

## Summary

### Facilities Planning Committee Meeting April 3, 2024

Members Present:	Members Excused:	Staff Present:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ian Beaty</li> <li>2. Debbie Chin</li> <li>3. LeeAnn Larson</li> <li>4. Dan Maks</li> <li>5. Stephen Roberts</li> <li>6. Farahnaz Zaman</li> <li>7. Brian Kennedy</li> <li>8. Jodi Bean</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Abhijit Sathaye</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Steven Sparks</li> <li>2. Robert McCracken</li> <li>3. Dr. Carl Mead</li> <li>4. Karla Barrett-Curtis</li> <li>5. Dr. Gustavo Balderas</li> </ol>

Committee Chair Stephen Roberts opened the meeting, welcomed the committee members and reviewed the agenda. Dr. Balderas joined the meeting about half-way through and thanked the committee for their time and dedication. He stressed that as enrollment declines, the District needs to make many difficult decisions and having community input is essential. The District cannot consider these decisions in isolation and needs a strong community presence, beginning with this committee.

Staff presented to the committee the Raleigh Hills Reopening project overview.

Staff highlighted that all figures presented for Raleigh Hills will be for the newly built school, which will have a capacity of 750 general education K-5 students. Spaces for self-contained specialized programs and pre-Kinder programs will be provided separately. The Raleigh Hills Reopening project is looking at five boundaries in the area: Raleigh Hills, Raleigh Park, Montclair, McKay, and Greenway. The combined capacity of the buildings serving these boundary areas will far exceed the K-5<sup>th</sup> grade population by 2032 (over 1,000 open seats); there are opportunities for closures and/or consolidations. Staff presented draft guiding goals and evaluation criteria for the reopening scenarios; they included goals from the 2021 adopted Long Range Facilities Plan (address deferred maintenance, upgrade seismic ratings, balance capacity and enrollment) and factors from Board

**Belong. Believe. Achieve.**

Policy JC, which governs attendance boundaries (school demographics and composition, capacity, feeder patterns, and neighborhood proximity and accessibility).

The presentation provided an overview of four tools staff has developed to aid the committee. Tool #1, the Composite Building Score is a 30-point building ranking scale that covers seismic condition, deferred maintenance, building capacity utilization, walkable areas, etc. Staff welcomed suggestions from committee to adjust tools provided and consider whether they wanted to weigh one element (e.g. seismic) over another. Discussion and questions included:

- What is the definition of “walkable”?

*Walkable areas must be within 1 mile of an elementary school (route distance from a home to school, not as the crow flies) and have continuous sidewalks or safe paths and crossings. The maximum posted speed for an elementary crossing is 35 MPH, subject to safety considerations (e.g. crash rates in the area) and a BSD crossing guard. If a student lives within one-mile of a school, but cannot walk safely they are provided bus transportation.*

- Confirmation that McKay was built 1929?

*Yes, that was the year of original construction. Some discussion followed about unreinforced masonry and the cost and effort needed to seismically upgrade those elements.*

For building condition and deferred maintenance staff highlighted the role of the 2022 Bond Program, which allocates about \$20 million per year. Community members have asked why the District only devotes \$20 million per year to deferred maintenance. The main limiting factor is time: these projects (e.g. repairs, reroof projects, HVAC upgrades, etc.) are very disruptive and cannot be done while school in session. The Bond team maximizes projects and deferred maintenance during the summer months, and bundles projects for maximum efficiency.

- Has there been any analysis of FCI (Facility Index Scores) years over time?

*Yes, the FCI scores can improve over time, for example a new roof or HVAC upgrade can improve a building's score. The Bond team tracks FCI scores and facility condition at all buildings with the help of a McKinstry dashboard. Results are provided to the Bond Accountability Committee and the School Board on a regular basis. The detailed FCI score information by system (structural, HVAC, plumbing, etc.) is too granular for this committee's work – staff recommends focusing on the overall building score.*

- Does the District know what the impact of the new Raleigh Hills will be on traffic on Scholls Ferry Road and at the new school? Can the district estimate the transportation cost and ride times for students under each scenario?

**Belong. Believe. Achieve.**

*The District prohibits discrimination and harassment based on any basis protected by law, including but not limited to, an individual's actual or perceived race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, national or ethnic origin, marital status, age, mental or physical disability, pregnancy, familial status, economic status, veterans' status, or because of a perceived or actual association with any other persons within these protected classes.*

*As part of the land use application for the new school, the District prepared a traffic impact analysis. The new design for Raleigh Hills will be a great improvement on the current situation (separated bus and parent drop-off areas, entry & exit points, new traffic signal etc.). The district knows how many students are eligible to ride the bus to school and compare with actual ridership levels to estimate how many students are driven by their families. But it is impossible to predict the actual private cars driving to school. The district's Safe Routes to School team works closely with principals to educate families about transportation options, drop-off & pick-up plans, and mitigating traffic impacts.*

*The Transportation Department has reviewed Scenario 1 and 2 and provided comments (in the presentation and staff report). When the committee comes up with new scenarios, Transportation will evaluate them and provide comments (e.g. the number of bus routes needed, students to be bused, total mileage and estimated cost of transportation). All cost figures presented will be before any state reimbursement (70% of eligible costs). While the district does receive reimbursement for eligible transportation costs, it still has to pay the total costs up front.*

Staff reviewed the three remaining tools: #2 the school one pagers: building condition, seismic, enrollment and 2014 and 2022 bond project information is provided; tool #3: area maps, including student density, neighborhood poverty levels and walk-to-school zones; and tool #4 the online scenario builder.

Next staff provided an overview of Scenarios 1 and 2 & their initial evaluation.

- Scenario 1 proposes the closure of McKay and the placement of students living north of Highway 217 at Raleigh Hills and those living south at Greenway. It also proposes the closure of Montclair and the movement of all students within that boundary to Raleigh Hills.
- Scenario 2 proposes the same change for McKay (closure and north/south split to Raleigh Hills and Greenway) with the closure of Raleigh Park and movement of all students within that boundary to Raleigh Hills (Montclair remains open and unchanged).

Discussion and questions included:

- Discussion of the idea of closing two schools. Do we want to close two schools? Why do we want to? McKay is so small building and enrollment is low, so it makes sense to close or combine? Committee members noted the Greenway enrollment is also low.

*This is the primary focus of this committee: to study and recommend the reopening option(s) to the Superintendent, based on a comprehensive review of the area, enrollment and school conditions. It could be one or two schools – the committee could consider looking at a third. The District needs your help in looking at the pros and cons of a variety of scenarios and options*

**Belong. Believe. Achieve.**

The District prohibits discrimination and harassment based on any basis protected by law, including but not limited to, an individual's actual or perceived race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, national or ethnic origin, marital status, age, mental or physical disability, pregnancy, familial status, economic status, veterans' status, or because of a perceived or actual association with any other persons within these protected classes.

*Regarding McKay specifically, when staff have looked at this building with its declining enrollment, condition and seismic rating, it has always prompted consideration of closure and consolidation.*

- What is the feasibility of extending SW Vermont St to Garden Home Road? How accessible is the Montclair attendance area to Raleigh Hills?

*It is unlikely that an extension of SW Vermont would rank high as a transportation project (it would need to cross a creek and the Portland Golf Club). But it is important to consider how accessible the Montclair attendance area is to the new Raleigh Hills building. Currently Montclair has a fairly large walk-to-school zone; those students would need to be bused to Raleigh Hills.*

- Scenario 2 appears to isolate the Montclair boundary (keeping it open and instead consolidating Raleigh Park with Raleigh Hills). That means Montclair must remain as a building to serve this area. It prompts one to consider a broader study area, including Ridgewood and how it relates to Raleigh Park. Is that a scenario we can consider?

*Yes, Scenarios 1 and 2 are meant as a starting point. Staff can develop scenarios that broaden the scope to include Ridgewood and other nearby schools, including whole or partial boundary moves. The committee is welcome to consider these and issue a recommendation to the Superintendent that has several phases. Another consideration is whether a school, like Greenway, which receives some additional enrollment but still has a lot of open seats, could become a hub for a dual language program. Vose currently hosts students from outside its boundary, and fully utilizes the capacity of the building.*

- Are the transportation costs for Scenarios 1 and 2 are higher than current, due to more students needing to be bused. Is cost shown before or after the 70% reimbursement from the state?

*The costs shown are total, before the reimbursement. We should keep in mind that the District will be cutting costs as we phase in electric buses. Also, the increased transportation cost would be eclipsed by the savings from closing a building.*

- Is the District assuming a reduction in administrative costs as enrollment declines?

*Yes, the district has estimated about \$1 million in annual administrative, custodial, and operational costs for a small elementary school like McKay. This does not include teachers, who are allocated by students – in the case of a closure, teaching positions would “follow” students to another facility. The operational savings from closing a school building can be directed elsewhere and/or offset needed budget reductions as our enrollment declines over time.*

**Belong. Believe. Achieve.**

The District prohibits discrimination and harassment based on any basis protected by law, including but not limited to, an individual's actual or perceived race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, national or ethnic origin, marital status, age, mental or physical disability, pregnancy, familial status, economic status, veterans' status, or because of a perceived or actual association with any other persons within these protected classes.

- Can the committee look at a broader area than the five boundaries shown? For example, elementary schools east of Murray Blvd and south of Highway 26 as the large area. And then look at major dividers, like Highway 217. All of this keeping in mind the need to balance student travel times and neighborhood-serving schools versus operational efficiency.
- The committee should look at Montclair and its relationship to the schools around it; whether it is an isolated school and community, and how to consider it. Are there any district guidelines about communities that are kind of isolated, like Montclair?
- The committee should look at where students are concentrated, for example, in neighborhoods behind the commercial areas off Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway. There are probably natural neighborhoods/communities that could be grouped together if boundaries are redrawn.

*Yes, the scope of the committee's initial project can be broadened, but the committee should make sure the recommendation addresses the Raleigh Hills reopening question. Raleigh Park and Ridgewood are schools in need of significant investment or replacement, and they are proximate to one another. There could be one or more scenarios that looks at splitting Raleigh Park, with the eastern portion going to Raleigh Hills and the western portion to Ridgewood (assuming a Ridgewood rebuild at some point in the future). About half of Ridgewood's attendance boundary is located west of Highway 217, and may be within walking distance to William Walker Elementary. William Walker is a brand new school, opened in 2019, and is currently underutilized (capacity of 625, which could be expanded if some special education programs were relocated). The far western portion of Raleigh Park is west of Highway 217 and is more proximate to William Walker.*

- What will the District do with any buildings that are closed?

*The district does not plan to sell any property, rather, it would prefer to hold, repurpose or lease buildings.*

- Where will Raleigh Hills students attend school during the rebuild?

*The Raleigh Hills student body will be located at Greenway Elementary, which has sufficient capacity to house both schools. Raleigh Hills will remain a distinct school while at Greenway.*

The next meeting will be more of a work session – brief presentation and more time for discussion.

Staff will develop scenarios for the May 1st meeting that consider Ridgewood and William Walker as well as Montclair. The committee may email staff with ideas, and Stephen Roberts has a couple

**Belong. Believe. Achieve.**

The District prohibits discrimination and harassment based on any basis protected by law, including but not limited to, an individual's actual or perceived race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, national or ethnic origin, marital status, age, mental or physical disability, pregnancy, familial status, economic status, veterans' status, or because of a perceived or actual association with any other persons within these protected classes.

sketches he will provide to staff for starters. Staff will also send out one-pagers for additional schools (Ridgewood, William Walker, etc.).

Staff will send out the roster with email addresses. After consulting with general counsel, it would be preferred to collect comments from the committee and have staff compile them as running discussion.

The next meetings were scheduled. The district will provide dinner and staff will send out menus.

May 1, 2024 from 5:00 – 7:00 PM at District Central Office

June 5, 2024 from 5:00 – 7:00 PM at District Central Office

Staff will look at dates for the final June meeting (June 19<sup>th</sup>, originally proposed, is a holiday) and poll the committee for availability.

Adjourn

**Belong. Believe. Achieve.**

*The District prohibits discrimination and harassment based on any basis protected by law, including but not limited to, an individual's actual or perceived race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, national or ethnic origin, marital status, age, mental or physical disability, pregnancy, familial status, economic status, veterans' status, or because of a perceived or actual association with any other persons within these protected classes.*