

TO: Development Review Commission

From: Tamara DiVergilio

Subject: LU 12-0016 Application for up to 4 Portable Structures at River Grove Elementary

Date: June 29, 2012

RECEIVED  
JUN 29 2012  
City of Lake Oswego  
Community Development Dept.

The purpose of this letter is to state my opposition to the application noted above for portable construction at River Grove Elementary submitted by the Lake Oswego School District (LOSD). I very much appreciate the effort by both the LO school district and the Lake Oswego city staff to provide a comprehensive report for this application. The staff report contains analysis to support the application with conditions. I support many of the conditions of the staff report, as I believe it will make for safer conditions for children to walk to school and minimize the impact on surrounding neighborhoods, but the analysis does not bear out the need for 4 portable structures (8 classrooms) with the enrollment conditions correctly imposed in the staff recommendations. In addition, some assumptions of the traffic analysis ignore the reasons that the district has identified for needing additional capacity. Furthermore since the city council agreed last year (2011) to a one time gift of \$2MM to the LOSD which enhanced the LOSD operating reserves, I believe the city council has an interest in the use of the economic resources that it has provided to LOSD. Prudent use of resources should be of utmost concern as the resources are derived from the taxpayers of the city of Lake Oswego. District operating funds will pay for the installation and lease of these temporary portables. Lastly, the district confirmed in its land use application that other school structures in Lake Oswego's city limits (Palisades and Uplands) "may remain closed while portables are used" (Exhibit 2). This has an impact on the neighborhoods surrounding these closed schools, and an impact on the city's ability to attract families into those areas.

On page 3 and 5 of the staff report it lists that in 1990 4 additional classrooms were constructed at River Grove to bring the total school current capacity to 16 classrooms, however per the districts' own documents (see attachment 1), there are currently 17 classrooms available for use at River Grove. Therefore with an approval for 8 additional classrooms, there would a total of 25 not the 24 listed on the staff report (page 4,) versus the originally approved 20. In addition, the functional capacity (staff report page 5) is listed as 20 students per classroom necessitating the 24 rooms. However the target ratio classroom ratios of the district range from 25 (K, 1st, 2nd grades) to 28 (5<sup>th</sup> grade) students per class (see attachment 2). Therefore assuming an average of 26 students per class, for 25 classrooms, there is capacity of 650 (26 x 25) students if all 8 portables are installed.

I support the staff recommendation to limit enrollment to 460 students, as the traffic analysis was based on numbers closer to this, and the impact on the surrounding neighborhood is minimized, but I do not see why the application for 4 portable structures should then be approved. In order to offer a substantially similar program to what exists in the districts other elementary schools, River Grove does need a 2 dedicated class room spaces for their Learning Center/Title 1 room, and a dedicated Music room (the stage on the gym is not adequate) that will not house children full day as their home room classrooms do. In addition, small breakout spaces are available both in the existing pods and the main building. However as confirmed by Stuart Ketzler in his letter dated June 13<sup>th</sup>, 2012 (staff report exhibit 2), the district has confirmed they will be purchasing new technology for River Grove, in the form of 2 mobile computer labs) so that the space currently used for

EXHIBIT G-200  
LU 12-0016

computer labs can now be used as dedicated classroom space not lab space. Therefore by capping enrollment at 460 there are 18 classrooms ( $460/26 = 17.7$ ) needed to house students, plus 2 additional rooms for the learning center and music, for a total of 20 classrooms. Since there are 17 existing classroom spaces at River Grove, 3 additional are needed not the 8 additional classrooms that the application is for. Even with portables coming with 2 classrooms each, that means the district would only need the space afforded by 2 portable structures not 4.

The traffic analysis contained in staff exhibits 3 and 4 is quite detailed, however the River Grove analysis was based on a day where 272 students were present. With an enrollment cap of 460, that is an approx. 70% increase in students over the sample day. I agree with the staff report, that is it unlikely that 100% of the new students will come via private car or bus, but regardless of their mode of entry, there will be up to a 70% increase in foot and motor traffic. I find the traffic report conclusion that there will be "no appreciable impact to driveway operations" highly suspect when looked at from the perspective that enrollment could increase nearly 70% over the day measurement was taken. Especially in light of the comments of 2011-2012 River Grove Principal Nancy Verstegen at the LOSD neighborhood meeting held March 22, 2012, "Principal Verstegen stated it is not just the number of parking spaces, but it is the whole traffic flow, which is very awkward, but with current enrollment works." Nancy was at the school daily, not just one day for a traffic survey, and has a clear understanding of the daily effort to get kids into and out of the school safely on a daily basis. If one drove by the school at school start and stop times this past year, you would see numerous cars parked in grass areas along McEwan road, some in areas that will soon have a walking path and will no longer be available for temporary parking by parents. This will put further strain on the existing parking lot. The staff approval of the application was based on the number of parking spaces, but it is unclear that the parking lot can accommodate a 44+% increase in traffic flow, as it was barely functional with a 300 student enrollment. If the parking lot cannot accommodate the flow, then there will be long queues of cars of McEwan and possibly Pilkington roads creating unsafe driving and potentially walking conditions.

In addition, page 7 of the traffic analysis report states "No other background traffic growth in River Grove vicinity was assumed". Since the reason the LOSD is requesting portables is to accommodate not just students from closed Bryant Elementary, but also new student growth estimated from new housing developments along Pilkington, and Childs Roads. It is likely that these new housing units will also provide increased traffic in the River Grove vicinity.

The City's gift of \$2MM to the LOSD was unrestricted in its use, however the city council should still seek to encourage prudent use of the money. Yes the student population expected at River Grove does exceed the current capacity of the school, however the LOSD elected to close a much larger Uplands Elementary (26 classrooms) and keep Lake Grove serving North side of lake students (instead of adjusting boundaries to have it serve some students in the south west region of the city), and instead plans to spend funds on installing and leasing temporary portable structures which the district acknowledges are "not wholly desirable". For the short term the district has made it feasible to house River Grove's population for the next year by utilizing rooms at Bryant Elementary and through the use of mobile computer labs. The LOSD plans to have a population demographic and real estate studies done to assist with forecasting student growth by area and to determine what properties the district might sell. The need for portables, and if so where they should be located, is not truly known without the results of these studies. To approve their use without the study results is short sighted. The impact of these decisions is not just the students, but also the entire community. The city should be mindful of the impact of the school's decisions on the strength of the community.

**Scenario B**

	River Grove			Westridge			Hallinan			South-Side Totals		
	Ideal	Current Est (6)	Max (7)	Ideal	Current Est (6)	Max (7)	Ideal	Current Est (6)	Max (7)	Ideal	Current Est (6)	Max (7)
Total Available	17	17	17	22	22	22	22	22	22	61	61	61
Core Needs (Note 1):												
Projected K classrooms	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	5	5	5
Projected 1-5 classrooms (2)	12	15	15	15	16	16	14	14	14	45	45	45
Total K-5 classrooms-regular	13	16	16	17	18	18	16	16	16	50	50	50
Learning Center (3)	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
2 Computer Labs (4)	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	3	3	0
Science Lab (5)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
Access (need 2)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delta (need 2)	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2
ELS (need 2)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>Title 1A Room</u>	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Total Core Needs	15	18	17	20	20	19	20	20	20	55	58	55
Rooms Remaining	2	-1	0	2	2	3	2	2	2	6	3	6
Pre-K/Enrich/Extended Care	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	3
Music	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	3	3	0
Spanish K-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	-3	-1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0

Note 1 Core needs based on ideal use of classrooms and other spaces within each school such that all schools are able to offer the same level of elementary programs in spaces that are optimum, within the constraints of each building, for each program.

2 For ideal, the number of 1-5 classrooms has been adjusted to the the capacity of the specific building after all other noted uses have been met.

3 River Grove's Learning Center could be combined with its Title 1A program in a larger than normal classroom.

4 All elementary schools will have 2 computer labs, though most buildings have one computer lab in a space that is not otherwise suitable for a normal classroom.

5 A science lab is maintained for each side of the lake. This reduces the number of 1-5 classrooms at Hallinan as compared to Westridge, which are otherwise the same floorplan.

6 Current Estimate is based on 10 year avg growth, current approved Scenario B boundaries and placement of K-1 Spanish at LGE.

7 Maximum based on conversion of 1 lab to wireless (where feasible) and Music to a cart program.

## Lake Oswego School District Grade 1-5 Elementary Enrollment Projections For the 2012-13 School Year April 2012

North-Side FHE	Grade Level (in: FY 11/12, 12/13)	Minimum (Straight Roll-Up) # of Sections				Maximum (Using 10-Year Historical Growth Rates) # of Sections				Avg Class Size	
		Projected Enrollment	Target Ratio	Calculated	Rounded	Projected Enrollment	Target Ratio	Calculated	Rounded		
	K	67				77.7				23.6	
	1	77	144	25	5.8	80.9	158.6	25	6.3	5	
	2	80				82.8				24.0	
	3	74	154	27	5.7	76.2	159.0	27	5.9	5	
	4	75	75	28	2.7	77.3	77.3	28	2.8	3 A	
		373	373			394.8	394.8			15	
LGE	K	56				65.0				24.7	
	1	69	125	25	5.0	72.5	137.4	25	5.5	6	
	2	81				83.8				26.4	
	3	68	149	27	5.5	70.0	153.9	27	5.7	5	
	4	73	73	28	2.6	75.2	75.2	28	2.7	3 A	
		347	347			366.5	366.5			17	
OCE	K	64				74.2				24.8	
	1	88	152	25	6.1	92.4	166.6	25	6.7	4	
	2	79				81.8				24.8	
	3	87	166	27	6.1	89.6	171.4	27	6.3	4	
	4	101	101	28	3.6	104.0	104.0	28	3.7	3 A	
		419	419			442.0	442.0			15	
		North-Side Sub-Total Sections				North-Side Sub-Total Sections					
		District Grand Totals	District Growth Factors	District Grand Totals		District 10 Yr. Growth Factors		District Grand Totals		District Grand Totals	District Grand Totals
Actual 2011-12		389	0%	33	1/2	16.0%	913.24	1/2	37	40	30
Growth Factors		440	0%	35	3/4	5.0%	960.335	3/4	36	32	27
		487	0%	19	5th	3.0%	488.22	5th	19	17 A	27
		443	0%	87		3.0%	2361.795		92	89	84
		473		2229					25.7	25.7	25.6

Note - Kindergarten students have been returned to their resident school. Students on transfers in grades 1 through 4 have not been returned to their resident school unless they are transfers to Bryant or Uplands.

=Class Ratio that with growth would require an additional section.

=Class Ratio that approaches but does not exceed additional section triggerpoint (>2 over target ratio).

A - Contemplated no 6th graders. 10/3/11 data still has 6th graders.

B - Excludes 26 sections in grades 1-6 at Bryant and Uplands.