BRIC ARCHITECTURE

1233 NW NORTHRUP STREET, SUITE 100
PORTLAND, OR 97209

T 503 595 4900

Meeting Notes

PROJECT: Beaverton School District Long-Range Plan
DATE: September 16, 2025
PROJECT NUMBER: 24020
SUBJECT: Long-Range Facilities Planning Committee: Meeting #7
ATTENDEES: Carina Santoro-Quintanilla, Karina Ruiz, Ken Bell (BRIC); Robert McCracken, Shellie Bailey-Shah, Karla Barrett-Curtis, Kerry Delf, Steven Sparks, Casey Waletich and Long-Range Facilities Planning Committee members

---

Session Overview
This was the seventh meeting of the Long-Range Facilities Planning Committee. The session was heavily focused on providing quantitative data to the committee. Steven Sparks and Robert McCracken presented historical data about the Beaverton School District's residential development and population trends, current enrollment data, and forecasted future trends. Casey Waletich presented a draft problem statement which would be further analyzed and discussed at the following meeting.

Welcome & Introduction
Stephen Roberts (Committee Chair) began the meeting by welcoming a new member to the committee. He then shared meeting expectations and opened the session by providing an overview of the agenda. He noted that while the public is welcome to attend, they cannot give verbal testimony during the meeting. Written testimony is welcome to be submitted through the district website.

Presentation from Steven Sparks and Robert McCracken: Long Range Planning
Steven and Robert provided an overview of Beaverton School District's (BSD) current and projected enrollment, facilities, and demographic trends to inform long-range planning.

- **Demographic & Enrollment Trends:**
  - BSD's population is aging, with a significant decline in residents under 18. Enrollment peaked in 2019 and has been declining since. Kindergarten class sizes and general education cohorts (2014–2024) show downward trends, and updated 2025 data (expected to be available in 2026) will likely show even lower projections.
- **Residential Development & Student Distribution:**
  - Historical residential growth has shaped BSD's school system since 1960. Current development patterns show that new market-rate apartment complexes (mostly

studios/1-bedrooms) are not bringing in many families, while affordable housing, which is more likely to serve families, is limited in development.
    - The Southwest region is the only area expected to see enrollment growth.
    - The North region has sufficient capacity and may not require new schools; many Bethany-area middle school students currently cross Highway 26 to attend middle school in the SW region.
    - The Southeast region is the oldest part of the district, with many small schools and a surplus of seats.
- **Facilities & Capacity:**
    - Robert outlined the district's building capacity calculation formula (based on permanent seats) and compared 2024 enrollment to 2032 forecasts. Many buildings, particularly older ones, will see updated facility condition scores as ongoing repairs and upgrades (roofing, boilers, flooring, etc.) are completed.
- **Seismic Safety:**
    - The 2022 bond prioritized seismic upgrades, focusing first on older middle schools, with some elementary schools also receiving improvements.

Questions/Comments & Responses:

- C: *TriMet has been promoting Park & Ride locations and working with non-profits on affordable housing projects, especially in the Western region of Beaverton. There are likely more affordable housing developments to come soon.*
- Q: *Do these numbers include all residents or just students attending schools in BSD? Many students are likely being homeschooled since the pandemic.*
  A: The number includes just BSD students. Forecasting does take homeschool registrations into account which are now close to pre-pandemic numbers. BSD also receives a count of resident students who have opted for virtual charters. This number has also gone up, with a large spike in 2021.
- Q: *Does the forecast also account for generational turnover? New families appear to be moving into single-level homes that are going on the market as people are aging.*
  A: The 10-year forecast will look at demographic changes in those areas. In Oak Hills for example, enrollment has shown that trend. But generally, there are fewer families and fewer children and the refill into those neighborhoods may not generate the same number of students that we have seen in the past.
- Q: *The kindergarten classes appear to be smaller than the first-grade classes. Is that a common trend?*
  A: Typically, kindergarten classes will grow as they matriculate into first grade. 2015 was a watershed year, with full-day kindergarten opening. After the pandemic, we saw that increase level out at about a 3-4% increase, perhaps due to remote work options or increased availability of kindergarten options. Looking at 2025, the incoming first-grade class is no bigger than the

kindergarten class last year. This is a new trend and probably the first time that we've seen this happen.

- Q: *Are there regions of the District (N, SW, SE) where charter schools, homeschooling, and private school options are predominantly being chosen?*
  A: We don't have enough information to determine this.
- C: *It appears that the newer schools are over capacity, and it almost looks as though they're cannibalizing the other schools. It feels like we're setting aside spaces for new schools that aren't needed. Will this trend impact future bond decisions?*
  A: Enrollment forecasting is a critical component of any facility plan moving forward. All decisions are based on the needs of current and future students. While the District did buy land with the 2014 bond, they did not purchase any in the 2022 bond due to peak enrollment. The conversation will continue to evolve with future bond planning. The trend in BSD and throughout the state will likely focus more on improving current inventory rather than building new.
- C: *The state is on a declining population trajectory as the birth rate is far below the death rate.*
- C: *Beaverton has been a destination for migration – more than other school districts. We may see that come to an end or at least taper off in the near term.*
- C: *The state of Oregon has relied on the influx of immigration.*
- Q: *Is there a correlation between large corporate layoffs (like Nike and Intel) and declining enrollment?*
  A: Historically, yes. We can see that enrollment declined during the great recession. It's been assumed that companies like Intel have a significant impact on local enrollment trends.
- Q: *Do we expect seismic upgrades to be a higher priority for bond dollars? The seismic rating descriptions are alarming, with a lot of schools being listed below the threshold score of 50.*
  A: Seismic upgrades have been a big priority for the community and bond-planning committee over the last two bonds. Beaverton High School, which is currently being rebuilt, is one of the worst seismically rated buildings. As we get into future bond planning, we expect to see it remaining a high priority. The facilities development team has also been pursuing grants for seismic upgrades. Beaver Acres was recently upgraded using grant funding.
- C: *Looking at the 2024 and 2032 attendance and utilization maps, I noticed that there are seven schools around or below 60% utilization, with four of them being in the SE subregion.*

The Problem Statement

Casey Waletich introduced the draft problem statement, which had been created with the goal of providing more clarity around the role of this committee and what they have been tasked to solve. Steven Sparks noted that the group would not be asked to agree on this statement tonight, as there had not yet been ample time to discuss. At the next meeting, they would spend time discussing it and how to move forward.

Questions/Comments & Responses:

- Q: *Dr. Balderas mentioned that he expects educational specifications (ed specs) to be revised late next year, with the expectation that they will decrease and the District will need to build smaller in the future. The finance team also expects to form a committee to review BSD's staffing model. Seeing how these are relevant to our work, how do we avoid getting ahead of that?*
  A: This committee is not looking at size of schools, but rather boundaries, current enrollment and utilization. Ed specs will dictate how new buildings are constructed. We are discussing current buildings.
- C: *Raleigh Hills is currently being built. How we plan for that building feels relevant to our work and could be part of the problem statement.*
  A: Raleigh Hills is in the current ed spec. The District is currently having programming discussions about this and is planning for ways to utilize the building.
- Q: *Two buildings could have the same seismic rating but could have very different costs involved in bringing them up to standards. Are those figures significant or important to us regarding decision-making?*
  A: Cost is a significant factor, especially with recent significant cost escalation.
- Q: *How do we reconcile our task with timing and the search for a new superintendent?*
  A: The purpose of this committee is to make recommendations to our current superintendent. We won't solve all long-range planning concerns in these next six months, but we will hopefully have a path forward with recommendations for the next phase. We urge the committee not to base hesitancy on the status of the new superintendent.
- Q: *Why is it important that we move forward?*
  A: The District's long-term financial prognosis shows that if changes aren't implemented in the next three years, we will face serious financial difficulties. The purpose of this committee is to begin that process, especially as these changes wouldn't be implemented until fall 2027 at the earliest.
- C: *The District has known for six years that they were under capacity. This process began with the boundary adjustment in 2019 and the bond committees that were formed in years following. We have continued to spend and are facing an enrollment and money problem. Instead of waiting, we should collectively begin to work out our best options and do what is fiscally responsible.*
- C: *We are a recommending body and will not have final say. Delaying recommendations is a slippery slope. We need to move forward.*
- C: *I feel a strong sense of urgency because many students are at schools that are at capacity. There is an urgency for our least advantaged kids to have a school experience with acceptable school and class sizes. We need to make some difficult decisions, and I hope that we focus on the greater good of the District. We are one piece; there are several other committees. Focusing on what we control is important.*
- C: *The board wants this committee to think outside the box and think creatively. I hope that this*

committee thinks widely about what this looks like – whether it's program changes, boundary changes, etc.

- Q: *At the last meeting, we voted on the North Stars. Did anyone submit comments about the implications that received sideways-thumb votes?*
  A: We received one email from a committee member asking to add the word "fiscally" to one of the planning implications under Equitable and Sustainable Resource Stewardship. The change was accepted. The updated North Stars and Planning Implications will be shared with the committee. (2.3 Schools are structured to meet current needs while ensuring the District remains **fiscally** strong and sustainable for the future).
- Q: *Didn't the board recommend adding more about academic achievement to the North Stars?*
  A: It wasn't necessarily a recommendation to change the North Stars but rather a recommendation to take it into account in future work which we will dive into next time. Today's meeting was about providing the committee with data.
- *C: The "Actions Needed" section of The Problem Statement leaves us with a lot of room to have robust discussion. It will be helpful for our committee to think about the objectives and have an ongoing discussion.*

Closing & Next Steps

Steven Sparks noted that the next meeting would be on October 22nd and would be focused on discussing The Problem Statement document, as well as drafting guardrails, levers and outcomes for consideration. District staff along with the BRIC team would come prepared with suggestions to guide that discussion.

Additional Comments/Questions & Responses

- Q: *Will we be discussing whether the problem statement is correct during the next meeting?*
  A: We will discuss it and if there are any concerns from the committee or desire to expand or modify it, we will have time to do so.
- Q: *How are we defining equitable and high-quality in the problem statement?*
  A: It might be a good homework assignment to dive into the problem statement before we meet next. It would be helpful if folks could share their thoughts ahead of time.
- C: *We don't have all the data yet. One eye opening thing from last year was the cost of maintaining and upgrading schools. It may be pertinent to the discussion of how to proceed.*
  A: We will provide as much data as we can. As noted earlier, cost estimates are a complete guess but can provide orders of magnitude for things.

These meeting notes are a record. If there are any errors and/or omissions in the foregoing notes, please advise our office immediately; otherwise these notes will be considered correct and complete as written.

Submitted by

Carina Santoro-Quintanilla, Planner
BRIC Architecture, Inc
Attachments: