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: November 12, 2025
PROJECT NUMBER: 24020
SUBJECT: Long-Range Facilities Planning Committee: Meeting #9
ATTENDEES: Carina Santoro-Quintanilla, Karina Ruiz, Ken Bell (BRIC); Robert McCracken, Karla Barrett-Curtis, Kerry Delf, Steven Sparks, Casey Waletich and Long-Range Facilities Planning Committee members

---

Session Overview
This was the ninth meeting of the Long-Range Facilities Planning Committee. The session focused on the guardrails and levers that the committee would vote on to recommend to the superintendent as avenues to pursue.

Welcome & Introduction
The meeting opened with Stephen Roberts reviewing guidelines and the public testimony process. Public comments received will be posted to the website and included in the next meeting packet. To support equitable participation, each person will have a chance to speak once before anyone is called on again.

Questions/Comments & Responses:

- Q: When are public comments shared with the committee?
  A: Comments that are received will be sent out with the next packet of materials and posted to the LRFP website.

Review of Committee Charter & North Stars
Ken reviewed the committee charter and charge. Karina reinforced that the North Stars and Planning Implications will be used as the evaluative lens for recommendations.

Guardrails and Levers
Robert presented an overview of existing split attendance areas and how students in these areas matriculated into their next schools. Robert also presented illustrations of how split feeders could occur and the potential solutions which are articulated in the draft recommendations. Robert concluded with sharing information requested by the Committee concerning building capacity, utilization, FCI scoring and seismic scoring. The guardrails and levers that would be reviewed this evening would be:

- Bucket 3: Feeder Patterns

- Bucket 4: Attendance Boundaries
- Bucket 1: Annual Enrollment Report
- Bucket 5: School Conditions Assessments

It was noted that Bucket 2 would be held for the following meeting. Steven presented the draft recommendations for committee consideration. The committee divided into two work groups to disuss the buckets 3 and 4 followed by a report out on the discussions.

Small Group Work: Discussion Around Draft Recommendations

Group 1 – Feeder Patterns (Bucket 3)

- What is the basis for current feeder patterns?
- What might be applicable today might not make sense in the future – how do we future proof decisions?
- Missing short- and long-term impacts at the school level, especially around social demographics – feeder patterns are replicating inequity.
- Where are people dropping off / where are we losing students?
- Don't let perfect be the enemy of good.
- When making a change, look at what problem you are creating when you make that change, including:
    - Proximity
    - Balance of SES / Title I
- Principle works of even feeder patterns, and when it is necessary to split, make the split even, split them early, and maintain clean feed up to high school.
- Location should be age dependent.
- Add in lever of Ed Spec.

Group 1 – Attendance Areas (Bucket 4)

- Makes sense to add a threshold for enrollment changes.
- Create a threshold for capacity rather than enrollment, but the District needs to determine what that number is.
- Do you look at the performance of programs before addressing bullet 2?
- Add equity and Title I status and transparency of how it is applied.
- Consideration of feeder patterns needs to be specific to programming.

Group 1 – Annual Enrollment Report (Bucket 1)

- This is a foundational element rather than a bucket.
- Examine data accuracy of enrollment projections – use more comprehensive analysis and provide transparency of how these are calculated.
- Include data on things included in the North Stars.

Group 1 – School Conditions Assessments (Bucket 5)

- #A – then what do you do with students in that building?
- Remove "less than 75 years old" from #B.

- Add physical safety and access control and other elements that speak to intrinsic value – historic, neighborhood value, educational adequacy, etc. – to #C.

Group 2 – Feeder Patterns (Bucket 3)

- Erin's email was well-written; feels like this is missing: extra consideration for Title 1 schools within boundary decisions.
- Need to understand walkability impacts and whether there is an inherent preference for walkability or if it's just an easy way to demarcate land.
    - Federal government reimburses 70% for transportation; no reimbursement inside walk zones.
- Need a framework for evaluating impacts of feeder pattern changes, including cost implications.
- Problem statement says we want to advance equity, but equity is not defined; unclear whether North Stars go far enough.
- Would like risk analysis that lays out drawbacks of decisions (negatives, costs, tradeoffs).
- Less splits is better, but some historical splits reflect unique geographies.
- There has been demographic clustering to create Title 1 schools — should this be preserved?
- Bussing cost is not a major factor (cost per student, # of teachers, etc.).
- Last boundary adjustments tried to avoid splits as much as possible.
- Building utilization targets should be maintained; recommendations should evaluate existing examples.
- If splitting is required, some feel you should split later (MS rather than ES).
- Feeder patterns should:
    - Avoid three-way splits (MS → three HS).
    - Ideally limit to maximum of two high schools.
- Would like research on student outcomes of early vs. late splits.
- Cohort consistency can help, but lifelong friendships aren't guaranteed — varies by community size.
- Equity lens: students in high-poverty situations may be less likely to attend a school where they know no one.
- Should examine feeder patterns across all three levels (K–12), not one level at a time — avoid "goofball" results from isolated decisions.
- Should explore strategic boundary adjustments before considering school closures.
- Question whether new development and land availability have been evaluated; districts rarely give up land.
- Suggested adding % poverty as a specific metric under Bucket 3.
- Feeling that there is too much abstraction — more data and research are needed.

- Language concerns: “bucket,” “lever,” and “guardrail” feel too jargony; prefer category/threshold/action.

Group 2 – Attendance Boundaries (Bucket 4)

- Need to account for Title 1 implications, equity considerations, and walkability limits.
- Attendance boundary recommendations reference Policy JC, but socioeconomic status doesn’t feel emphasized despite being in policy.
- High-density poverty makes it very difficult to offer the same level of education; examples given (Findley 5% vs. Beaver Acres 65%).
- A suggested guardrail is that schools should not exceed 50% poverty.
- Want an educator to help interpret what matters more: walkability or lowering school poverty concentrations.
- Need to prioritize decision-making lenses, not leave it to two bullet points — otherwise it feels like abdication.
- Each boundary situation is different; this work should stay with the boundary committee informed by community feedback.
- Would like to see attendance boundaries and feeder patterns analyzed together, not separately.
- Need more clarity on how program performance factors into boundary decisions.
- Raised concern that doing boundary changes one level at a time has caused unintended splits (e.g., MS feeding three HS).
- Should consider sectioning the district in ways that avoid multi-split pathways.
- Need to revisit 2022 Bond discussions around adding classrooms in the north end — may have contributed to current declining enrollment concerns.

Group 2 – Annual Enrollment Report (Bucket 1)

- Problem statement notes extra capacity + $1M+ overage — want this clearly visible to the community.
- Would like to know:
    - Available vs. extra capacity across levels.
    - Cost of an extra school.
    - What this means districtwide, not school-by-school.
- Need both sides of the ledger — closing a school doesn’t automatically save $1M.
    - Want to see net impact calculations.
- Believe district must have a reasonable conversation about cost-saving strategies, given fiscal concerns.
- Want a summary by level of capacity and extra capacity for ES, MS, and HS.
    - Feel this information should be in every bond measure.
- Support adding context to numbers (cost reduction strategies, SAM adjustments).

- Would only consider school consolidation after exhausting all other options and confirming it is the most equitable and fiscally responsible decision.
- Need to evaluate the SAM model and understand current bus utilization and how it affects cost.
- Enrollment report should also answer:
    - Did we lose more students than expected?
    - Did more leave for private schools?
    - What are we doing to attract and retain families (strategic changes)?
- Overall sentiment: too abstract, need more research and clarity.
- Would rely on Erin's language from her email if forced to vote now.

Group 2 – School Conditions Assessments (Bucket 5)

- Need more detail on deferred maintenance costs.
- If capital investments aren't being made, what happens?
    - Sell it? Decommission? Repurpose?
    - Want clarity on the impact of each scenario.
- Suggest looking at buildings earlier than 75 years; possibly a 65-year trigger.
- Some feel it should be based on FCI over time, not age.
- Should follow recommendations of the external evaluating consultant.
- Confusion about linking age and seismic score — do we maintain something structurally outdated?
- Some suggested removing building age entirely and focusing on seismic score and FCI, but want clarity on why age was originally included and what removing it would change.
    - 75 years is the expected "lifetime" of a school building.
- Desire for more specific thresholds and less abstraction.

Small Group Report-Outs

Bucket 3 (Feeder Patterns)

- "Less splitting is better."
- Discussed poverty and equity lens.
- Need data on student outcomes of splits.

Bucket 4 (Attendance Boundaries)

- Only area of clear agreement: poverty rate threshold.

Bucket 1 (Enrollment Report)

- Missing data on how indicators support North Stars.
- Want clarity on data sources.
- Need utilization data inclusive of special services and Title I status.
- Want attrition and student flow data.

Bucket 5 (School Conditions Assessments)

- Want facilities evaluated holistically, not by age alone.

- Missing safety/access control considerations.

Additional Comments and Questions

- Fear decisions could be made without considering other buckets.
    - No bucket should stand alone.
- Voting is about process, not specifics.
- Need clearer guidance on next steps.
- Current draft is too vague; need research, history, data.
- Recommendation: district must conduct a more in-depth process.

Closing & Next Steps

- Steven reviewed edits to recommendations for Buckets 3 and 4.
    - Agreed to add: a school should split to no more than two schools.
- Due to time, group recommended adjourning and voting at the next meeting.
- Casey noted only two meetings remain per superintendent direction.
    - Clarified that this committee's purpose is to recommend moving forward on these buckets, not finalize solutions.
- Next Meeting: December 17 — updated recommendations will be sent to the committee as soon as possible.

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: