# **Facilities Planning Committee**

April 3, 2024



# Agenda & Meeting Objectives

- 1. Welcome
- 2. Overview of Raleigh Hills study area & Goals/Evaluation criteria
- 3. Introduction of tools for the FPC's work
- 4. Review scenarios 1 and 2 & initial evaluation and discuss future ideas to test
- 5. May/June meeting scheduling
- 6. Adjourn



# Agenda & Meeting Objectives

- 1. Welcome
- 2. Overview of Raleigh Hills study area & Goals/Evaluation criteria
- **3.** Introduction of tools for the FPC's work
- 4. Review scenarios 1 and 2 & initial evaluation and discuss future ideas to test
- 5. May/June meeting scheduling
- 6. Adjourn



# Project #1: Raleigh Hills Reopening in SY 2026-27



Problem statement:

- The new Raleigh Hills will provide significantly more capacity than the existing building
- Forecasted enrollment in the current Raleigh Hills boundary will be well below the building capacity
- Several surrounding school buildings are in poor condition or are underutilized, presenting an opportunity for consolidation

### Project Goals:

- 1. Develop a recommendation for the Superintendent on reopening Raleigh Hills with greater capacity utilization in 2026-27.
- 2. Consider the trade-offs of different boundary scenarios and future building investment needs within the study area.

The FPC may issue a recommendation to reopen Raleigh Hills in a way that maximizes enrollment in 2026-27, or a phased plan.

#### Beaverton School District Raleigh Hills Reopening Study Area





4

# Raleigh Hills Reopening Study Area: 5 Boundaries

- 1. Raleigh Hills
- 2. Raleigh Park
- 3. Montclair
- 4. McKay
- 5. Greenway

Throughout this presentation all building condition, seismic and capacity figures for Raleigh Hills are for the *new* structure, which will open in 2026

			_				
					Building 9	6 Utilization	Available
Resident K-5 Population	2023	2032(f)	#	%	Capacity	in 2032	Seats in 2032
Raleigh Hills Elementary (new)	294	291	(3)	-1.0%	750	39%	459
Raleigh Park Elementary	297	273	(24)	-8.1%	325	84%	52
Montclair Elementary	286	248	(38)	-13.3%	325	76%	77
McKay Elementary	246	217	(29)	-11.8%	375	58%	158
Greenway Elementary	276	240	(36)	-13.0%	500	48%	260
Total	1,399	1,269	(130)	-9.3%	2,275	56%	1,006

Change

	Originally	Seismic Score		FCI Score (consider
Building Characteristics	Built	(Goal is 81+)	Seismic Performance Level	replacement if >0.30)
Raleigh Hills Elementary (new)	2026	95	Immediate Occupancy	-
Raleigh Park Elementary	1959	50	Less Than Collapse Prevention	0.37
Montclair Elementary	1969	69	Limited Safety	0.19
McKay Elementary	1929	49	Less Than Collapse Prevention	0.29
Greenway Elementary	1979	63	Limited Safety	0.25

#### Beaverton School District Raleigh Hills Reopening Study Area





\*Vose is not included because it serves as a destination for Spanish Language dual language students from other boundaries, and has little available capacity.

## Raleigh Hills Reopening Suggested Goals/Policy Guidance & Evaluation Criteria

Guiding Goals / Policies	Scenario Evaluation Criteria
<b>LRFP Goal 1</b> : Utilize the 2020 Facility Condition Assessment (FCA) to prioritize building investments and decrease deferred maintenance.	<ul> <li>Reduction or avoidance of deferred maintenance costs through building closure/consolidation</li> <li>Reduce need to operate and maintain underutilized capacity in school buildings</li> <li>Reduction or avoidance of future building replacement costs</li> </ul>
LRFP Goal 2: invest in seismic improvements such that all schools meet collapse prevention performance on or before December 2032 and as directed by Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 455.400.	<ul> <li>Increase of student enrollment in buildings with 81 or greater structural score (the district performance goal is to have all school buildings at 81 or above by 2032)</li> <li>Reduction or avoidance of seismic retrofit costs</li> </ul>
<b>LRFP Goal 6</b> : Balance school capacity with current and projected enrollment levels.	<ul> <li>Increase efficiency by right-sizing student enrollment levels for staffing and operational purposes while balancing value of community-based neighborhood schools</li> </ul>
Board Policy JC factors (Attendance Boundary Adjustments) Full board policy JC <u>here</u>	<ol> <li>Student body composition</li> <li>Current and future availability of space at a school</li> <li>Feeder patterns from elementary, middle to high school</li> <li>Neighborhood proximity and accessibility (including transportation cost &amp; walkability)</li> </ol>



# Agenda & Meeting Objectives

- 1. Welcome
- 2. Overview of Raleigh Hills study area & Goals/Evaluation criteria
- 3. Introduction of tools for the FPC's work
- 4. Review scenarios 1 and 2 & initial evaluation and discuss future ideas to test
- 5. May/June meeting scheduling
- 6. Adjourn



# Tools for FPC Work

## **#1** Composite Building Score (CBS)



## **#3** Maps



## #2 School Building One Pager



### #4 Boundary Scenario Builder





# What is a Grid Code?

- Every part of the district is divided into small non-overlapping geographies along major roads and geographic features.
- These are the Grid Codes they are the building blocks of the district's attendance boundaries. They were originally laid out in the 1990s; some have been split over time. Grid Codes are specific to Beaverton School District, but many districts have similar geographic analysis zones.
- Each Grid Code has its own number. The geographic area of each Grid Code is assigned to an elementary school, middle school, and high school boundary (no overlaps).
- Resident students counts can be made by Grid Code. This allows us to explore different boundary arrangements by assigning Grid Codes to different schools. The 2032 forecast has also been disaggregated to the Grid Code level.



Numbers refer to the Grid Code identification number, **not** the number of students

![](_page_8_Picture_7.jpeg)

# Tool #1: Composite Building Score (CBS)

What is it? A scorecard with 6 major categories, drawing from the most recent evaluations or assessments of BSD buildings

The 6 Categories:

- **1. SEIS**mic: most recent structural performance rating
- FCI: most recent Facility Condition Index score 2.
- 3. SITE Size: Actual acres vs. target size
- **CAP**acity Utilization: Utilization of permanent capacity in 4. 2032 (K-5 forecast of current boundary).
- Staffing **EFF**iciency: Size of forecasted student body (under 300 is considered inefficient)
- **WALK**ability: Share of resident students in current 6. boundary within walk-to-school zones (approximate)
- Each category has a maximum score of 5 and total ٠ possible building score of 30. Scores for each category reflect "bins" of scores. For example a building with an Immediate Occupancy seismic rating (highest) receives 5 points.
- Currently, all categories are equally weighted; if the ٠ committee would like to consider weights to any category, we can discuss options

1 = Low/Poor

	TOTAL	SEIS	FCI	SITE	CAP	EFF	WALK
Avg. (30 Max):	13.4	1.8	2.6	3.2	2.2	1.0	2.6
School	TOTAL	SEIS	FCI	SITE	CAP	EFF	WALK
Greenway ES	14	2	2	3	1	1	5
McKay ES	10	0	2	2	2	1	3
Montclair ES	14	2	3	2	3	1	3
Raleigh Hills ES	17	5	5	4	1	1	1
Raleigh Park ES	12	0	1	5	4	1	1

5 = High/Good

### Maximum building score of 30 (highest/best)

![](_page_9_Picture_14.jpeg)

# Seismic Component

SEIS mic: Most recent seismic rating (KPFF 2019/Holmes 2023)

pt pt

pts pts

pts

pts

Points rubric: 5 total possible points (highest)

< Collapse Prevention	41-50	0
Collapse Prevention	51-60	1
Limited Safety	61-70	2
Life Safety	71-80	3
Damage Control	81-90	4
Immediate Occupancy	91-100	5

Damage Control is the district's seismic performance rating goal for all buildings by 2032. The district uses bond funds and applies for state seismic retrofit grants.

For more information: January 24, 2024 Plan for Seismic Safety: <u>Presentation Video</u>

![](_page_10_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Figure_7.jpeg)

Maximum building score of 30 (highest/best)

# Seismic Rating Descriptions

	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Points</u>	Immediate Occupancy
Immediate Occupancy	91-100	5 pts	<ul> <li>Very limited structural damage has occurred.</li> <li>Risk of life-threatening injury as a result of structural damage is very low.</li> <li>Minor repairs might be required, but not generally to re-occupy.</li> <li>Continued use of the building will not be limited by its structural condition.</li> </ul>
Damage Control	81-90	4 pts	Damage Control     BSD Goal       • Half-way between Immediate Occupancy and Life Safety.     BSD Goal
Life Safety	71-80	3 pts	<ul> <li>Life Safety</li> <li>Significant damage to the structure will occur but some margin against partial or total collapse will remain.</li> <li>Some structural elements will be severely damaged, but this damage will not result in large falling debris hazards, either inside or outside the building.</li> <li>Injuries might occur during the earthquake; however, the overall risk of life-threatening injury as a result of structural damage is expected to be low.</li> <li>It should be possible to repair the structure; however, for economic reasons, this repair might not be practical.</li> <li>Although the damaged structure may not be an imminent collapse risk, it would be prudent to implement structural repairs or install temporary bracing before reoccupancy.</li> </ul>
Limited Safety	61-70	2 pts	<ul> <li>Limited Safety</li> <li>Half way between Life Safety and Collapse Prevention.</li> </ul>
Collapse Prevention	51-60	1 pt	<ul> <li>Collapse Prevention</li> <li>Little to no lateral strength or stiffness to resist lateral loads.</li> <li>Large permanent drifts to the building where doors may not open.</li> <li>Structural collapse possible in aftershock events thus not safe to occupy after event.</li> <li>Cost to repair structure will likely outweigh demo/replacement.</li> </ul>
< Collapse Prevention	41-50	0 pt	<ul> <li>Collapse Prevention</li> <li>Possible partial or full collapse of structure.</li> <li>Non-collapsed areas have minimal reserve capacity and significant residual drift.</li> <li>Full structural collapse probable in aftershock or wind event.</li> <li>Building will likely require full demo/rebuild.</li> </ul>

![](_page_11_Picture_2.jpeg)

# Facility Condition Index (FCI) Component

Facility Condition Index (FCI) is a standard capital planning benchmark used to indicate the condition of the assets in the facility and is defined as the ratio of the total asset replacement cost to current building replacement value. The <u>lower</u> the FCI score, the better.

**FCI**: Most recent FCI score from the McKinstry building condition assessment dashboard.

Points rubric: 5 total possible points (highest)

FCI can be improved with repairs and upgrades to a building's systems. The 2022 bond program dedicates ~\$20 million per year districtwide for deferred maintenance.

For more information: October 25, 2023 Deferred Maintenance Plan: <u>Presentation Video</u>

![](_page_12_Picture_7.jpeg)

1 = Low/Poor

	TOTAL	SEIS	FCI	SITE	CAP	EFF	WALK
Avg. (30 Max):	13.4	1.8	2.6	3.2	2.2	1.0	2.6
School	TOTAL	SEIS	FCI	SITE	CAP	EFF	WALK
Greenway ES	14	2	2	3	1	1	5
McKay ES	10	0	2	2	2	1	3
Montclair ES	14	2	3	2	3	1	3
Raleigh Hills ES	17	5	5	4	1	1	1
Raleigh Park ES	12	0	1	5	4	1	1

5 = High/Good

Maximum building score of 30 (highest/best)

# Site Size (Acres) Component

**SITE**: Recommended site size for elementary buildings (7-10 acres), based on building specifications.

Points rubric: 5 total possible points (highest)

0 to 69% of Minimum size 70% to 79% of Target size 80% to 99% of Target size 100% of Target size Over 100% of Target

This metric is most important when considering the possible replacement of a building. An undersized site may not easily accommodate all of the spaces or circulation needs for a modern school building.

![](_page_13_Figure_6.jpeg)

Maximum building score of 30 (highest/best)

![](_page_13_Picture_8.jpeg)

# Forecasted Capacity Utilization Component (2032)

**CAP**: Utilization of the permanent capacity of the building (non-portable space) in the 2032 forecast year for the current attendance boundary.

Points rubric: 5 total possible points (highest)

< 50% utilization of perm capacity Very Low: 51% to 60% utilization Low: 61% to 79% utilization Medium: 80% to 89% High: 90% to 95% utilization

Very high Over capacity or 95%+ utilization

![](_page_14_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Figure_6.jpeg)

## Maximum building score of 30 (highest/best)

![](_page_14_Picture_8.jpeg)

\*Capacity for Elementary schools is calculated as 25 students per general education classroom – those not used for special education, Pre-K or other programs. Capacity used in these slides assumes the current allocation of classrooms. Portable capacity is not included.

# Staffing & Operational Efficiency Component

1 pt

2 pts

3 pts

4 pts

5 pts

**EFF**: A measure of operational efficiency based on total student body size (independent of building capacity).

Points rubric: 5 total possible points (highest)

< 300 resident students 300 - 399 resident students 400 - 499 resident students 500 - 599 resident students 600+ resident students

300 students is considered the floor for efficient staffing of an elementary school building. At levels below 300, section sizes fall below staffing ratio thresholds and music & art teachers are not fully utilized.

#### 1 = Low/Poor5 = High/GoodTOTAL SEIS FCI SITE CAP EFF WALK Avg. (30 Max): 13.4 1.8 2.6 3.2 2.2 1.0 2.6 School TOTAL SEIS FCI SITE CAP EFF WALK Greenway ES 14 2 2 3 1 5 2 3 McKay ES 10 0 2 2 Montclair ES 14 2 3 2 3 3 Raleigh Hills ES 17 4 Raleigh Park ES 12 0

Maximum building score of 30 (highest/best)

![](_page_15_Picture_7.jpeg)

# Walk-to-School Component

**WALK**: A measure of walking access to school, as measured by the share of resident students who live within grid codes covered by the current walk-to-school zone.

Points rubric: 5 total possible points (highest)

=< 10% of resident students in walk zone	1 pt
11 - 20%	2 pts
21 – 50%	3 pts
51 – 70%	4 pts
71 – 100%	5 pts

Walk-to-school zones and grid code boundaries do not always align exactly, but this measure is an efficient and reasonably accurate way to compare the walking accessibility of different buildings. Improvements like signals, sidewalks, crossings, and posted speed limit reductions can expand walk-to-school zones; these scores reflect *current* conditions.

1 = Low/Poor5 = High/GoodTOTAL SEIS FCI SITE CAP EFF WALK Avg. (30 Max): 13.4 1.8 2.6 2.6 3.2 2.2 School TOTAL SEIS FCI SITE CAP EFF WALK Greenway ES 14 2 3 5 2 McKay ES 10 0 2 2 3 Montclair ES 14 2 3 2 3 3 Raleigh Hills ES 17 4 Raleigh Park ES 12 0

Maximum building score of 30 (highest/best)

![](_page_16_Picture_7.jpeg)

# A Note about Walk-to-School Zones

- Raleigh Hills has one of the smallest walk-toschool zones in the district.
- It is due to several factors including discontinuous sidewalks and limited signalized crossings.
- The District, City of Beaverton, and Washington County are working together on a number of projects that will improve crossings and sidewalk connectivity in the vicinity of Raleigh Hills.
- The ultimate size of the walk-to-school zone for Raleigh Hills is yet to be established. For now, we are only depicting the current conditions.

![](_page_17_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_6.jpeg)

# CBS Example: Comparing Raleigh Hills & Raleigh Park

- The **rebuilt** Raleigh Hills has a score of 17, the highest of the five schools in the study area. It scores very well for seismic, FCI and site size. However it scores at the bottom for future utilization and operational efficiency, and for walkability.
- The resident student population in the current boundary will be less than 300 students (low EFF) and far below the building's capacity (low CAP) .
- Raleigh Park, scores well for site size (large parcel) and well on the utilization of capacity (capacity of 325 and projected utilization of 84% in 2032). But scores low on seismic, FCI and operational efficiency (it is a small school).

\* At the moment, we are not proposing to alter these scores through any scenarios. The CBS scores are meant to provide an at-a-glance comparison of current conditions. But we can explore that as a possibility if the committee would like.

![](_page_18_Figure_5.jpeg)

### Maximum building score of 30 (highest/best)

![](_page_18_Picture_7.jpeg)

# Tool #2: School Building One Pager

What is it? Compilation of building information, including CBS and seismic, FCI, feeder and bond information

![](_page_19_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_0.jpeg)

SCHOOL DISTRICT

![](_page_22_Figure_0.jpeg)

BEAVERTON SCHOOL DISTRICT TOTAL SEIS FCI SITE CAP EFF WALK Summary 1 = Low/Poor

3 Needs seismic investment; underutilized capacity; <300 enrollment 2 3 1

76			of 30			All figures a	rre for general education K-5 (d	oes not include Pre-K or SPED)
School Aloha Huber Park K8 Barnes ES	SRHS HS Feeder	Rale	eigh Hills	Capa	city	<b>286</b> 2023 Residents (K-5)	88% 2023 Utilization (Resid	d
Bethany ES Bonny Slope ES Cedar Mill ES Chehalem ES	WHMS MS Feeder	210 GARDEN	Hayt Sch	Pern	n. Cap	<b>248</b> 2032 Residents (K-5)	76% 2032 Utilization	<b>77</b> 2032 Open Seats (K-5)
Cooper Mtn ES Elmonica ES Errol Hassell ES Findley ES	1969 Orig. Built	RALEIGH HILLS	VERMI SW Vermont		2014 \$3.221 Bond Pro	✔ oject Category	Project	
Greenway ES Hazeldale ES Hiteon ES Jacob Wismer ES	7.2 Site Acres	ortland Golf Club	MAPLEWOOD		2014 Sec 2014 Sec 2014 Sec 2014 Mo	curity & Other Equipment curity & Other Equipment curity & Other Equipment odernization	Door & Hardware Replaced Interior Classroom Locks Security Upgrades Backboard Hoist Replacem	nent
Kinnaman ES McKay ES McKinley ES Montclair ES Nancy Ryles ES	% in Walk Zone	Garden Home School Garden Hameton e on	SW-Multhoma	h.Blvd	2014 Mo 2014 Mo 2014 Mo 2014 De	odernization odernization odernization ferred Maintenance	District-Wide Unified Com Learning Technology Playground Improvements Flooring Replacement	nunication System
Oak Hills ES Raleigh Hills ES Raleigh Park ES Ridgewood FS	Seismic Level	Seismic Structural Score (Goal is 81 or higher)	Performance Levels S Immediate Occupancy 91	core	2014 De 2014 Ad	ferred Maintenance ditional Capacity	Roof Replacement Portable Moves	
Rock Creek ES Sato ES Scholls Heights ES Sexton Mountain ES	Limited Safe	ty <b>69</b>	Damage Control (Goal)         81           Life Safety         71           Limited Safety         61           Collapse Prevention         51           Less than Collapse Prevention         41	90 80 70 60 50	2022 \$422.0	ж		
<ul> <li>Springville ES</li> <li>Terra Linda ES</li> </ul>	Facility Condition	n Current FCI Score	Potential Action		Bond Pr	roject Category Project		_
Vose ES West Tualatin View William Walker ES	Near 2nd Life Cycle Replace Major System	e 0.19	Repair		2022 M	Iodernization Applicable	District-Wide Projects Onl	ý

2 3

14

![](_page_23_Picture_4.jpeg)

Montclair ES

![](_page_24_Figure_0.jpeg)

BEAVERTON SCHOOL DISTRICT

## Tool #3: Maps

What is it? Large-format printed maps with boundaries and grid codes, walk-to-school areas, and community information (staff will print these)

### A couple examples

Aloha Huber K-8 Raleigh Hills Study area map with boundaries. grid codes and Cooper current walk-toschool zones Sexton Mountai

Beaverton School District

![](_page_25_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Figure_5.jpeg)

Childhood poverty data from the 2023 American Community Survey (census tract-level) overlaid with boundaries and grid codes

![](_page_25_Picture_7.jpeg)

# Tool #4: Boundary Scenario Builder

What is it? A Power BI worksheet with resident forecast and feeder pattern info to create boundary scenarios (staff will operate with FPC input)

![](_page_26_Figure_2.jpeg)

# Agenda & Meeting Objectives

- 1. Welcome
- 2. Overview of Raleigh Hills study area & Goals/Evaluation criteria
- 3. Introduction of tools for the FPC's work
- 4. Review scenarios 1 and 2 & initial evaluation and discuss future ideas to test
- 5. May/June meeting scheduling
- 6. Adjourn

![](_page_27_Picture_7.jpeg)

## Overview: Scenarios 1 and 2

### <mark>Scenario 1</mark>:

New Raleigh Hills Boundary:

- All Raleigh Hills
   current boundary
- All Montclair current boundary
- Northern portion of McKay (generally area west of HWY 217)

New Greenway Boundary

 Southern portion of McKay is assigned to Greenway Elementary

BEAVERTON

SCHOOL DISTRICT

#### Beaverton School District Raleigh Hills Reopening Study Area

![](_page_28_Figure_9.jpeg)

### Scenario 2:

New Raleigh Hills Boundary:

- All Raleigh Hills
   current boundary
- All Raleigh Park
   current boundary
- Northern portion of McKay (generally area west of HWY 217)

New Greenway Boundary

 Southern portion of McKay is assigned to Greenway Elementary

#### Beaverton School District Raleigh Hills Reopening Study Area

![](_page_28_Figure_18.jpeg)

### Comparing Scenarios with *current* Composite Building Scores

1 = Low/Poor

![](_page_29_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Figure_4.jpeg)

			TOTAL	SEIS	FCI	SITE	CAP	EFF	WALK
<mark>Scenario 2</mark>		Avg. (30 Max):	13.4	1.8	2.6	3.2	2.2	1.0	2.6
		School	TOTAL	SEIS	FCI	SITE	CAP	EFF	WALK
Adds stude	nts →	Greenway ES	14	2	2	3	1	1	5
Clos	sed →	McKay ES	10	0	2	2	2	1	3
Unchang	jed →	Montclair ES	14	2	3	2	3	1	3
Adds stude	nts 🔶	Raleigh Hills ES	17	5	5	4	1	1	1
Clos	sed →	Raleigh Park ES	12	0	1	5	4	1	1

![](_page_29_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_7.jpeg)

## Raleigh Hills Reopening: Scenario 1 (Raleigh Hills + McKay North & Montclair)

Notes:

boundary

as a whole

• Whitford

SCHOOL DISTRICT

•

•

•

•

![](_page_30_Figure_1.jpeg)

## Raleigh Hills Reopening: Scenario 1 (Greenway + McKay South)

### Notes:

- All Greenway current boundary
- Southern portion of McKay is assigned to Greenway Elementary
- Results in forecasted utilization of Greenway 67% (capacity available if adjustment from east is needed)
- All schools within Conestoga MS
- Larger Hispanic/Latino population than district as a whole
- All feeds to Conestoga MS
- All feeds to Southridge HS

SCHOOL DISTRICT

![](_page_31_Figure_9.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Figure_10.jpeg)

## Raleigh Hills Reopening: Scenario 2 (Raleigh Hills + McKay North & Raleigh Park)

![](_page_32_Figure_1.jpeg)

All Raleigh Hills current boundary

V

V

V

 $\checkmark$ 

V

 $\vee$ 

 $\vee \square$ 

 $\vee \square$ 

 $\vee \square$ 

 $\vee \square$ 

 $\vee$ 

- All Raleigh Park current boundary
- Northern portion of McKay (generally area west of HWY 217)
- Southern portion of McKay is • assigned to Greenway Elementary (next slide)
- Results in good forecasted • utilization of Raleigh Hills 91%
- Less R/Eth diversity than district • as a whole
- All schools within Whitford MS
- Feeder split at HS (Beaverton & Southridge) – same as today
- **Raleigh Park** closed

SCHOOL DISTRICT

McKay closed

![](_page_32_Figure_12.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Figure_13.jpeg)

Forecast Year 2032 750 685 Perm Capacity Allocated Stus 91% Seats Remaining % Util

**ES Boundary** 

McKay ES

2032

Raleigh Hills ES

Raleigh Park ES

Perm Capacity Value

## Raleigh Hills Reopening: Scenario 2 (Greenway + McKay South)

### Notes:

- All Greenway current boundary
- Southern portion of McKay is assigned to Greenway Elementary
- Results in forecasted utilization of Greenway 67% (capacity available if adjustment from east is needed)
- All schools within Conestoga MS
- Larger Hispanic/Latino population than district as a whole
- All feeds to Conestoga MS
- All feeds to Southridge HS

SCHOOL DISTRICT

![](_page_33_Figure_9.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Figure_10.jpeg)

## Raleigh Hills Reopening: Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 Preliminary Comparison

Guiding Goals / Policies	Scenario Evaluation Criteria	Comments on Scenario 1	Comments on Scenario 2
LRFP Goal 1: Utilize the 2020 Facility Condition Assessment (FCA) to prioritize building investments and decrease deferred maintenance.	<ul> <li>Reduction or avoidance of deferred maintenance costs through building closure/consolidation</li> <li>Reduce need to operate and maintain underutilized capacity in school buildings</li> <li>Reduction or avoidance of future building replacement costs</li> </ul>	Avoids capital & operation cost of McKay (FCI 0.29) and Montclair beginning 2026 (FCI 0.19) Greenway (FCI 0.25) receives additional students Raleigh Park still needs replacement	Avoids capital & operation cost of McKay (FCI 0.29) and Raleigh Park beginning 2026 (FCI 0.37) Greenway (FCI 0.25) receives additional students
LRFP Goal 2: invest in seismic improvements such that all schools meet collapse prevention performance on or before December 2032 and as directed by Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 455.400.	<ul> <li>Increase of student enrollment in buildings with 81 or greater structural score (district performance goal)</li> <li>Reduction or avoidance of seismic retrofit costs</li> </ul>	2026: Raleigh Hills: 295 Montclair: 262 McKay North: 143 Total: 692 in Immed. Occ. (score 95) 2026: McKay South: 333 <u>Greenway: 241</u> Total: 333 in Limited Safety (score 63)	2026: Raleigh Hills: 295 Raleigh Park: 278 McKay North: 143 Total: 726 in in Immed. Occ. (score 95) 2026: McKay South: 333 <u>Greenway: 241</u> Total: 333 in Limited Safety (score 63)
LRFP Goal 6: Balance school capacity with current and projected enrollment levels.	<ul> <li>Increase efficiency by right-sizing student enrollment levels for staffing and operational purposes while balancing value of community-based neighborhood schools</li> </ul>	Raleigh Hills is utilized at 88% of capacity in 2032 (up from 39%) Greenway is utilized at 67% of capacity in 2032 (up from 48%)	Raleigh Hills is utilized at 91% of capacity in 2032 (up from 39%) Greenway is utilized at 67% of capacity in 2032 (up from 48%)

![](_page_34_Picture_2.jpeg)

## Raleigh Hills Reopening: Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 Preliminary Comparison

Guiding Goals / Policies	Scena	ario Evaluation Criteria	Comments on Scenario 1	Comments on Scenario 2
Board Policy JC factors (Attendance Boundary Adjustments)	1.	Student body composition	<ol> <li>New Raleigh Hills less R/Eth diversity than district as a whole. New Greenway larger Hispanic/Latino population than district as a whole.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>New Raleigh Hills less R/Eth diversity than district as a whole. New Greenway larger Hispanic/Latino population than district as a whole.</li> </ol>
Full board policy JC <u>here</u>	2.	Current and future availability of space at a school	<ol> <li>Both Raleigh Hills and Greenway are better utilized, though Greenway remains below 70%.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Both Raleigh Hills and Greenway are better utilized, though Greenway remains below 70%.</li> </ol>
	3.	Feeder patterns from elementary, middle to high school	3. No change in feeder patterns for Raleigh Hills, McKay North or <mark>Montclair</mark> Students – all attend Whitford, and then split to Beaverton and Southridge	3. No change in feeder patterns for Raleigh Hills, McKay North or Raleigh Park Students – all attend Whitford, and then split to Beaverton and Southridge
	4.	Neighborhood proximity and accessibility (including transportation cost & walkability)	<ol> <li>Raleigh Hills: Students joining from McKay North and Montclair will not be able to walk to Raleigh Hills. Raleigh Hills has very small walk-to-school zone due to major roads and other barriers.</li> </ol>	4. Raleigh Hills: Students joining from McKay North and Raleigh Park will not be able to walk to Raleigh Hills. Raleigh Hills has very small walk-to-school zone due to major roads and other barriers.
			Greenway: No change for students in Greenway's current boundary. Students joining from McKay South will not likely be able to walk to Greenway. Scholls Ferry Road is a major road that K-5 <sup>th</sup> grade students will not be able to cross.	Greenway: No change for students in Greenway's current boundary. Students joining from McKay South will not likely be able to walk to Greenway. Scholls Ferry Road is a major road that K-5 <sup>th</sup> grade students will not be able to cross.
			The estimated increase in transportation costs is 19% above current conditions (next slide for details)	The estimated increase in transportation costs is 10% above current conditions (next slide for details)

![](_page_35_Picture_2.jpeg)

## Transportation Cost Analysis

The Transportation Department evaluated Scenarios 1 and 2 for anticipated changes to the cost of bus transportation.

Both scenarios result in an increased in total bus transportation costs due to an increase in the number of routes and students transported. Scenario 1 results in a 19% increase in transportation costs, and Scenario 2 a 10% increase.

- Students who currently walk to Montclair or Raleigh Park would need bus transportation to Raleigh Hills under Scenarios 1 or 2, respectively.
- Students who currently walk to McKay will need transportation to Raleigh Hills and Greenway (both scenarios).
- Students who currently walk to Greenway would remain the same.

#### **Current Situation**

Raleigh Hills, Greenway, Montclair, and Raleigh Park all serviced individually:

School	Routes	Riders	Miles	Cost
Raleigh Hills ES	4	249	56.97	\$90,625
McKay ES	2	169	45.39	\$72,204
Montclair ES	3	207	49.07	\$78,058
Raleigh Park ES	3	213	70.83	\$112,673
Greenway ES	0	0	0	\$0
Grand Totals	12	838	222.26	\$353,560

### Scenario 1

Northern portion of McKay joins Raleigh Hills, Southern portion of McKay joins Greenway, Montclair joins Raleigh Hills, Raleigh Park remains intact:

School	Routes	Riders	Miles	Cost	
Raleigh Hills ES	11	666	167.38	\$266,260	
Greenway ES	1	83	25.59	\$40,707	
Raleigh Park ES	3	213	70.83	\$112,673	
Grand Totals	15	962	263.80	\$419,640	+19% over current

### <u>Scenario 2</u>

Northern portion of McKay joins Raleigh Hills, Southern portion of McKay joins Greenway, Raleigh Park joins Raleigh Hills, Montclair remains intact:

School	Routes	Riders	Miles	Cost
Raleigh Hills ES	10	627	170.71	\$271,557
Greenway ES	1	83	25.59	\$40,707
Montclair ES	3	207	49.07	\$78,058
Grand Totals	14	917	245.37	\$390,322

![](_page_36_Picture_15.jpeg)

## Overview: Scenarios 1 and 2

### <mark>Scenario 1</mark>:

New Raleigh Hills Boundary:

- All Raleigh Hills
   current boundary
- All Montclair current boundary
- Northern portion of McKay (generally area west of HWY 217)

New Greenway Boundary

 Southern portion of McKay is assigned to Greenway Elementary

BEAVERTON

SCHOOL DISTRICT

#### Beaverton School District Raleigh Hills Reopening Study Area

![](_page_37_Figure_9.jpeg)

### Scenario 2:

New Raleigh Hills Boundary:

- All Raleigh Hills
   current boundary
- All Raleigh Park
   current boundary
- Northern portion of McKay (generally area west of HWY 217)

New Greenway Boundary

 Southern portion of McKay is assigned to Greenway Elementary

#### Beaverton School District Raleigh Hills Reopening Study Area

![](_page_37_Figure_18.jpeg)

38

## **Next Considerations**

Scenarios 1 and 2 both achieve the goal of opening Raleigh Hills with a larger enrollment. Both scenarios close two schools (McKay, and/or Montclair & Raleigh Park). However, there are other considerations, if we expand the scope of schools.

Ridgewood is also a candidate for replacement or decommission (Seismic 56, FCI 0.26). William Walker, next door to Ridgewood and built in 2018, is underutilized (69% in 2023). Raleigh Park and Ridgewood are proximate to one another, and a replacement building at either site could accommodate most the two school's enrollment.

The FPC may explore these alternatives as it considers options for reopening Raleigh Hills.

TOTAL	SEIS	FCI	SITE	CAP	EFF	1 = Low/Poor $5 = High/Good$
12.0	2.3	2.9	2.9	2.4	1.6	
TOTAL	SEIS	FCI	SITE	CAP	EFF	Issue Summary
9	2	2	3	1	1	Needs seismic investment; low FCI score; <300 enrollment
5	0	2	1	1	1	Needs seismic investment; low FCI score; <300 enrollment
10	2	3	2	2	1	Needs seismic investment; underutilized capacity; <300 enrollment
16	5	5	4	1	1	New large school (cap 750); <300 enrollment
13	1	1	5	5	1	Needs seismic investment; <300 enrollment
13	1	2	2	5	3	Needs seismic investment; low FCI score; <400 enrollment
18	5	5	3	2	3	Underutilized capacity; <500 enrollment
	TOTAL 12.0 70TAL 9 5 10 16 13 13 13 18	TOTAL     SEIS       12.0     2.3       TOTAL     SEIS       9     2.       5     0.       10     2.       10     2.       11     1.       13     1.       18     5.	TOTAL     SEIS     FCI       12.0     2.3     2.4       TOTAL     SEIS     FCI       9     2     2       5     0     2       10     2     3       110     5     5       13     1     2       18     5     5	TOTALSEISFCISITE12.02.32.43.1TOTALSEISFCISITE9223.11023.13.11053.11.113122.118553.1	TOTALSEISFCISITECAP12.02.32.92.43.4TOTALSEISFCISITECAP922.3.411023.2.2.165.3.41113115.5.1312.2.3.185.5.3.42.	TOTAL         SEIS         FCI         SITE         CAP         EFF           12.0         2.3         2.9         2.4         2.6         3.6           TOTAL         SEIS         FCI         SITE         CAP         EFF           10         2         2         3         1         1         1           10         2         3         2         2         1         1         1           10         2         3         2         2         1

![](_page_38_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Picture_6.jpeg)

# Agenda & Meeting Objectives

- 1. Welcome
- 2. Overview of Raleigh Hills study area & Goals/Evaluation criteria
- 3. Introduction of tools for the FPC's work
- 4. Review scenarios 1 and 2 & initial evaluation and discuss future ideas to test
- 5. May/June meeting scheduling
- 6. Adjourn

![](_page_39_Picture_7.jpeg)

# Project #1: Raleigh Hills Reopening in SY 2026-27

	Activity	Timeframe
FPC -	Startup & Orientation	February 28
	Raleigh Hills issue brief & study	April 3
	Raleigh Hills study	Мау
l	Raleigh Hills recommendation	June
District -	Superintendent review of recommendation	July/August
	Board review of recommendation	September
	Board adopt objectives for Boundary Adjustment and/or Building Closure process	October
	Public Process & recommendation	Nov-January
	Board review & approval	February 2025
	Transition planning	Up to Sept 2026

![](_page_40_Picture_2.jpeg)

# **Proposed FPC Meeting Schedule**

Date	Time	Location	Agenda	Status
February 28, 2024	4:00 PM	BSD District Administrative Office	Introductory Meeting	Confirmed
April 3, 2024	6:00 PM	BSD District Administrative Office	Raleigh Hills Study Session	Confirmed
May 1, 2024	6:00 PM	BSD District Administrative Office	Raleigh Hills Study Session	Proposed
June 5, 2024	6:00 PM	BSD District Administrative Office	Raleigh Hills Recommendation	Proposed
2nd June Meeting If Needed	6:00 PM	BSD District Administrative Office	Raleigh Hills Recommendation	If Needed
		Summer Break		
September 4th, 2024	6:00 PM	BSD District Administrative Office	LRFP Topics	Proposed
October 2, 2024	6:00 PM	BSD District Administrative Office	SY 2024-25 Enrollment Overview	Proposed
December 4, 2024	6:00 PM	BSD District Administrative Office	LRFP Topics	Proposed

![](_page_41_Picture_2.jpeg)

# Thank you!

![](_page_42_Picture_1.jpeg)