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: December 17, 2025
PROJECT NUMBER: 24020
SUBJECT: Long-Range Facilities Planning Committee: Meeting #10
ATTENDEES: Carina Santoro-Quintanilla, Ken Bell (BRIC); Robert McCracken, Karla Barrett-Curtis, Kerry Delf, Steven Sparks, Casey Waletich (BSD) and Long-Range Facilities Planning Committee members

---

Session Overview
This was the tenth meeting of the Long-Range Facilities Planning (LRFP) Committee. The session focused on reviewing and voting on the revised problem statement, advancing votes on the previously identified guardrail and lever "buckets," finalizing draft recommendations for several buckets, and beginning discussion of Bucket 2 (School Utilization).

Welcome & Context
The meeting opened with Stephen Roberts (Committee Chair) reviewing guidelines and the public testimony process. It was noted that the committee has limited time remaining and emphasized that this is an advisory body. If recommendations are not finalized, the superintendent may proceed independently. This meeting, and potentially one additional meeting, are intended to conclude the committee's work.

Steven Sparks (BSD) reviewed the updated problem statement incorporating feedback from the previous meeting. Members discussed whether the objective was to recommend frameworks or take action on specific buckets. It was clarified that the goal is to recommend that action be taken on the buckets that pass, allowing them to move forward, without specifying the exact actions.

Vote: Problem Statement
Members voted yes or no to approve the District's proposed Problem Statement. The statement was approved with a majority "yes" vote.

- Approved (8 in favor, 2 opposed)

Guardrails & Levers: Bucket Review and Voting
Steven reviewed edits to the guardrails and levers document with tracked changes reflecting committee feedback. It was clarified that the initial votes would be on whether to recommend

exploring each bucket as a whole, not on the detailed recommendations within them. Buckets were approved if there was a majority "yes" vote.

Bucket Approval Votes (Bucket-Level Only)

- Bucket 1 – Annual Enrollment Report: Approved (10 votes)
- Bucket 3 – Feeder Patterns: Approved (10 votes)
- Bucket 4 – Attendance Boundaries: Approved (10 votes)
- Bucket 5 – School Conditions Assessments: Approved (8 votes)

With all buckets approved, the committee returned to vote on draft recommendations within each bucket.

Draft Recommendation Votes

- Bucket 1 (Annual Enrollment Report):
  - Approved (9 in favor, 1 opposed)
- Bucket 3 (Feeder Patterns):
  - Approved (8 in favor, 2 opposed)
  - Clarifying edit agreed to: *"Splitting of cohorts should occur no more than once in a student's tenure."*
- Bucket 4 (Attendance Boundaries):
  - Approved (7 in favor, 3 opposed)
- Bucket 5 (School Conditions Assessments):
  - Initial vote resulted in a split (5 in favor, 5 opposed), prompting further discussion and revisions.

Bucket 5: School Conditions Assessments — Discussion & Revisions

Members who did not initially support Bucket 5 raised concerns that the language appeared to predetermine outcomes that would discourage investment in older schools, potentially creating disproportionate impacts on lower-income communities. Questions were raised about who would have decision-making authority and how historic, cultural, and community value would be considered.

District staff clarified that:

- The criteria do not preclude investment in older buildings.
- Replacement on an existing site remains an option.
- Evaluations would occur within future LRFP and bond-planning processes, which include community engagement.

Additional discussion emphasized:

- The importance of seismic safety as a priority metric.
- Clarifying that age, FCI, and seismic scores are evaluated together.

- The need for transparency around how fiscal constraints and bond capacity influence prioritization.
- Interest in including a quantitative community impact analysis, while acknowledging that specifics require further development.

Revised Language and Votes

- Recommendation A (as revised):
  In the 2027 LRFP, the committee should evaluate the merit of making long-term deferred maintenance capital investments in structures that are over 75 years of age, or have an FCI score greater than 0.3, or have a seismic score below 51.
    - Approved
- Recommendations A–C (with agreed additions referencing quantitative impact considerations such as FCI, age, seismic condition, enrollment forecast):
    - Approved

It was clarified that if future committees cannot agree on implementation specifics, those decisions would rest with subsequent planning bodies.

Small Group Work: Bucket 2 – School Utilization

Point A –

- Language was viewed as vague and overly procedural, with insufficient clarity around purpose and outcomes.
- Members sought clearer definitions of:
    - What data is monitored.
    - How often monitoring occurs.
    - What constitutes a trigger for action.
- Questions were raised about whether utilization thresholds reflect a single-year snapshot or multi-year trends.
- Suggested that sustained under-enrollment (e.g., 2–3 consecutive years below a threshold) should be required to initiate action.
- Concern that a 60% utilization threshold may be too low, particularly for smaller schools.
- Desire for clearer articulation of goals, such as fiscal responsibility, educational quality, and target utilization ranges.

Point B –

- Concern that examples such as blended classrooms are overly specific and may imply instructional decisions rather than illustrative options.
- Members questioned whether certain strategies are developmentally appropriate and beneficial for students.

- Suggested revising language to be less prescriptive and to include “including but not limited to” phrasing.
- Questions about whether thresholds apply at a single point in time or over a defined period.
- Desire to explicitly address equity, including:
    - Cost per student.
    - Impacts on Title I and lower-income communities.
- Noted that the bucket does not adequately address schools with limited access (e.g., option or magnet schools).

Point C

- Uncertainty about the role, composition, and authority of advisory committees.
- Questions about whether committees would be established for each impacted school and whether this could create unnecessary complexity.
- Concern that the approach feels overly procedural and may reduce transparency.
- Discussion about whether student enrollment should be evaluated as a moment-in-time metric or over a multi-year trend.
- Some members questioned whether these decisions should remain with the School Board or the LRFP Committee rather than additional advisory bodies.

Point D

- Members expressed concern that Point D overlaps with responsibilities traditionally held by the School Board.
- Interest in expanding potential actions to include:
    - Boundary adjustments.
    - Grade-level realignment (e.g., K–6, K–8).
    - Proactive enrollment strategies prior to consolidation.
- Questions about who would ultimately make decisions regarding consolidation and based on what criteria.
- Noted absence of strategies for addressing over-enrolled schools.
- Desire for clearer prioritization of actions and alignment with districtwide goals.

Overall Takeaways

- Bucket 2 was viewed as requiring significant refinement before advancing.
- Members emphasized the need for clearer intent, data, thresholds, and prioritization.
- Some questioned whether the bucket should proceed in its current form without additional clarity and revision.

Closing & Next Steps

- The committee agreed that Bucket 2 will require further discussion and refinement.

- Next meeting will continue discussion of Bucket 2 in a format similar to this session.
- Next Meeting: January 14

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: