from their neighborhood. Current Springville K-8 programs, such as running club, cub scouts, as well as all but one of the PTO board members reside within the Pirate Park community and will leave Springville K-8 bereft of identity, programs and volunteers. It also moves majority of the Springville 4th graders out to a new school, and then onto Stoller middle school, which cannot take such a large influx of students. Kaiser is a North Bethany school, and should be filled by the community surrounding it. Map Submittal #3 is the only long term proposal that looks at communities as planners intended, with the schools, parks, and communities interspersed. It is the only long term plan that does not require a major boundary adjustment at a later date. Finally, let's not move whole communities unnecessarily. Limiting the changes to the intended Springville K-8 boundaries, leaving current Jacob Wismer boundaries as they are, and encouraging the community of North Bethany to grow around Abbey Creek and the Kaiser school will accomplish these goals as envisioned in BSD policies."***

Dear Superintendent Grotting and School Board Members:

I am the parent of a 2nd grade student at Springville K-8 and also have a daughter who will start school in 2018. I have attended many of the Elementary Boundary Committee meetings and have been working with a group of parents representing all of the Pirate Park communities. We not only feel that the objectives of the committee were not met, but also that the committee members themselves were very biased in their considerations. Of the 6 committee parent members, 3 were from Jacob Wismer, who locked down their boundaries and refused to consider any scenarios that resulted in a boundary adjustment to their school, and 2 of the 3 Springville representatives live in the northern area of Springville, which was favored in committee meetings despite being a newer and much smaller proportion of the greater Springville community. If the committee process cannot be reconvened with members from all of the Springville communities, we ask that you consider this bias when evaluating their recommendation.

I, myself, and the majority of the parents within the Pirate Park Community, believe that the proposed boundary map from the Elementary Boundary Committee (known as Map 2) **does not meet several of the criteria** outlined by the Beaverton School District. I hope you will take the time to look over our arguments below and to evaluate the other maps we are providing. I, personally, have proposed the Map 3 and Map 3 Adjusted scenarios below.

I ask you to please consider the **Map 3** scenario as it provides the **most solid base plan** for the area and is the **ONLY** map that takes the additional BSD elementary school property in NE Bethany into consideration. Although Map 3 was dismissed by the committee in the final meeting, we feel that it meets more of the criteria than Map 2 (the committee's recommendation). Within a year or two, as the development of North Bethany progresses, it will not only meet ALL of the BSD criteria but would also set up the area for an easy boundary adjustment if the additional BSD property is opened in 2021 or later. It is also the only scenario that offers **several minor adjustment possibilities** to accommodate Kaiser growth in the future and **allows Jacob Wismer to remain below capacity so they are able to help relieve Findley Elementary** of overcrowding when necessary. (Please see my attached document that shows some of the future adjustments that I have worked through.) In addition, the committee members expressed interest in finding an adjustment to Map 3 that would help decrease the projected numbers for the Kaiser school and include either the 185th neighborhoods bordering Rock Creek Elementary or the Abbey Creek neighborhood north of Springville within its bounds. I have provided you with what I believe is the best adjustment and have outlined how it meets the criteria as well.

We have considered community unity, long-term stability, continuity of educational programs, and ease of future boundary adjustments in our scenarios and believe that keeping the **original neighborhoods that Springville was intended for - the Pirate Park Community and Arbor Oaks** (plus the 185th Apts if possible) - is in the best interest of all students. I understand that the Arbor Creek area north of Springville can walk to Springville school now and would need to be bused to the Kaiser school, but it is not out of the norm for school boundaries to be drawn between areas such as these. Fortunately, they will *also* be able to walk to the Kaiser school when the North Bethany trails are developed along with their neighborhoods. They will have the same interconnective community trails within their North Bethany

Community as we have within Pirate Park and Jacob Wismer. In the committee proposed Map 2, the Pirate Park Community will never have a safe walk route to the Kaiser school as they are located so far away and down a dangerous road. The Abbey Creek area will not only have a safe and direct route to the Kaiser school when development progresses, but they will also be the focal point for the community development of that area - making it a true neighborhood school. **Map 3 is the best option for the Kaiser school to become a neighborhood school and for Springville to remain one.**

I feel that these additional scenarios better suit the best interests of the majority of students, the school communities, and the stability of boundaries. **It is important to consider the stability of Springville as the middle school is an options program.** A well-established neighborhood with lower growth potential is better suited to maintain this program. Springville K-8 was built as neighborhood school for the Pirate Park communities and Arbor Oaks. Moving over 70% of its original neighborhoods to the Kaiser school is not only detrimental to the students who have made an investment in the Expeditionary Learning (EL) program at Springville, but also strips Springville of its community identity and greatly impacts the success of the school and of the middle school EL Options Program. The continuity of the Expeditionary Learning program is important for the middle school's success - and the overwhelming majority of students that have been in this program from the start of their school careers live in the Pirate Park community. This community not only deserves a neighborhood school, but also deserves to stay within the learning program that they have built from the start and hope to continue.

Finally, I would like to stress that our main concern is **community unity** and the **neighborhood school concept**. I believe these are top concerns for the school district as well. The Pirate Park Community, as a whole, has been moved repeatedly over the past 15 years. We need stability. We have finally created a community within ourselves and consider Pirate Park as a central point upon which all of our communities are connected. Please consider this connectivity in your decision. We are concerned not only about losing our school community but also being split among 3 different schools if other scenarios are considered. If the Pirate Park neighborhood needs to be split, the most logical division is outlined below in my Map 3 Adjusted scenario.

We hope you will agree with the logic of our scenario and we would also gladly welcome you into our community to give you a tour of our neighborhoods. Thank you for the taking the time to consider our concerns! If you would like any further feedback from me, I would gladly meet with you and/or the committee to talk more.

Sincerely,

Dr. April Powers - [powers.vmd@gmail.com](mailto:powers.vmd@gmail.com), (267) 275-1021

### **BSD Criteria for Proposed Attendance Boundary Adjustment**

Below is a table to demonstrate which BSD criteria for proposed boundary adjustments are met by Map 2 (committee proposed), Map 3, and Map 3 Adjusted (proposed as a “tweak” of Map 3 as requested by the Elementary Boundary Committee). Please see the following pages for additional maps and explanations of why these three scenarios meet or fail to meet the BSD Criteria. A map of neighborhoods is included on the last page to aid in identifying community locations.

<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>MAP 2</b>	<b>MAP 3</b>	<b>MAP 3 ADJUSTED</b>
Availability of space	Yes	Yes	Yes
Proximity to school	No	Yes	Yes
Neighborhood unity	Yes/No	Yes	Yes/No
Safety	Yes/No	Yes	Yes
Transportation	No	Yes/No(temporary)	Yes
Student body configuration	Yes	Yes/No(temporary)	Yes
Staffing patterns	Yes/No	Yes	Yes

## **EVALUATION OF BSD CRITERIA FOR COMMITTEE PROPOSED MAP (MAP 2)**

Availability of space: YES

- Achieves criteria with the exception that Kaiser opens higher than target goal of 500
- Increased load could impact school while it relies on a septic tank rather than sewer

Proximity to school: NO

- No safe walk routes for Pirate Park neighborhood to Kaiser now or in future
- Kaiser is unwalkable for the majority of neighborhoods in proposed boundary
- Boundary perimeters of Kaiser are not a relative equal distance from school; southernmost areas of current Springville enrollment are pulled all the way north to fill
- NO neighborhood school concept
  - Springville was built for the Pirate Park area as their neighborhood school
  - Abbey Creek is located nearest to Kaiser and is the start of the neighborhood community that will fill North Bethany; trails planned will bring walking routes

Neighborhood unity: YES/NO

- Keeps the Jacob Wismer and Pirate Park neighborhoods intact
- Kaiser school and its immediate surrounding community is not united with any other neighborhoods within its boundaries; Pirate Park neighborhood is permanently disconnected from this school as no safe walk routes are possible
- Springville made of 3-4 smaller, distinct neighborhoods rather than an interconnected community

Safety: NO FOR KAISER

- Kaiser unsafe with no safe walk routes for most of its neighborhoods now or in the future
  - Majority of neighborhoods will always be bussed
  - However, the Abbey Creek neighborhoods north of Springville would have safe routes to Kaiser via trails in the near future as part of the North Bethany Community Plan

Transportation: YES/NO

- Lower cost option compared to Map 3, but higher cost to district in the long-term
  - Majority of proposed Kaiser neighborhoods will never have safe walk routes to school
- Puts highest cost of transportation on the newest school (Kaiser)
- If areas 42 + 23 + 0 are to walk north to Kaiser rather than being bused, they will have to walk through the Springville boundary to get to their “neighborhood” school
- If additional BSD property is built and opened in the future, the Kaiser boundary becomes non-contiguous with majority of neighborhoods an island

Student body composition: YES

Staffing Patterns: YES/NO


- Decreases Springville to an extent that causes significant burden; majority of PTO parents, Cub Scout leaders, and parent-run clubs are within Pirate Park neighborhood



MAP #3

Map Submittal #3

2016



## **EVALUATION OF BSD BOUNDARY CRITERIA FOR MAP 3**

Availability of space: YES

- Kaiser opens close to 500 student target but does not overload septic tank
- Provides most options to relieve eventual Kaiser overcrowding
  - Minor boundary changes can bring all schools under capacity in this scenario only
  - Sets area up for easy adjustment if new BSD property school opens

Proximity to school: YES

- Eventual safe walk routes for all North Bethany communities west of Kaiser Rd. to Kaiser
- Kaiser boundary perimeters relatively equidistant
- Neighborhood school concept for all 3 schools - Jacob Wismer, Springville, and Kaiser

Neighborhood unity: YES

- Pirate Park communities stay united; very important to community as they have strong historical ties and are interconnected via trail systems and streets
- Elementary-to-high school feeder system stays the same; also sets up the area to bring all schools into alignment with their correct elementary-to-high school feeder system if new BSD opens

Safety: YES

- Pirate Park communities have been safely transported to Springville since it opened
  - Addition of a stoplight and crosswalk at the Springville/Joss intersection would give a large portion of these areas safe walk routes as well
- Safely buses Abbey Creek to avoid students walking past construction hazards until safe walk routes are available via North Bethany trail system

Transportation: YES/NO(temporary)

- Long-term contiguous boundaries
- Costs will decrease as North Bethany trails allow Abbey Creek areas to walk to Kaiser
- Stoplight and crosswalk at Springville/Joss intersection would create safe walk routes for Pirate Park neighborhoods to Springville
- Assigns lower cost of transportation to Kaiser compared to proposed Map 2


Student body composition: YES/NO(temporary)

- Apparent economic disparity (Kaiser 23%) is a non-issue as it is based on lower initial enrollment
  - As single family homes and enrollment increase, this drops to 15%, on par with other schools/scenarios ( $110/487 = 23\%$ ;  $110/750 = 15\%$ )

Staffing Patterns: YES

- Springville drops below capacity but retains all parent-run clubs/organizations and its identity with the retention of its original and intended student population
- Kaiser opens at target and allows for the development of community around the school and established Abbey Creek neighborhoods

### MAP #3 ADJUSTED



**\*Note:** If growth is on target for Kaiser school in 2021 or beyond, a simple boundary adjustment moving the starred areas (42 + 23) back to Springville - to which they would have safe walk routes - would bring Kaiser to 873 projected and Springville to 800 projected. Both schools would then be at capacity (with portables) without the addition of the other BSD elementary property. Jacob Wismer would be below capacity by approximately 70 students and could help relieve Findley Elementary of any overcrowding if needed.

## **EVALUATION OF BSD BOUNDARY CRITERIA FOR MAP 3 ADJUSTED**

Availability of space: YES

- As with Map 3, only minor changes required to bring all schools under capacity with inevitable Kaiser overcrowding

Proximity to school: YES

- Provides safe walk routes for West Parc (60) and Bethany Meadows Apartments (40+12) to JW
- Allows Arbor View buses to travel northward to Kaiser instead of southward on high traffic Bethany Blvd to Jacob Wismer

Neighborhood unity: YES/NO

- Divides Arbor View area of Jacob Wismer (not ideal)
  - Sends bused regions north to Kaiser and permits walking regions to remain with JW
- West Parc and Bethany Meadow Apartment areas are separated from the rest of the Pirate Park community by a fenced partition, so if the area is divided, it is easier to split here
- Allows the 185th areas to remain with Springville to avoid disruption (largely economically disadvantaged students in this area)

Safety/Transportation: YES

- Safe walk routes or shorter and more direct bus transportation for West Parc and Bethany Meadows Apts to Jacob Wismer
  - Crossing guards already present at Bethany/Laidlaw and Kaiser/Laidlaw intersections
- Safer/shorter bus route for Arbor View to Kaiser vs Jacob Wismer
- Contiguous attendance boundaries

Student body composition: YES


- Addition of Bethany Meadows Apts to Jacob Wismer could potentially help balance out the economic disparity between it (4%) and other schools in the area

Staffing Patterns: YES

- Kaiser opens at target and community is able to develop around the school
- Springville drops below capacity but retains all parent-run clubs/organizations and its identity with the retention of its original and intended student population



## MAP OF NEIGHBORHOODS



Pirate Park Community: Made up of Graf, Emerald Estates, and Pirate Park areas; interconnected via trail system around Pirate Park in its center. Areas  $91 + 18 + 57 + 9 + 1 + 18 + 84 + 0 + 14$ .

Bethany Meadows Apartments: Consists of east and west regions. Areas  $41 + 12$ .

West Parc: Area 60.

Arbor View: Areas  $61 + 55 + 74 + 15$ .

Arbor Oaks: Areas  $222 + 55$

Abbey Creek: Areas  $93 + 9 + 72$  (still developing)


185th Apartments: Areas  $68 + 39$

## FUTURE BOUNDARY PROJECTIONS FOR MAP 3


The Map 3 scenario provides several options for minor boundary adjustments to accommodate the growth and inevitable overcrowding of the Kaiser school. In this scenario, and only in this scenario, communities that have strong, long-term ties are kept together and the neighborhood school concept is achieved.

Included here are two future boundary projections without the opening of the additional BSD elementary school property in North Bethany and one with its projected boundaries (areas east of Kaiser Rd and south through Arbor View).

Please consider that with this scenario, even if the worst happens and the projected enrollments jump to predicted numbers, **two very small boundary changes will bring ALL schools under or at capacity, Jacob Wismer boundaries will stay intact and the school will be able to relieve Findley from overcrowding if needed, and a new school will not need to be opened.** Adjustments made are (1) reincorporating the 185th apartments into Rock Creek Elementary and (2) moving the 42 area of Kaiser to Springville. Jacob Wismer would remain unchanged and able to help relieve Findley.




If the 185th Apts cannot be reincorporated with Rock Creek Elementary, minor adjustments can still bring all three schools under capacity by moving two Kaiser areas to both Springville and Jacob Wismer. This would bring all schools to capacity with portables.





Ideally, Map #3 sets up the North Bethany area for the opening of the additional BSD elementary property in the northeast corner. Adding the Arbor View area of Jacob Wismer to this school will bring all three schools into the **correct elementary-to-high school feeder system**, could **remove portables from all schools**, and would **allow Jacob Wismer to relieve Findley of overcrowding** as well. It is the ideal situation for all schools involved.



Finally, please keep these future considerations in mind and be a visionary when deciding on boundary adjustments now. The children and families in the Pirate Park community need stability. We have been shuffled from school to school - 4 times in the past 16 years - and we should not be put into a position now (for the convenience of others) that could lead to us being forced to move again in 4 years in order to accommodate growth in other areas. Springville K-8 was built for us and was intended to be our neighborhood school. We deserve to remain there - as a whole.

Thank you so very much for your time and consideration!



**From:** April Powers <[powers.vmd@gmail.com](mailto:powers.vmd@gmail.com)>

**Date:** December 12, 2016 at 9:56:03 PM PST

**To:** [Don\\_Grotting@beaverton.k12.or.us](mailto:Don_Grotting@beaverton.k12.or.us), [Anne\\_Bryan@beaverton.k12.or.us](mailto:Anne_Bryan@beaverton.k12.or.us)

**Subject:** Map 3 Petition UPDATE #2 - Over 100 signatures!

Dear Superintendent Grotting:

The Petition for Map Submittal 3 has now collected over 100 signatures online!

View the petition here: [https://www.change.org/p/superintendent-grotting-please-keep-our-children-in-our-neighborhood-elementary-schools?recruiter=269860296&utm\\_source=share\\_petition&utm\\_medium=copylink](https://www.change.org/p/superintendent-grotting-please-keep-our-children-in-our-neighborhood-elementary-schools?recruiter=269860296&utm_source=share_petition&utm_medium=copylink)

I have also downloaded the signatures and comments to the petition and have attached them to this email.

Thank you for your time and consideration!

- Parents of Jacob Wismer and Springville K-8 -

***"As a collective group of Jacob Wismer and Springville K-8 parents and community members we would like to request in the strongest possible terms that Map Submittal #3 is given strong consideration due to the disruption Map Submittal #2 creates at Springville K-8. It is not reasonable to move over 70% of the founding community at Springville K-8 to a school that is located the farthest away from their neighborhood. Current Springville K-8 programs, such as running club, cub scouts, as well as all but one of the PTO board members reside within the Pirate Park community and will leave Springville K-8 bereft of identity, programs and volunteers. It also moves majority of the Springville 4th graders out to a new school, and then onto Stoller middle school, which cannot take such a large influx of students. Kaiser is a North Bethany school, and should be filled by the community surrounding it. Map Submittal #3 is the only long term proposal that looks at communities as planners intended, with the schools, parks, and communities interspersed. It is the only long term plan that does not require a major boundary adjustment at a later date. Finally, let's not move whole communities unnecessarily. Limiting the changes to the intended Springville K-8 boundaries, leaving current Jacob Wismer boundaries as they are, and encouraging the community of North Bethany to grow around Abbey Creek and the Kaiser school will accomplish these goals as envisioned in BSD policies."***

---

# Comments

Name	Location	Date	Comment
April Powers	Portland, OR	2016-12-10	I would also like to stress that our main concern is community unity and the neighborhood school concept. We know that these are top concerns for the school district as well. The Pirate Park Community has been moved repeatedly over the past 15 years. We need stability. We have finally created a community within ourselves and consider Pirate Park as a central point upon which all of our communities are connected. Please consider this connectivity in your decision. We are concerned not only about losing our school community but also being split among 3 different schools if other scenarios are considered. Map 3 is the best option for the Kaiser school to become a neighborhood school and for Springville and Jacob Wismer to remain so!
Marilyn Ritenour	Portland, OR	2016-12-10	I live in the pirate park area and want my children to remain at Springville especially my current 4th grader who will as it stands now will go to Kaiser for one year and then have to move to another school for middle school. I have lived in the pirate park area since 2004 and believe we should stay at Springville because it makes the most sense for all of the many many reasons submitted by the people that started this petition.
Karen Teale	Lake Wylie, SC	2016-12-10	Jacob Wismer needs to be left out of this conversation entirely!
Wei Wei	Portland, OR	2016-12-10	This is the only proposal that makes sense!
Vicky Brooks	Portland, OR	2016-12-10	<p>It does not make sense to move the Pirate Park community to the new Kaiser school. Stop moving this neighborhood!! The new Kaiser school was not built with the intention to house the Pirate Park community. It was built to relieve overcrowding at Sprivngville that has happened in the last few years form new housing developments in North Bethany.</p> <p>Kaiser school is one of 6 Design Features planed for North Bethany. It is one of the focal points around which this area will grow and develop, and create a neighborhood school concept. The Pirate Park neighborhood is not part of the design for North Bethany and therefore should not be attending a school built to bring the North Bethany community together.</p> <p>Pirate Park will NEVER have walkable "safe routes to school" to Kaiser. With parents, Pirate Park children can walk or ride bikes via trails and sidewalks to Springville. With the increase in traffic a signal is needed at Joss and Springville, this will complete the walkability for some of the Pirate Park children.</p> <p>Displacing the Pirate Park community from Springville will destroy ALL continuity for current Springville students wishing to move into the middle school at Springville.</p> <p>Keep Pirate Park at Springville and Don't change Jacob Wismer's boundries. Washington County's North Bethany Subarea Plan</p> <p>&lt;a href="http://www.co.washington.or.us/LUT/Divisions/LongRangePlanning/Publications/bethany-cp.cfm" rel="nofollow"&gt;http://www.co.washington.or.us/LUT/Divisions/LongRangePlanning/Publications/bethany-cp.cfm&lt;/a&gt;</p>
Holly Pierce	Portland, OR	2016-12-10	Keep this area in the same school they have moved enough!

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Carin Thueson	Portland, OR	2016-12-10	The option proposed by the committee is not a long term solution and with two children currently in school I feel that with the growth and the boundary they would have to change again before completing elementary school. Also this community was never in the future plan for Kaiser Road Elementary it was always the development to the north.
Martin Baker	Portland, OR	2016-12-11	I want my child to remain in his neighborhood school - Jacob Wismer.
Lori Uhl	Portland, OR	2016-12-11	No more changing schools in our neighborhood! Our neighborhood was Findlay originally, then Jacob Wismer, then Springville then this would be the 4th school. Please stop moving our kids around!
Rob Hill	Portland, OR	2016-12-11	Our population has been moved three times. Our school was built to support our population. This new school is being built to support a new population. Our kids are not filler material for poor planning and accelerated timelines.
Nicholas Orr	Portland, OR	2016-12-11	Because I don't want my neighborhood school to be moved for a 4th time!!
Rachel Hansen	Portland, OR	2016-12-11	The map that has been suggested by committee doesn't address needs of community nor properly address the criteria put forth by district. In particular, if select option 2, my neighborhood has been moved 4 times in 15 years- or moved every single time a new school has been added. The distance to the school is not walkable by students and we will be in a school that becomes overcrowded yet again when houses are complete and young ones grow up and boundaries will need to be adjusted yet again. Please consider option 3
Jeff Hansen	Portland, OR	2016-12-11	Please consider option 3. It is best for all parties, communities and most of all, students.
Melinda Shelton	Portland, OR	2016-12-11	I love the experiential education at Springville, it is why we chose our home. I think it makes for more well rounded kids, and I want my youngest to have that experience.
Linda Dahan	Portland, OR	2016-12-11	I care about not only quality education but keeping community solid....and together!
Tanya Abou-Elmajd	Portland, OR	2016-12-12	I want to keep my kids in Jacob Wismer Elementary School
Allison Guilfoyle	Portland, OR	2016-12-12	I want to keep neighborhood unity and stay at Jacob Wismer. I am also concerned about the two major intersections my children would have to cross for playdates, after school activities and we would no longer be able to walk to school. Please keep Arbor View at Jacob Wismer.
Mairead McCabe	Portland, OR	2016-12-12	We want to stay at Jacob Wismer. We love walking to school and meeting all our friends we have made over ten years on th way.
Navit Klein	Portland, OR	2016-12-12	We want our kids stay in Jacob Wismer!

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Marcus Guilfoyle	Portland, OR	2016-12-12	<p>There is simply no sound logic behind moving our neighborhood to the new elementary school. Our neighborhood is so close to Jacob Wismer that we can hear the children playing during recess, our children can walk through the wooded trails to get to school, and besides that Jacob Wismer is not overpopulated. In fact, it is trending with a reduced number of students each year. Why impact children and communities when they do not need to be? Our community, if using simple logic, should remain part of Jacob Wismer. The boundary change should focus on the needs of the overcrowding at Springville. Use the new school to provide relief to the much needed Springville opportunity. Do not impact areas that do not need to be affected. Keep the number of impacted families and communities to a minimum. Keep Map #2 as the most logical choice to change school boundaries. Map #2 has been discussed and put on the table as recommendation of the boundary committee after numerous meetings and neighborhood involvement over the past few months.</p> <p>Our neighborhood was built and designed to allow the children to walk to school through trails without ever crossing a single street. The other options, Map #1 &amp; #3, would cause our neighborhood children to cross a very dangerous Kaiser/Springville Rd. and thus decreases the safety of our children. All their new school peers in scenarios of Map #1 &amp; #3 would be on the other side of this dangerous intersection/road where they would be crossing to go play with their schoolmates. Keeping them at Jacob Wismer (Map #2) would eliminate any needs of crossing streets, for school or play, as they are part of the community that surrounds Jacob Wismer.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of making Map #2 the sound choice moving forward.</p>
Travis Arnzen	Portland, OR	2016-12-12	<p>It is important to keep neighborhoods together and provide the safest routes possible to school. It makes no sense to alter JW boundaries when the school is within the target capacity. It also doesn't make sense to shift the Pirate Park neighborhood to the school the farthest away when they will likely have to be broken up after the new Kaiser school becomes overcrowded.</p>
Judy Tanzer	Libertyville, IL	2016-12-12	<p>My extended family lives in the district and I believe educational continuity is important to our children. This proposal is the best solution.</p>
Xi Lin	波特 • , OR	2016-12-12	<p>We recommend map submittal #3 Please don't move our community over and over!</p>
Stu Teale	Portland, OR	2016-12-12	<p>There is no plan in place for my children to safely walk to Kaiser Rd Elementary. We can walk to Jacob Wismer quickly and safely along the trails. I also don't want to keep moving my children from school to school. As the area around the Kaiser Rd school continues to develop, there is no guarantee that my children won't have to move again in two years when the boundaries get reassessed. Finally, Arbor View is a founding community for JW, and I don't believe it is right or makes sense to move our children to the new school.</p>
Janis Rooker	Portland, OR	2016-12-13	<p>I'm signing because I don't think the same families should have to move schools - yet again because of new homes in the area. Keep the original Springville community together.</p>

Name	City	State	Postal Code	Country	Signed On
April Powers	Portland	Oregon		United States	12/9/16
Linda Feldha	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/10/16
Evan Powers	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/10/16
aubrey marti	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/10/16
Lorie Bartee	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/10/16
Marilyn Riter	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/10/16
Jessi Sigande	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/10/16
Cristina Dsou	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/10/16
Kristen Orr	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/10/16
Natalie Call	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/10/16
Miri Yoo	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/10/16
Horie Asako	ポートラン	Oregon	97229	United States	12/10/16
Emily Hollanc	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/10/16
Alexey Klimki	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/10/16
Hyesun Kim	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/10/16
Ori Lempel	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/10/16
Anna Logan	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/10/16
Jefferson Call	Portland	Oregon	97229-1586	United States	12/10/16
Karen Teale	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/10/16
Wei Wei	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/10/16
Kyeonglan R	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/10/16
Vicky Brooks	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/10/16
Holly Pierce	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/10/16
Carin Thueso	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/10/16
Cynthia Moh	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Martin Baker	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
eduardo bola	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Melissa Polla	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Tiffany Caroli	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Kristy O'Byrn	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Tasha Allen	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Hiro Ito	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Ito Kana	ポートラン	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Maryl Kunkel	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Justin Neill	Beaverton	Oregon	97006	United States	12/11/16
Rebecca Neil	Beaverton	Oregon	97006	United States	12/11/16
Max Sigande	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Matt Pearsor	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Tomizawa Mi	ポートラン	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Linda Armstr	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Lori Uhl	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16

Hirai Yoshiko	ポートラン	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Tara Morisse	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Beate Falcon	Portland	Oregon	97229-8994	United States	12/11/16
Carolyn Hill	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Mizuno Yadu	ポートラン	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Sowmiya Jay	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Charlotte Sp	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Rachel Evans	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Jin hee Hwan	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Cortney Tass	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Robert Hill	PORTLAND	Oregon	97229-1857	United States	12/11/16
Nicholas Orr	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Bryon Allen	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Rachel Hanse	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Adam Riteno	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Karen Stipe	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Jeff Hansen	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Raguraman V	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Melinda Shel	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Troy Burran	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Linda Dahan	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Jianren Tai	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Patty Verzani	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Alejandra He	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/11/16
Moniqueka T	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/12/16
Chien-Ju Hsu	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/12/16
Fenny Wibov	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/12/16
Nelson Dsou	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/12/16
Tanya Abou-I	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/12/16
Danielle Derk	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/12/16
Allison Guilfo	Portland	Oregon	97229-1564	United States	12/12/16
Mairead McC	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/12/16
Emily Jones	APO	Armed Force	9112	United States	12/12/16
Pam Boland	Grovetown	Georgia	30813	United States	12/12/16
Navit Klein	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/12/16
Elizabeth Per	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/12/16
Marcus Guilf	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/12/16
Alycia Johnsc	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/12/16
Padmaja gan	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/12/16
Clara Parkins	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/12/16
Jeremy Holla	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/12/16
Travis Arnzer	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/12/16

Ruslan Kvetn	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/12/16
Judy Tanzer	Libertyville	Illinois	60048	United States	12/12/16
Kristi Arnzen	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/12/16
Ken Lee	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/12/16
Karen Imanis	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/12/16
Tim Tassone	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/12/16
Xi Lin	波特兰	Oregon	97229	United States	12/12/16
CHARLES JAN	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/12/16
Sarah Tsai	波特蘭	Oregon	97229	United States	12/12/16
Molly Wright	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/12/16
Sara Nopsitti	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/12/16
Shannon Fris	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/12/16
Stu Teale	Portland	Oregon	97229	United States	12/12/16
Kotsugi Kimik	ポートラン	Oregon	97229	United States	12/13/16

# Elementary Boundary Adjustment Comment Form

Do\_Not\_Reply@beaverton.k12.or.us

Tue 12/13/2016 5:58 AM

To: BSD Elementary Boundary Comments <Elementary-Boundary-Comments@beaverton.k12.or.us>;

**Name:** Shivanagh samala

**Email:** Shivasap12@gmail.com

**Comment:**

I support submittal #2 for the elementary school boundary and also this is the one approved by the committee. Please don't change by taking emotions into consideration rather Han it should be logical and should be as per the criteria given to select the boundaries .



## Fw: Fw: Map Submittal #1 Petition Update: BSD School Elementary Schools Boundary Change

deborah wohlmutter

Mon 12/12/2016 7:37 PM

To: BSD Elementary Boundary Comments <Elementary-Boundary-Comments@beaverton.k12.or.us>;

3 attachments (3 MB)

Map\_Submittal\_1\_Petition\_100\_signatures.pdf; Petition\_For\_MapSubmittal\_1\_BSD\_ES\_BoundaryChange.docx; mapsubmittal1\_updated.pdf;

**From:** Abhijit Sathaye <abhijitsathaye@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Sunday, December 11, 2016 10:29 PM

**To:** donald grotting; Susan Greenberg; Anne Bryan; Eric Simpson; Donna Tyner; leeann larsen; Becky Tymchuk; linda degman; Arundhati S; Alpesh Rodage; gauri dhamdhare

**Cc:** Abhijit Sathaye

**Subject:** Map Submittal #1 Petition Update: BSD School Elementary Schools Boundary Change

Dear Superintendent Don Grotting and BSD Board members,

As coordinators of petition for map submittal 1, we would like to update you on our petition signature status: as of this writing we have 100 signatures in support of petition for map submittal 1 (scanned copy attached). This includes families from:

-- various neighborhoods within Pirate Park,  
Arbor Oaks,  
Arbor Heights,  
Bethany View etc..

There are many more signature sheets in circulation and we fully expect this support for map submittal 1 to grow in coming days.

All of these families have the same concern: to avoid overcrowding of schools long term, the student population (current and future growth) should to be addressed by all 3 schools under consideration. We all would like long term stability and make sure that the solution we pick is not short sighted, not based on emotional arguments and is actually delivering towards the goals BSD set out to do -- which were to relieve overcrowding at the 2 schools (Springville, Jacob Wismer), address new growth areas

north of Springville and start the new school Kaiser ES with ~500 students.

We would therefore like to request you again to consider map submittal 1 that was submitted by advisory committee member Sarah Beachy, as we outlined in our petition (attached).

Thank you,  
Abhijit Sathaye

On Thu, Dec 8, 2016 at 10:20 AM, Abhijit Sathaye <[abhijitsathaye@gmail.com](mailto:abhijitsathaye@gmail.com)> wrote:

Dear Superintendent Don Grotting and BSD Board Members,

My name is Abhijit Sathaye and I live in Pirate Park community. My daughter is a second grader at Springville (SV) elementary and my son will be starting kindergarten in 2 years.

I would like to request you to consider map submittal 1 for elementary school boundary change. I have attached that as a word document and the actual map as a pdf with this email.

As a parent, I am confident that no matter which of the 3 schools (Springville ES, Jacob Wismer ES, Kaiser ES) my kids go to, they will do well. However, as a parent, I would like long term stability and make sure that the solution we pick is not short sighted, not based on emotional arguments and is actually delivering towards the goals BSD set out to do -- which were to relieve overcrowding at the 2 schools (Springville, Jacob Wismer), address new growth areas north of Springville and start the new school Kaiser ES with ~500 students. Boundary changes should not be made to make up numbers to start a new school.

I do not think map 2 solves overcrowding at schools, long term. After looking at all options, I do believe that map submittal 1 is the right thing to do long term, even if it means as a parent, my kid has to go to a different school starting next year. This is also what many different neighborhoods within Springville school think and agree to.

I strongly recommend map submittal 1 which will require the larger Pirate Park neighborhood to be split up but address all the relevant issues: over-crowding, proximity to school, neighborhood unity, transportation, congestion and safety long term. So as a resident of the Pirate Park neighborhood, I am in favor of Map Submittal #1.

Please find the details in attached document. Thank you for taking the time to read this petition.

Thanks,  
Abhijit Sathaye

Dear Superintendent Don Grotting,

We the undersigned residents of various Springville communities (Arbor Oaks, Abbey creek and Pirate Park) would like to **request you to consider map submittal 1** thought out by advisory committee member Sarah Beachy for elementary school boundary change. We have attached submittal 1 in this set (Figure 1 at the end and also as attachment). This map was introduced along with other submittal maps for the first time in meeting #4 and also eliminated in a hurry towards the end of meeting #4 not giving the public enough time to study this map.

1. Map 1 delivers both objectives outlined by the school board -- relieving overcrowding at Springville ES (SV) & Jacob Wismer ES (JW) and starting Kaiser K-5 with ~500 students. Map submittal 1 can be slightly modified to retain areas 84 and 14 along with its neighbors 18 and 1 and have those families continue at Springville. This brings SV and JW both to at or below their capacity for foreseeable future. **It requires that the larger Pirate Park neighborhood would need to be split but we, the Pirate Park residents are agreeable to that solution to help maintain long term stability for all the kids involved and not have to revisit this process in another 3-4 years.** The resulting projected enrollment graph is shown in **Graph 1** (attached at the end).

2. Total expected enrollment in 2021 for all three schools is 2353. Even with all the pre-approved portables that we were told can be put at Kaiser the total capacity for the schools is 2428. So all schools will need to be at 97% capacity. We cannot expect only Kaiser and Springville to shoulder that burden. Map submittals 2 and 3 under-utilize Jacob Wismer while over burden Kaiser and Springville. All 3 schools should be part of the solution space (**see Table 1: Projected % Capacity Utilization**).

school	total capacity	Map submittal 1*	Map submittal 1*	Map submittal #2	Map submittal #2	Map submittal #3	Map submittal #3
		2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021	2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021	2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021
jacob wismer	749	753	101%	656	88%	656	88%
springville	790	820	104%	777	98%	686	87%
kaiser	769	780	101%	920	120%	1010	131%

\* additionally retains area 84 and 14 with springville in Map submittal 1

**Table 1: Projected % Capacity Utilization comparing Map submittal 1, 2, 3.**

3. The Committee's recommended option, map #2 had several problems (details below) as acknowledged by the committee members themselves, most important amongst them being: Kaiser goes over capacity within 2 years of inception needing portables and it still progressively gets worse till 2023. Overcrowding of the schools needs to be solved by looking at all 3 schools, instead of artificially creating constraints by limiting it to only 2 schools.

4. Map 1 is the only map that addresses growth that is happening north by drawing boundaries east-west, as opposed to north-south (map 2), therefore allowing better long term stability. It also addresses proximity to school, continuity of education and neighborhood unity, by keeping whole physical neighborhoods intact and in one school. As such, it will prevent any boundary adjustment process for the next 7 years (2023) which is the absolute earliest date that the new east BSD property can be opened as an elementary school per Mr. Steve Sparks in meeting #5.

#### **Details:**

## **Why map submittal #1 works better than map submittal #2:**

### **A. Map 1 addresses overcrowding problem and balances student population distribution among all 3 schools for both the short term and long term, while map 2 does not:**

Map 1 will cause JW to go over capacity by ~45 students for the first 3 years. This small increase for such a short term can be easily managed. SV has been operating at 119% of capacity for past ~2 years. Moreover JW elementary projected enrollment trend is a declining curve which statistically suggests Map1 will do well even by allocating 45 more at the beginning which would even out this declining curve.

Map 2 on the other hand will cause Kaiser to start the school with a projection of 600 students rather than 500 and go overcapacity from 2019, just 2 years after its inception putting it at 837 students in 2019 which is well over its capacity of 769. This is while JW operates at 92% capacity in 2019 (691/749). Hence map 2 does not balance out the student population evenly between 3 schools and is a solution that is short sighted.

### **B. Map 1 addresses proximity to school while map 2 does not:**

Neighborhoods that are closer to JW will be retained at JW: South Pirate Park below green corridor- (areas 91, 18, 57, 9) plus areas (41, 12, and 60). Neighborhoods that are closer to SV will remain at SV: Abbey Creek- (area 93, 9, 72), low income housing off of 185<sup>th</sup> – (area 39, 68) and north pirate park – (area 1, 18, 84, 14). Neighborhoods closer to Kaiser (Arbor view – (areas 61, 55, 74, 15) including all new growth areas, will be directed to Kaiser ES.

In Map 2, children from far south pirate park are being pulled way up north to just make up numbers for Kaiser while areas 61, 55, 74, 15 which are more proximate to Kaiser really should move to Kaiser ES. Also this area naturally delineates well into Kaiser due to the new high school boundary and hence should be considered for Kaiser Enrollment. When the current zero enrollment neighborhoods next to Kaiser start to fill up, Southern most pirate park (areas 91, 18, 41, 12, 60, 57, 9, 0) would be the most obvious candidate for rezoning.

### **C. Map 2 does not meet BSD's criteria for boundary change:**

Map 2 does not meet BSD's criteria for the change of boundaries because JW's boundaries remain unchanged and therefore Jacob Wismer is a mere spectator with a right to 50% vote on the advisory committee while overcrowding continues to persist at Kaiser and Springville. So it defies the criteria of resolving overcrowding.

Map 2 requires the North and South Pirate Park communities to move to a new elementary school for the 4th time in 15 years never affording its children a stable neighborhood school. Pirate park started out at Bethany elementary, then were moved to Jacob Wismer, moved in 2009 to Springville, and with map 2, will be moved again in 2016 to Kaiser ES. If Map Submittal #1 is accepted it would offer continuity to north Pirate Park to continue at Springville and again move south pirate park but this time rightly to the most proximate neighborhood school which is Jacob Wismer rather than pulling up children all the way north to a not so proximate school.

### **D. Map 2 requires over ~70% of Springville school to move:**

Map 2 requires over ~70% of Springville families to move to the new school Kaiser and 90% of the PTO to move to the new school. Starting next year Springville will have moved

over most of its PTO supporting families to Kaiser if map submittal #2 is approved. Shouldn't that ring a warning that boundary lines are being drawn incorrectly?

**E. Map submittal #1 addresses safety while map submittal #2 does not and map submittal #1 has the lowest transportation costs:**

Map submittal #2 forces BSD to route busses on the already busy and narrow Bethany Boulevard causing long term congestion for all the communities and compromises the safety of the kids and everyone in the community.


On the other hand, Map submittal #1 would direct South pirate park traffic areas (60, 41, 12, 57, 9, 18, and 91) east to Jacob Wismer across Bethany Boulevard and not north onto Bethany Boulevard.

Transportation costs chart provided by BSD at the 14<sup>th</sup> November meeting#4 (**see attached Table 2**) states that the total annual route cost of transportation for BSD for map submittal #1 is \$81,462 while for map submittal #2 it is \$82,451. Map submittal #1 has also proved itself to be the cheapest option for transportation when compared to both Map submittal #2 and #3.

**F. Mode of teaching**

All schools follow the common core syllabus but have different approaches of teaching it. Springville uses expeditionary learning (EL) and Kaiser will use STEAM. It would work well if Jacob Wismer could adopt one of the newer learning models like the ones above.

On reviewing the testimony of all the committee members at meeting #5, they seem to have accepted map submittal #2 as it worked logically with numbers than did map submittal #3, but Map submittal #1 was not even given a chance for discussion in meeting #5 with all committee members being present. Hence we have garnered support for map submittal #1.




**Graph 1: Projected Enrollment capacity –Map submittal 1\***

**\*Retains areas 84, 14 with Springville**

Kaiser ES population explodes starting 2019

### Resulting Projected Enrollment
























**Graph 2: Projected Enrollment capacity –Map submittal 2**


























# Petition: Support Map 1 BSD ES boundar

Name	Neighborhood	E-mail	Signature
Aakanksha B	Arbor Ridge	bhaleadag@gmail.com	
Sushama P.	Arbor View	Sjadhav422@gmail.com	SSPawas
Rupali N.	Bethany creek	Shivroop2002@yahoo.com	
Shivaji N.	"	Shivaji_Nimane@yahoo.co.uk	
Pranjakta S.	Bethany	PranjaktaSoman9@gmail.com	
Rahul	Bethany Creek	swiss_24_2002@yahoo.com	
Anand	Arbor oaks	anandamarathe@yahoo.com	
Ashutosh Ghavi	Arbor Oaks	ashutosh.ghavi@gmail.com	
Shilpa Lel.	Arbor oaks	shilpa.lead2005@gmail.com	
Mrudula Ch.	Arbor Oaks	mrudula.chandra@gmail.com	
Veena Kulkarni	Arbor oaks	veenavk2008@gmail.com	
Vidyanand	Arbor oaks	vidyanandk@yahoo.com	
Hiten Dora	Hi Hit i@yahoo.com	ARBOR OAKS	
Anju	Arbor Oaks	anju.babaria@gmail.com	
Shivani	Arbor Oaks	shivani.marathe@yahoo.com	
Ajit	South Parc	ajitdsin@yahoo.com	
Veera	Arbor oaks	Sasi.Tarigopula@gmail.com	
Satish	Arbor Oaks	gannam77@gmail.com	
pratyusha	Arbor Oaks	pratyusha.janga@gmail.com	
Priyanka L	Arbor Oaks	priyanka2603@gmail.com	
RAHUL A	Arbor Oaks	radokar@gozuti.com	
Asawari Kulkarni	Arbor Oaks	kulkarni.asawari@gmail.com	



# Petition: Support Map 1 BSD ES boundary

Name	Neighborhood	E-mail	Signature
RAVI IYER	PIRATE PARK	RAVI IYER20@GMAIL.COM	
USHA KRISHNAMURTHY	PIRATE PARK	DEVIOUSHAK@GMAIL.COM	
Andrew Richardson	Pirate Park	andrew@andrewrichardson.com	
Paige Richardson	Pirate Park	paige@paigerichardson.com	
Joanne Lee		joannelee@yahoo.com	
Evan Yonge		EYOUN24691@GMAIL.COM	
AHMAD S MAZUMDER		sahukzarif@gmail.com	
Jay Lind	Wister Ridge		
AMANDA LEE	PIRATE PARK	alee20@gmail.com	
Nathan Bannan	Pirate Park	ETHSB@yahoo.com	
HEMA AYYAGARI	PIRATE PARK	HAYYAGARI2014@GMAIL.COM	
Venki Ayyagari	Pirate Park	vayyagarizow@gmail.com	
ROBERT CHAN			
Joyce Brizendine	Westview	jimbrize@frontier.com	
Dan Brizendine	Westview	bluherongreenheron@yahoo.com	
Melissa Pollard	Pirate Park	melpollard4@hotmail.com	
Brogan Pierce	Pirate Park	brogan44@gmail.com	
Penny Pierce	Westfield	pennycamick@hotmail.com	
Neha Urrutia	Pirate Park	agrawal.neha10@gmail.com	
Tony Urrutia	Pirate Park	tonyurrutia79@gmail.com	
BLAKEMEL	CLOSEENOUGH	bmcd72@gmail.com	

Petition: Support Map 1 BSD ES Boundar

[illegible]



# Petition Signatures: Support Map 1: BSD ES Boundary

Name	Neighborhood	E-mail	Signature
Gavvi	Arbor oaks		
Shubha	Arbor oaks		
Rama	Arbor Oaks.		
Vasudevan	Arbor Oaks		
Seema	Arbor Oaks		
Aseem	Arbor Oaks		
Amruta	Arbor Oaks	aparicharak@gmail.com	
Santosh	Arbor Oaks	Santosh.Paricharak@gmail.com	
Medha	Arbor Oaks		
Girish	Arbor Oaks		
Pratibha	Arbor Oaks	MADHU. PRATIBHA @GMAIL.COM	
Amity	Arbor Oaks	amityoverallaib@gmail.com	
Overallaib	Arbor Oaks	amityoverallaib@gmail.com	
Rebecca Peil	Arbor Oaks	rwpeil@yahoo.com	
Neerav	Arbor Oaks	neerav.parikh@gmail.com	
RAJASEKHAR	Arbor Oaks	vsreddy28@gmail.com	
ANUMULA	Pirate Park	manuel.prince@gmail.com	
Manuel Prince	Pirate Park	manuel.prince@gmail.com	
Castillo	Pirate Park		
Hsin-Tzu Hou	Pirate Park	hsin_tzu@hotmail.com	

# SUPPORT FOR MAP SUBMITTER #1\*

Name	Area	Email	Phone	Sign
Yang Zou	91	yang82208@hotmail.com		SY
Haiyan Wu	91	haiyanballet@hotmail.com		HU
Balita Benegal	222	balita.benegal@gmail.com		BB
SHYAM Benegal	222	shyam.benegal@gmail.com		SB
Deepa. K	84	deepa.18.pup@gmail.com		DK
A. Shastri	91	asoundhats24@gmail.com		AS
Lee Chun	91	leechun2000@gmail.com		LC
ARCHANA. K	84	archkum@gmail.com		AK
Nanya J	59	nanyaj2@gmail.com		NJ
Anil J	59	anil1121@yahoo.com		AJ
H. Thatikonda	84	hanshthatikonda@gmail.com		HT
Amit K.	84	amit sr 1974@gmail.com		AK
<del>Chetana S.</del>	91	Lyn @ blue ridge farm.com		<del>Chetana S.</del> LB
Ramnath. R	91	ramnath.raju@gmail.com		R. R
N. Prudhvi	91	narina prudhvi@gmail.com		NP
M. Guraji	91	myguraji@hotmail.com		MT
Phani. G.	91	phani8@yahoo.com		PG
Dasaka. S	42	dasaka@gmail.com		DS
Padmini.		reach padmini@gmail.com		Padmini
Chetana S.	91	chetana.singh@gmail.com		Chetana S.
Kris. Bedaull	91	kris @ blue ridge farm.com		K.B.

Laura Manuel 222

laura~~lora~~manuel@gmail.com h.M.

Brad Manuel 222

bradmanuel@gmail.com B.M.

# Petition Signatures : Support Map 1: BSD ES Boundary

Name	Neighborhood	E-mail	Signature
Gauri Sathaye	Pirate Park	gauri1105@gmail.com	<u>Gathaye</u>
Abhijit Sathaye	Pirate Park	abhijitsathaye@gmail.com	<u>Abhijit Sathaye</u>
Alpesh Rodage	Pirate Park	alpeshrodage@gmail.com	<u>Alpesh</u>
Harsha Rodage	Pirate Park	harsha.patil@gmail.com	<u>Harsha</u>
Sujay Pattani	Pirate Park	sujay.pattani@gmail.com	<u>Sujay Pattani</u>
Kanchan Pattani	Pirate Park	kanchan.pattani@gmail.com	<u>Kanchan Pattani</u>



# Kaiser Road K-5 Elementary Boundary Adjustment: Map Submittal #1

November 15, 2016



## Scenario Overview

This map was submitted to the Boundary Advisory Committee for evaluation

- Sends top portion of JW to Kaiser
- Moves southern Pirate Park N'hood to Jacob Wismer
- Jacob Wismer enrollment above capacity
- Provides relief to Springville
- Approximately same Kaiser opening enrollment as Modified Scenario 3
- All three schools must transition

## Legend


- Current Springville & Jacob Wismer Boundaries
- 12 Proj. Students in 2017 (K-5)

## Scenario Boundaries


- Jacob Wismer K-5
- Kaiser Road K-5
- Springville K-8

Areas 84+14+0 can be moved to Springville, to preserve neighborhood unity.


## Resulting Projected Enrollment




## Student Body Composition Information (SY 2016-17 general student population)



## Share of Student Population: Economically Disadvantaged



## Share of Student Population: English Language Learners



School	Permanent Capacity*	Capacity Provided by Portables	Capacity Available in 2017	2016 K-5 Enrollment	2016 % Utilization of Capacity	Notes
Jacob Wismer K-5	711	38	749	702	94%	2 portable classrooms onsite
Springville K-5**	676	114	790	944	119%	6 portable classrooms onsite, some non-classroom spaces have been converted
Kaiser Road K-5	769	0	769			No portable classrooms

## FW: Support of Map Submittal 1 for Elementary Boundary Change

Steven Sparks - Exec Admin

Mon 12/12/2016 7:37 AM

To:deborah wohlmutter <Debby\_Wohlmutter@beaverton.k12.or.us>;

1 attachments (490 KB)

Support Map Submittal 1 for BSD Elementary Boundary Change.pdf;

[For the correspondence record.](#)

**From:** Arundhati S [mailto:arundhati.24@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Thursday, December 8, 2016 8:34 AM

**To:** Sarah Beachy <sarahfisherbeachy@gmail.com>; sgolem7@gmail.com; robin kobrowski <Robin\_Kobrowski@beaverton.k12.or.us>; jerela@yahoo.com; Steven Sparks - Exec Admin <Steven\_Sparks@beaverton.k12.or.us>

**Subject:** Support of Map Submittal 1 for Elementary Boundary Change

Hello Ms.Kobrowski , Mr.Sparks and Springville advisory committee members,

I am a springville school parent and would like to present a case on why BSD capacity utilization of all 3 schools works out **only and only** if we consider Map Submittal 1 which was the map thought out by Advisory committee member Sarah Beachy.

At this point when we know the absolute earliest that we can have the new elementary school is year 2023 we just cannot afford to accept any map that does **NOT BRING all 3 schools into solution space.**

Please do read the attached pdf as it is well thought out and has a rational thought process , does not ramble on and you might have fun reading it too :)

We are in the process of reaching a 100+ signatures from all springville communities towards supporting **Map Submittal #1**

Thank you so much,  
Arundhati Shastri  
Springville Kindergarten Parent



Dear Superintendent Don Grotting,

We the undersigned residents of various Springville communities would like to **request you to consider map submittal 1** thought out by advisory committee member Sarah Beachy for elementary school boundary change. We have attached submittal 1 in this set. This map was introduced along with other submittal maps for the first time in meeting #4 and also eliminated extremely quickly towards the end of meeting #4 not giving the public any time to possibly study this map. Springville advisory committee member Sheetal Golem was also absent at this meeting giving this map no chance for her comments which then put Springville and Kaiser schools ( 67% of area of total area under consideration) to have only 2 advisory representatives thus putting them at an immediate disadvantage at meeting #4.

1. Our belief is that Map submittal 1 is the most sustainable long term, and is not based on emotion (which Map submittal 3 is being tagged as) or based off of treating children as mere numbers by acquiring children from way down south to be able to start the new North Bethany school Kaiser at a healthy number of ~500. (which Map submittal 2 is doing).

2. Map 1 delivers both objectives outlined by the school board -- relieving overcrowding at Springville ES (SV) & Jacob Wismer ES (JW) and starting Kaiser K-5 with ~500 students. Map submittal 1 can be slightly modified to retain areas 84 and 14 along with its neighbors 18 and 1 and have those families continue at Springville. This requires the larger Pirate Park neighborhood to be split along the green corridor but we, the Pirate Park residents are agreeable to that solution for the sake of continuity and stability of education for all the families involved so as not have to revisit this process in another 3 years. The resulting projected enrollment graph is shown in **Graph 1** below.

3. The Committee's recommended option, map #2 had several problems (details below) as acknowledged by the committee members themselves, most important amongst them being: Kaiser goes over capacity within 2 years of inception needing portables and it progressively gets worse till 2023. Overcrowding of the schools needs to be balanced out by all the 3 schools. Total expected enrollment in 2021 for all three schools is 2353. Even with all the pre-approved portables that we were told can be put at Kaiser the total capacity for the schools is 2428. So all schools will need to be at 97% capacity in that year for the numbers to be shared. We cannot expect only Kaiser and Springville to carry that burden. Map submittals 2 and 3 under-utilize Jacob Wismer while over burden Kaiser and Springville. (**see Table 1**)

		Map submittal 1*	Map submittal 1*	Map submittal #2	Map submittal #2	Map submittal #3	Map submittal #3
school	total capacity	2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021	2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021	2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021
jacob wismer	749	753	101%	656	88%	656	88%
springville	790	820	104%	777	98%	686	87%
kaiser	769	780	101%	920	120%	1010	131%

\* additionally retains area 84 and 14 with springville in Map submittal 1

**Table 1 : Projected % Capacity Utilization comparing Map submittal 1,2,3**

4. Map 1 is the only map that addresses growth that is happening north by drawing boundaries east-west, as opposed to north-south (map 2), therefore allowing better long term stability. It also maintains proximity, continuity of education and neighborhood unity, by keeping whole physical neighborhoods intact and in one school for the next 7 years without having them be redrawn prior to 2023 which is the absolute earliest date that the

new east BSD property can be opened as an elementary school per Mr. Steve Sparks in meeting#5.

## **Details:**

### **Why Map submittal #1 works better than map submittal #2:**

#### **A. Map 1 addresses proximity to school while map 2 does not:**

Neighborhoods that are closer to JW will be retained at JW. South Pirate Park below green corridor-(areas 91, 18, 57, 9) plus areas (41, 12, and 60). Neighborhoods that are closer to SV will remain at SV: Abbey Creek- (area 93, 9), low income housing off of 185<sup>th</sup> – (area 39, 68) and north pirate park – (area 1, 18, 84, 14).

Neighborhoods closer to Kaiser (Arbor view – (areas 61, 55, 74, 15) including all new growth areas, will be directed to Kaiser ES.

In Map 2, children from far south pirate park are being pulled way up north to just make up numbers for Kaiser while areas 61, 55, 74, 15 which are more proximate to Kaiser are better doing that. Also this area naturally delineates well into Kaiser due to the new high school boundary and hence should be considered for Kaiser Enrollment. When the current zero enrollment neighborhoods next to Kaiser start to fill up, Southern most pirate park is the most obvious candidate for being rezoned.

#### **B. Map 1 addresses overcrowding problem and balances student population distribution among all 3 schools better for both the short term and long term until, while map 2 does not:**

Map 1 will cause JW to go over capacity by ~45 students for the first 3 years. This is possibly a 2 classroom size increase over the first 3 years. SV has been running at 119% capacity for past ~2 years and to be fair has done an excellent job at it.

Moreover JW elementary projected enrollment trend is a declining curve which statistically suggests Map1 will do well even by allocating 45 more at the beginning which would even out this declining curve.

Map 2 on the other hand will cause Kaiser to start the school with a projection of 600 students rather than 500 and go overcapacity from 2019, just 2 years after its inception putting it at 837 students in 2019 which is well over ~80 students over its capacity of 769. This is while JW operates at 92% capacity in 2019 (691/749). Hence map 2 does not balance out the student population evenly between 3 schools and is a solution that is short sighted.

#### **C. Map submittal #2 does not meet BSD's criteria for boundary change**

Map 2 does not meet BSD's criteria for the change of boundaries because JW's boundaries remain unchanged and therefore Jacob Wismer is a mere spectator with a right to 50% vote on the advisory committee while overcrowding continues to persist at Kaiser and Springville. So it defies the criteria of resolving overcrowding. Map 2 requires the North and South Pirate Park communities to move to a new elementary school for the 4th time in 15 years never affording its children a stable neighborhood school. Pirate park started out at Bethany elementary, then were moved to Jacob Wismer, moved in 2009 to Springville, and moved again in 2016 to

Kaiser. If Map Submittal #1 is accepted it would offer continuity to north Pirate Park to continue at Springville and again move south pirate park but this time rightly to the most proximate neighborhood school which is Jacob Wismer rather than pulling up children all the way north to a not so proximate school.

**D. Map submittal #2 requires over ~70% of Springville school to move**

Map 2 requires over ~70% of Springville families to move to the new school Kaiser and 90% of the PTO to move to the new school. Starting next year Springville will have moved over most of its PTO supporting families to Kaiser if map submittal #2 is approved. Shouldn't that ring a warning that boundary lines are being drawn incorrectly?

**E. Map submittal #1 has the lowest Transportation costs and # of bus routes**

Map submittal #2 forces more school busses to go north on the already busy and narrow one lane Bethany Boulevard causing long term congestion for all the communities and affecting the safety of everyone.

On the other hand, Map submittal #1 would direct South pirate park traffic areas (60, 41, 12, 57, 9, 18, and 91) east to Jacob Wismer across Bethany Boulevard and not north onto Bethany Boulevard. Transportation costs chart provided by BSD at the 14<sup>th</sup> November meeting#4 (**see below Table 2**) states that the total annual route cost of transportation for BSD for map submittal #1 is \$81,462 while for map submittal #2 it is \$82,451. Map submittal #1 has also proved itself to be the cheapest option for transportation when compared to both Map submittal #2 and #3.


**F. Mode of teaching**

All schools follow the common core syllabus but have different approaches of teaching it. Springville uses expeditionary learning (EL) and Kaiser will use STEAM. It would work well if Jacob Wismer could adopt one of the newer learning models like the ones above.

**G. Equal distribution of economically disadvantaged population**


Finally the economically disadvantaged share of student population are distributed most equally only and only in this Map submittal 1.

On reviewing the testimony of all the committee members at meeting #5, they seem to have accepted map submittal #2 as it worked logically with numbers than did map submittal #3, but Map submittal #1 was not even given a chance for discussion in meeting #5 with all committee members being present. Hence we have garnered support for map submittal #1.



**Graph 1: Projected Enrollment capacity –Map submittal 1\***

**\*Retains areas 84, 14 with Springville**



Map Submittal 1\* : Map submittal 1 plus retains areas 84 & 14 with Springville



	Current Boundary Routes (SPR and JW only)	Modified Scenario 3 (current Tentative Proposal)	Modified Scenario 3 with Island	Map Submittal #1	Map Submittal #2	Map Submittal #3
Annual Operational Cost	\$ 27,139	\$ 11,902	\$ 12,145	\$ 7,792	\$ 7,347	\$ 19,459
Annual Wage & Benefit Cost	\$ 30,037	\$ 12,342	\$ 12,752	\$ 7,785	\$ 6,933	\$ 21,873
<b>Total Annual Route Cost</b>	<b>\$ 57,176</b>	<b>\$ 24,244</b>	<b>\$ 24,897</b>	<b>\$ 15,577</b>	<b>\$ 14,280</b>	<b>\$ 41,332</b>
Total Number of Routes	7	3	3	2	2	5
Avg Route Time	22:06	21:12	21:54	20:00	17:48	22:30
Avg Route Mileage	4.62	4.73	4.83	4.65	4.38	4.64
Average Miles from Center Point	1.1	0.8	1.0	0.6	0.8	0.9

KAISER						
	Current Boundary Routes (SPR and JW only)	Modified Scenario 3 (current Tentative Proposal)	Modified Scenario 3 with Island	Map Submittal #1	Map Submittal #2	Map Submittal #3
Annual Operational Cost	\$ -	\$ 20,457	\$ 18,427	\$ 12,288	\$ 25,137	\$ 13,269
Annual Wage & Benefit Cost	\$ -	\$ 20,923	\$ 19,232	\$ 11,802	\$ 26,161	\$ 11,976
<b>Total Annual Route Cost</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 41,380</b>	<b>\$ 37,659</b>	<b>\$ 24,089</b>	<b>\$ 51,298</b>	<b>\$ 25,246</b>
Total Number of Routes	0	5	5	3	7	3
Avg Route Time	0	21:30	19:48	20:12	19:12	20:30
Avg Route Mileage	0.00	4.88	4.39	4.88	4.28	5.27
Average Miles from Center Point	0.0	1.1	1.5	1.2	1.4	1.7

JACOB WISMER						
	Current Boundary Routes (SPR and JW only)	Modified Scenario 3 (current Tentative Proposal)	Modified Scenario 3 with Island	Map Submittal #1	Map Submittal #2	Map Submittal #3
Annual Operational Cost	\$ 6,995	\$ 6,995	\$ 6,995	\$ 19,576	\$ 6,995	\$ 6,995
Annual Wage & Benefit Cost	\$ 9,877	\$ 9,877	\$ 9,877	\$ 22,219	\$ 9,877	\$ 9,877
<b>Total Annual Route Cost</b>	<b>\$ 16,873</b>	<b>\$ 16,873</b>	<b>\$ 16,873</b>	<b>\$ 41,796</b>	<b>\$ 16,873</b>	<b>\$ 16,873</b>
Total Number of Routes	4	4	4	5	4	4
Avg Route Time	12:42	12:42	12:42	22:54	12:42	12:42
Avg Route Mileage	2.09	2.09	2.09	4.67	2.09	2.09
Average Miles from Center Point	0.9	0.9	0.9	1.0	0.9	0.88

TOTALS						
	Current Boundary Routes (SPR and JW only)	Modified Scenario 3 (current Tentative Proposal)	Modified Scenario 3 with Island	Map Submittal #1	Map Submittal #2	Map Submittal #3
<b>Total Annual Route Cost</b>	<b>\$ 74,048</b>	<b>\$ 82,496</b>	<b>\$ 79,429</b>	<b>\$ 81,462</b>	<b>\$ 82,451</b>	<b>\$ 83,450</b>
Total Number of Routes	11	12	12	10	13	12
Total Route Time	3:25:24	3:42:00	3:35:24	3:35:06	3:41:05	3:44:59
Total Route Mileage	40.7	46.9	44.8	47.3	47.1	47.4
Total Avg Mi from Center Point	1.1	0.9	1.2	0.9	1.0	1.2

Table 2: BSD Transportation costs distributed at Meeting #4

## FW: Support for Map Submittal 1

Steven Sparks - Exec Admin

Mon 12/12/2016 7:38 AM

To: deborah wohlmutter <Debby\_Wohlmutter@beaverton.k12.or.us>;

6 attachments (433 KB)

Table 2 -Transportation costs provided by BSD.JPG; ATT00001.htm; Petition supporting Map Submittal 1.docx; ATT00002.htm; Map Submittal 1.jpg; ATT00003.htm;

[For the correspondence record.](#)

---

**From:** donald grotting

**Sent:** Thursday, December 8, 2016 7:07 AM

**To:** robert mccracken <Robert\_Mccracken@beaverton.k12.or.us>

**Cc:** Steven Sparks - Exec Admin <Steven\_Sparks@beaverton.k12.or.us>; david williams <David\_Williams@beaverton.k12.or.us>

**Subject:** Fwd: Support for Map Submittal 1

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Arundhati S" <[arundhati.24@gmail.com](mailto:arundhati.24@gmail.com)>

**To:** "Arundhati S" <[arundhati.24@gmail.com](mailto:arundhati.24@gmail.com)>, "donald grotting" <[Don\\_Grotting@beaverton.k12.or.us](mailto:Don_Grotting@beaverton.k12.or.us)>

**Subject: Support for Map Submittal 1**

Dear Superintendent Don Grotting,

We are trying to garner support for our petition **in support of Map submittal 1** through the weekend but we would like you to please read our petition as it is very logically supported by data and hopes to bring forth some more realities of overcrowding problem by comparing all 3 Map submittals.

Thank you for your Valuable time

Anu Shastri

Area 91- South Pirate Park

Dear Superintendent Don Grotting,

We the undersigned residents of various Springville communities (Arbor Oaks, Abbey creek and Pirate Park) would like to **request you to consider map submittal 1** thought out by advisory committee member Sarah Beachy for elementary school boundary change. We have attached submittal 1 in this set. This map was introduced along with other submittal maps for the first time in meeting #4 and also eliminated extremely quickly towards the end of meeting #4 not giving the public any time to possibly study this map. Springville advisory committee member Sheetal Golem was also absent at this meeting giving this map no chance for her comments which then put Springville and Kaiser schools ( 67% of area of total area under consideration) to have only 2 advisory representatives thus putting them at an immediate disadvantage at meeting #4.

1. Our belief is that Map submittal 1 is the most sustainable long term, and is not based on emotion (which Map submittal 3 is being tagged as) or based off of treating children as mere numbers by acquiring children from way down south to be able to start the new North Bethany school Kaiser at a healthy number of ~500. (which Map submittal 2 is doing).

2. Map 1 delivers both objectives outlined by the school board -- relieving overcrowding at Springville ES (SV) & Jacob Wismer ES (JW) and starting Kaiser K-5 with ~500 students. Map submittal 1 can be slightly modified to retain areas 84 and 14 along with its neighbors 18 and 1 and have those families continue at Springville. This requires the larger Pirate Park neighborhood to be split along the green corridor but we, the Pirate Park residents are agreeable to that solution for the sake of continuity and stability of education for all the families involved so as not have to revisit this process in another 3 years. The resulting projected enrollment graph is shown in **Graph 1** below.

3. The Committee's recommended option, map #2 had several problems (details below) as acknowledged by the committee members themselves, most important amongst them being: Kaiser goes over capacity within 2 years of inception needing portables and it progressively gets worse till 2023. Overcrowding of the schools needs to be balanced out by all the 3 schools. Total expected enrollment in 2021 for all three schools is 2353. Even with all the pre-approved portables that we were told can be put at Kaiser the total capacity for the schools is 2428. So all schools will need to be at 97% capacity in that year for the numbers to be shared. We cannot expect only Kaiser and Springville to carry that burden. Map submittals 2 and 3 under-utilize Jacob Wismer while over burden Kaiser and Springville. **(see Table 1)**

		Map submittal 1*	Map submittal 1*	Map submittal #2	Map submittal #2	Map submittal #3	Map submittal #3
school	total capacity	2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021	2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021	2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021
jacob wismer	749	753	101%	656	88%	656	88%
springville	790	820	104%	777	98%	686	87%
kaiser	769	780	101%	920	120%	1010	131%
* additionally retains area 84 and 14 with springville in Map submittal 1							

**Table 1 : Projected % Capacity Utilization comparing Map submittal 1,2,3**

4. Map 1 is the only map that addresses growth that is happening north by drawing boundaries east-west, as opposed to north-south (map 2), therefore allowing better long term stability. It also maintains proximity, continuity of education and neighborhood unity, by keeping whole physical neighborhoods intact and in one school for the next 7 years without having them be redrawn prior to 2023 which is the absolute earliest date that the



new east BSD property can be opened as an elementary school per Mr. Steve Sparks in meeting #5.

### **Details:**

#### **Why Map submittal #1 works better than map submittal #2:**

##### **Map 1 addresses proximity to school while map 2 does not:**

Neighborhoods that are closer to JW will be retained at JW. South Pirate Park below green corridor-(areas 91, 18, 57, 9) plus areas (41, 12, and 60). Neighborhoods that are closer to SV will remain at SV: Abbey Creek- (area 93, 9), low income housing off of 185<sup>th</sup> – (area 39, 68) and north pirate park – (area 1, 18, 84, 14). Neighborhoods closer to Kaiser (Arbor view – (areas 61, 55, 74, 15) including all new growth areas, will be directed to Kaiser ES.

In Map 2, children from far south pirate park are being pulled way up north to just make up numbers for Kaiser while areas 61, 55, 74, 15 which are more proximate to Kaiser are better doing that. Also this area naturally delineates well into Kaiser due to the new high school boundary and hence should be considered for Kaiser Enrollment. When the current zero enrollment neighborhoods next to Kaiser start to fill up, Southern most pirate park is the most obvious candidate for being rezoned.

##### **Map 1 addresses overcrowding problem and balances student population distribution among all 3 schools better for both the short term and long term until, while map 2 does not:**

Map 1 will cause JW to go over capacity by ~45 students for the first 3 years. This is possibly a 2 classroom size increase over the first 3 years. SV has been running at 119% capacity for past ~2 years and to be fair has done an excellent job at it. Moreover JW elementary projected enrollment trend is a declining curve which statistically suggests Map1 will do well even by allocating 45 more at the beginning which would even out this declining curve.

Map 2 on the other hand will cause Kaiser to start the school with a projection of 600 students rather than 500 and go overcapacity from 2019, just 2 years after its inception putting it at 837 students in 2019 which is well over ~80 students over its capacity of 769. This is while JW operates at 92% capacity in 2019 (691/749). Hence map 2 does not balance out the student population evenly between 3 schools and is a solution that is short sighted.

##### **Map submittal #2 does not meet BSD's criteria for boundary change**

Map 2 does not meet BSD's criteria for the change of boundaries because JW's boundaries remain unchanged and therefore Jacob Wismer is a mere spectator with a right to 50% vote on the advisory committee while overcrowding continues to persist at Kaiser and Springville. So it defies the criteria of resolving overcrowding.

Map 2 requires the North and South Pirate Park communities to move to a new elementary school for the 4th time in 15 years never affording its children a stable neighborhood school. Pirate park started out at Bethany elementary, then were moved to Jacob Wismer, moved in 2009 to Springville, and moved again in 2016 to Kaiser. If Map Submittal #1 is accepted it would offer continuity to north Pirate Park to continue at Springville and again move south pirate park but this time rightly to the most proximate neighborhood school which is Jacob Wismer rather than pulling up children all the way north to a not so proximate school.

### **Map submittal #2 requires over ~70% of Springville school to move**

Map 2 requires over ~70% of Springville families to move to the new school Kaiser and 90% of the PTO to move to the new school. Starting next year Springville will have moved over most of its PTO supporting families to Kaiser if map submittal #2 is approved. Shouldn't that ring a warning that boundary lines are being drawn incorrectly?

### **Map submittal #1 has the lowest Transportation costs**

Map submittal #2 forces more school busses to go north on the already busy and narrow one lane Bethany Boulevard causing long term congestion for all the communities and affecting the safety of everyone.


On the other hand, Map submittal #1 would direct South pirate park traffic areas (60, 41, 12, 57, 9, 18, and 91) east to Jacob Wismer across Bethany Boulevard and not north onto Bethany Boulevard. Transportation costs chart provided by BSD at the 14<sup>th</sup> November meeting#4 (**see attached Table 2**) states that the total annual route cost of transportation for BSD for map submittal #1 is \$81,462 while for map submittal #2 it is \$82,451. Map submittal #1 has also proved itself to be the cheapest option for transportation when compared to both Map submittal #2 and #3.

### **Mode of teaching**

All schools follow the common core syllabus but have different approaches of teaching it. Springville uses expeditionary learning (EL) and Kaiser will use STEAM. It would work well if Jacob Wismer could adopt one of the newer learning models like the ones above.

Finally the economically disadvantaged share of student population are distributed most equally only in this Map submittal 1.

On reviewing the testimony of all the committee members at meeting #5, they seem to have accepted map submittal #2 as it worked logically with numbers than did map submittal #3, but Map submittal #1 was not even given a chance for discussion in meeting #5 with all committee members being present. Hence we have garnered support for map submittal #1.




**Graph 1: Projected Enrollment capacity –Map submittal 1\***

**\*Retains areas 84, 14 with Springville**

November 15, 2016

# Kaiser Road K-5 Elementary Boundary Adjustment: Map Submittal #1



	Current Boundary Routes (SPR and JW only)	Modified Scenario 3 (current Tentative Proposal)	Modified Scenario 3 with Island	Map Submittal #1	Map Submittal #2	Map Submittal #3
Annual Operational Cost	\$ 27,139	\$ 11,902	\$ 12,145	\$ 7,792	\$ 7,347	\$ 19,459
Annual Wage & Benefit Cost	\$ 30,037	\$ 12,342	\$ 12,752	\$ 7,785	\$ 6,933	\$ 21,873
<b>Total Annual Route Cost</b>	<b>\$ 57,176</b>	<b>\$ 24,244</b>	<b>\$ 24,897</b>	<b>\$ 15,577</b>	<b>\$ 14,280</b>	<b>\$ 41,332</b>
Total Number of Routes	7	3	3	2	2	5
Avg Route Time	22:06	21:12	21:54	20:00	17:48	22:30
Avg Route Mileage	4.62	4.73	4.83	4.65	4.38	4.64
Average Miles from Center Point	1.1	0.8	1.0	0.6	0.8	0.9

KAISER						
	Current Boundary Routes (SPR and JW only)	Modified Scenario 3 (current Tentative Proposal)	Modified Scenario 3 with Island	Map Submittal #1	Map Submittal #2	Map Submittal #3
Annual Operational Cost	\$ -	\$ 20,457	\$ 18,427	\$ 12,288	\$ 25,137	\$ 13,269
Annual Wage & Benefit Cost	\$ -	\$ 20,923	\$ 19,232	\$ 11,802	\$ 26,161	\$ 11,976
<b>Total Annual Route Cost</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 41,380</b>	<b>\$ 37,659</b>	<b>\$ 24,089</b>	<b>\$ 51,298</b>	<b>\$ 25,246</b>
Total Number of Routes	0	5	5	3	7	3
Avg Route Time	0	21:30	19:48	20:12	19:12	20:30
Avg Route Mileage	0.00	4.88	4.39	4.88	4.28	5.27
Average Miles from Center Point	0.0	1.1	1.5	1.2	1.4	1.7

JACOB WISMER						
	Current Boundary Routes (SPR and JW only)	Modified Scenario 3 (current Tentative Proposal)	Modified Scenario 3 with Island	Map Submittal #1	Map Submittal #2	Map Submittal #3
Annual Operational Cost	\$ 6,995	\$ 6,995	\$ 6,995	\$ 19,576	\$ 6,995	\$ 6,995
Annual Wage & Benefit Cost	\$ 9,877	\$ 9,877	\$ 9,877	\$ 22,219	\$ 9,877	\$ 9,877
<b>Total Annual Route Cost</b>	<b>\$ 16,873</b>	<b>\$ 16,873</b>	<b>\$ 16,873</b>	<b>\$ 41,796</b>	<b>\$ 16,873</b>	<b>\$ 16,873</b>
Total Number of Routes	4	4	4	5	4	4
Avg Route Time	12:42	12:42	12:42	22:54	12:42	12:42
Avg Route Mileage	2.09	2.09	2.09	4.67	2.09	2.09
Average Miles from Center Point	0.9	0.9	0.9	1.0	0.9	0.88

TOTALS						
	Current Boundary Routes (SPR and JW only)	Modified Scenario 3 (current Tentative Proposal)	Modified Scenario 3 with Island	Map Submittal #1	Map Submittal #2	Map Submittal #3
<b>Total Annual Route Cost</b>	<b>\$ 74,048</b>	<b>\$ 82,496</b>	<b>\$ 79,429</b>	<b>\$ 81,462</b>	<b>\$ 82,451</b>	<b>\$ 83,450</b>
Total Number of Routes	11	12	12	10	13	12
Total Route Time	3:25:24	3:42:00	3:35:24	3:35:06	3:41:05	3:44:59
Total Route Mileage	40.7	46.9	44.8	47.3	47.1	47.4
Total Avg Mi from Center Point	1.1	0.9	1.2	0.9	1.0	1.2

# FW: Choose Map Submittal #1: BSD School Elementary Schools Boundary Change

Steven Sparks - Exec Admin

Mon 12/12/2016 7:35 AM

To:deborah wohlmut <Debby\_Wohlmut@beaverton.k12.or.us>;

4 attachments (561 KB)

Map1\_submittal.pdf; ATT00001.htm; Petition\_For\_MapSubmittal\_1\_BSD\_ES\_BoundaryChange.docx; ATT00002.htm;

for correspondence record  
SAS

---

**From:** donald grotting

**Sent:** Friday, December 9, 2016 8:57 AM

**To:** david williams <David\_Williams@beaverton.k12.or.us>; Steven Sparks - Exec Admin  
<Steven\_Sparks@beaverton.k12.or.us>; robert mccracken <Robert\_Mccracken@beaverton.k12.or.us>

**Subject:** Fwd: Choose Map Submittal #1: BSD School Elementary Schools Boundary Change

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Param Singh" <[mithu.singh@gmail.com](mailto:mithu.singh@gmail.com)>

**To:** "donald grotting" <[Don\\_Grotting@beaverton.k12.or.us](mailto:Don_Grotting@beaverton.k12.or.us)>, "Anne Bryan"

<[Anne\\_Bryan@beaverton.k12.or.us](mailto:Anne_Bryan@beaverton.k12.or.us)>, "Eric Simpson"

<[Eric\\_Simpson@beaverton.k12.or.us](mailto:Eric_Simpson@beaverton.k12.or.us)>

**Subject: Choose Map Submittal #1: BSD School Elementary Schools Boundary Change**

Dear Superintendent Grotting & Respected Board Members,

I am a resident of the Jacob Wismer Neighborhood and my son is a first grader at Jacob Wismer Elementary. I have attended the Elementary school boundary committee meetings, and I don't feel like the concerns of a majority of my neighbors are reflected in the final proposal that was adopted by the Elementary Boundary Committee.

I have a very unbiased opinion of the situation given that any there is NO change to school my kids would go to regardless of the plan adopted by the School Board. The current options (map submittal #2 and map submittal #3) are very short sighted and don't address the over-crowding issue long term. As a result I am standing behind map submittal #1 since it address all the over-crowding, transportation, congestion and safety issues long term.

I list out the reason for my decision in great detail in the attached documents.


Thank you for this opportunity to present my case.

-Param



# Kaiser Road K-5 Elementary Boundary Adjustment: Map Submittal #1

November 15, 2016



School	Permanent Capacity*	Capacity Provided by Portables	Total Capacity Available in 2017	2016 % Utilization of Capacity	Notes
Jacob Wamer K-5	723	38	761	94%	2 portable classrooms onsite
Springville K-5**	676	114	790	115%	4 portable classrooms onsite, neither were classroom spaces have been converted
Kaiser Road K-5	769	0	769		No portable classrooms

\*All capacity figures are for the general student population; specialized education and/or classroom spaces have been deducted.

\*\*Springville's capacity is stated for P-5 only. BSO seats for K-5 options students, who will attend in 2017, have been deducted.



Dear Superintendent Don Grotting,

We the undersigned residents of various Springville communities (Arbor Oaks, Abbey creek and Pirate Park) would like to **request you to consider map submittal 1** thought out by advisory committee member Sarah Beachy for elementary school boundary change. We have attached submittal 1 in this set (Figure 1 at the end and also as attachment). This map was introduced along with other submittal maps for the first time in meeting #4 and also eliminated in a hurry towards the end of meeting #4 not giving the public enough time to study this map.

1. Map 1 delivers both objectives outlined by the school board -- relieving overcrowding at Springville ES (SV) & Jacob Wismer ES (JW) and starting Kaiser K-5 with ~500 students. Map submittal 1 can be slightly modified to retain areas 84 and 14 along with its neighbors 18 and 1 and have those families continue at Springville. This brings SV and JW both to at or below their capacity for foreseeable future. **It requires that the larger Pirate Park neighborhood would need to be split but we, the Pirate Park residents are agreeable to that solution to help maintain long term stability for all the kids involved and not have to revisit this process in another 3-4 years.** The resulting projected enrollment graph is shown in **Graph 1** (attached at the end).

2. Total expected enrollment in 2021 for all three schools is 2353. Even with all the pre-approved portables that we were told can be put at Kaiser the total capacity for the schools is 2428. So all schools will need to be at 97% capacity. We cannot expect only Kaiser and Springville to shoulder that burden. Map submittals 2 and 3 under-utilize Jacob Wismer while over burden Kaiser and Springville. All 3 schools should be part of the solution space (**see Table 1: Projected % Capacity Utilization**).

		Map submittal 1*	Map submittal 1*	Map submittal #2	Map submittal #2	Map submittal #3	Map submittal #3
school	total capacity	2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021	2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021	2021 projected enrollment	% capacity utilized 2021
jacob wismer	749	753	101%	656	88%	656	88%
springville	790	820	104%	777	98%	686	87%
kaiser	769	780	101%	920	120%	1010	131%

\* additionally retains area 84 and 14 with springville in Map submittal 1

**Table 1: Projected % Capacity Utilization comparing Map submittal 1, 2, 3.**

3. The Committee's recommended option, map #2 had several problems (details below) as acknowledged by the committee members themselves, most important amongst them being: Kaiser goes over capacity within 2 years of inception needing portables and it still progressively gets worse till 2023. Overcrowding of the schools needs to be solved by looking at all 3 schools, instead of artificially creating constraints by limiting it to only 2 schools.

4. Map 1 is the only map that addresses growth that is happening north by drawing boundaries east-west, as opposed to north-south (map 2), therefore allowing better long term stability. It also addresses proximity to school, continuity of education and neighborhood unity, by keeping whole physical neighborhoods intact and in one school. As such, it will prevent any boundary adjustment process for the next 7 years (2023) which is the absolute earliest date that the new east BSD property can be opened as an elementary school per Mr. Steve Sparks in meeting #5.

#### **Details:**

## **Why map submittal #1 works better than map submittal #2:**

### **A. Map 1 addresses overcrowding problem and balances student population distribution among all 3 schools for both the short term and long term, while map 2 does not:**

Map 1 will cause JW to go over capacity by ~45 students for the first 3 years. This small increase for such a short term can be easily managed. SV has been operating at 119% of capacity for past ~2 years. Moreover JW elementary projected enrollment trend is a declining curve which statistically suggests Map1 will do well even by allocating 45 more at the beginning which would even out this declining curve.

Map 2 on the other hand will cause Kaiser to start the school with a projection of 600 students rather than 500 and go overcapacity from 2019, just 2 years after its inception putting it at 837 students in 2019 which is well over its capacity of 769. This is while JW operates at 92% capacity in 2019 (691/749). Hence map 2 does not balance out the student population evenly between 3 schools and is a solution that is short sighted.

### **B. Map 1 addresses proximity to school while map 2 does not:**

Neighborhoods that are closer to JW will be retained at JW: South Pirate Park below green corridor- (areas 91, 18, 57, 9) plus areas (41, 12, and 60). Neighborhoods that are closer to SV will remain at SV: Abbey Creek- (area 93, 9, 72), low income housing off of 185<sup>th</sup> – (area 39, 68) and north pirate park – (area 1, 18, 84, 14). Neighborhoods closer to Kaiser (Arbor view – (areas 61, 55, 74, 15) including all new growth areas, will be directed to Kaiser ES.

In Map 2, children from far south pirate park are being pulled way up north to just make up numbers for Kaiser while areas 61, 55, 74, 15 which are more proximate to Kaiser really should move to Kaiser ES. Also this area naturally delineates well into Kaiser due to the new high school boundary and hence should be considered for Kaiser Enrollment. When the current zero enrollment neighborhoods next to Kaiser start to fill up, Southern most pirate park (areas 91, 18, 41, 12, 60, 57, 9, 0) would be the most obvious candidate for rezoning.

### **C. Map 2 does not meet BSD's criteria for boundary change:**

Map 2 does not meet BSD's criteria for the change of boundaries because JW's boundaries remain unchanged and therefore Jacob Wismer is a mere spectator with a right to 50% vote on the advisory committee while overcrowding continues to persist at Kaiser and Springville. So it defies the criteria of resolving overcrowding.

Map 2 requires the North and South Pirate Park communities to move to a new elementary school for the 4th time in 15 years never affording its children a stable neighborhood school. Pirate park started out at Bethany elementary, then were moved to Jacob Wismer, moved in 2009 to Springville, and with map 2, will be moved again in 2016 to Kaiser ES. If Map Submittal #1 is accepted it would offer continuity to north Pirate Park to continue at Springville and again move south pirate park but this time rightly to the most proximate neighborhood school which is Jacob Wismer rather than pulling up children all the way north to a not so proximate school.

### **D. Map 2 requires over ~70% of Springville school to move:**

Map 2 requires over ~70% of Springville families to move to the new school Kaiser and 90% of the PTO to move to the new school. Starting next year Springville will have moved

over most of its PTO supporting families to Kaiser if map submittal #2 is approved. Shouldn't that ring a warning that boundary lines are being drawn incorrectly?

**E. Map submittal #1 addresses safety while map submittal #2 does not and map submittal #1 has the lowest transportation costs:**

Map submittal #2 forces BSD to route busses on the already busy and narrow Bethany Boulevard causing long term congestion for all the communities and compromises the safety of the kids and everyone in the community.


On the other hand, Map submittal #1 would direct South pirate park traffic areas (60, 41, 12, 57, 9, 18, and 91) east to Jacob Wismer across Bethany Boulevard and not north onto Bethany Boulevard.

Transportation costs chart provided by BSD at the 14<sup>th</sup> November meeting#4 (**see attached Table 2**) states that the total annual route cost of transportation for BSD for map submittal #1 is \$81,462 while for map submittal #2 it is \$82,451. Map submittal #1 has also proved itself to be the cheapest option for transportation when compared to both Map submittal #2 and #3.

**F. Mode of teaching**

All schools follow the common core syllabus but have different approaches of teaching it. Springville uses expeditionary learning (EL) and Kaiser will use STEAM. It would work well if Jacob Wismer could adopt one of the newer learning models like the ones above.

On reviewing the testimony of all the committee members at meeting #5, they seem to have accepted map submittal #2 as it worked logically with numbers than did map submittal #3, but Map submittal #1 was not even given a chance for discussion in meeting #5 with all committee members being present. Hence we have garnered support for map submittal #1.




**Graph 1: Projected Enrollment capacity –Map submittal 1\***

**\*Retains areas 84, 14 with Springville**

Kaiser ES population explodes starting 2019

### Resulting Projected Enrollment



**Graph 2: Projected Enrollment capacity –Map submittal 2**



# Elementary Boundary Adjustment Comment Form

Do\_Not\_Reply@beaverton.k12.or.us

Tue 12/13/2016 6:22 AM

To: BSD Elementary Boundary Comments <Elementary-Boundary-Comments@beaverton.k12.or.us>;

**Name:** Suman Valusa

**Email:** suman.valusa@gmail.com

**Comment:**

Request you to please consider Submittal Map #2.