City Council Meeting May 1, 2013

Heather Leek

Beverly Cleary School - PTA President School Address – 1915 NE 33rd Ave, PDX 97212 Home address - 2414 NE 36th Ave, PDX 97212 (503) 317-3166 Cell theleeks@yahoo.com

- 1) Beverly Cleary School (BCS) Stats 731 Students, 1400 Parents
- 2) There has been tremendous growth within the BCS boundary.
 - 2000 Children 0-9 = 1034
 - 2010 Children 0-9 = 1288
 - A 25% increase
- 3) 9 multi-dwelling units have been built or are in the process of being built over the past 7 years within the BCS boundary.
- 4) BCS has a high "capture rate" and our numbers have greatly increased
 - 2005-6 school year there were 450 students at BCS
 - 2012-13 school year there are 731 students at BCS
 A 63% increase
 - 2013-14 school year we could see as many as 800 students at BCS
- 5) Our schools have used all "flex" space and we need additional funding. We can't grow the community with out growing the infrastructure. We are losing key learning centers.
- 6) How will we educate tomorrow's taxpayers?
- 7) When will tax breaks for the builders and developers stop?
- 8) Our parents and community members will contact your offices for assistance or you can contact me directly with ideas and answers (see above info.)

2000 and 2010 Census Profile by PPS Elementary Attendance Area Beverly Cleary

DPULATION 2000 2010		10	Change			
SEX AND AGE			L		U	
Total population	10,073	100.0%	10,647	100.0%	574	5.7%
Under 5 years	516	5.1%	648	6.1%	132	25.6%
5 to 9 years	519	5.2%	640	6.0%	121	23.3%
10 to 14 years	521	5.2%	525	4.9%	4	0.8%
15 to 19 years	486	4.8%	453	4.3%	-33	-6.8%
20 to 24 years	512	5.1%	469	4.4%	-43	-8.4%
25 to 29 years	857	8.5%	895	8.4%	38	4.4%
30 to 34 years	954	9.5%	830	7.8%	-124	-13.0%
35 to 39 years	960	9.5%	941	8.8%	-19	-2.0%
40 to 44 years	925	9.2%	966	9.1%	41	4.4%
45 to 49 years	1,049	10.4%	892	8.4%	-157	-15.0%
50 to 54 years	911	9.0%	824	7.7%	-87	-9.5%
55 to 59 years	486	4.8%	911	8.6%	425	87.4%
60 to 64 years	313	3.1%	726	6.8%	413	131.9%
65 to 69 years	234	2.3%	356	3.3%	122	52.1%
70 to 74 years	248	2.5%	190	1.8%	-58	-23.4%
75 to 79 years	234	2.3%	144	1.4%	-90	-38.5%
* 80 to 84 years	190	1.9%	116	1.1%	-74	-38.9%
85 years and over	158	1.6%	121	1.1%	-74	-23.4%
Median age (years)	38.		39.6		-57	
Under 18 years	1,859	18.5%	2,128	20.0%	269	14.5%
18 to 64 years	7,150	71.0%	7,592	71.3%	442	6.2%
65 years and over	1,064	10.6%	927	8.7%	-137	-12.9%
		101070	521	0.770	-157	-12.9%
Male population	4,882	100.0%	5,219	100.0%	337	6.9%
Under 5 years	260	5.3%	336	6.4%	76	29.2%
5 to 9 years	266	5.4%	326	6.2%	60	22.6%
10 to 14 years	294	6.0%	242	4.6%	-52	-17.7%
15 to 19 years	253	5.2%	228	4.4%	-25	-9.9%
20 to 24 years	249	5.1%	216	4.1%	-33	-13.3%
25 to 29 years	409	8.4%	442	8.5%	33	8.1%
30 to 34 years	490	10.0%	413	7.9%	-77	-15.7%
35 to 39 years	496	10.2%	474	9.1%	-22	-4.4%
40 to 44 years	430	8.8%	498	9.5%	68	15.8%
45 to 49 years	515	10.5%	432	8.3%	-83	-16.1%
50 to 54 years	447	9.2%	399	7.6%	-48	-10.1%
55 to 59 years	234	4.8%	452	8.7%	218	93.2%
60 to 64 years	150	3.1%	363	7.0%	218	95.2%
65 to 69 years	103	2.1%	164	3.1%	61	59.2%
70 to 74 years	104	2.1%	88	1.7%	-16	-15.4%
75 to 79 years	78	1.6%	66	1.3%	-10	
80 to 84 years	57	1.2%	45	0.9%	-12	-15.4%
85 years and over	47	1.0%	35	0.7%	-12	-21.1% -25.5%

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census, Summary File 1; 2000 Census, Summary File 1. Tabulated by Population Research Center, Portland State University.

www.pdx.edu/prc

.



	Census 2000-202	10 for BCS Bou	ndary	
Population	2000	2010 Cha	nge Pe	rcent
Total Pop	10073	10647	574	5.7%
Under 5	516	648	132	25.6%
5 to 9	519	640	121	23.3%
10 to 14	521	525	4	0.8%

×. . . .

							Projection
	2007-8 20	08-9 20	09-10 20	10-11 20	11-12 20	12-13	2013-14
Total Neighborhood	872	819	782	818	853	908	963
Own N'hood School	474	464	463	516	579	642	705
Capture Rate	54.4%	56.7%	59.2%	63.1%	67.9%	70.7%	73.2%
Total Enrollment	578	557	552	604	674	731	805

Beverly Cleary (K-8)

School Enrollment Facts



Senectanolmentestation

This chart shows the number of students who attended a school over the past five years and whether they lived in or out of the school's neighborhood. Grade level details are on the next page.

104	93 464	89 463	88 316	95 -579	89
					and a special second

Projections updated annually by PSU Population Research Center. Projections from each prior year shown for 2007-2011.

	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	-
Non-Residents	104	93	89	88	95	89					
Residents	474	464	463	516	579	642					1.15
Total Enrollment	578	557	552	604	674	731					1
Percent Resident	82%	83%	84%	85%	86%	88%					
Percent Non-Resident	18%	17%	16%	15%	14%	12%					
Projection	0	536	537	568	622	705	732	745	757	767	

Neighborning Students and the Schools They Aliend

The number of public school students who lived in a school's neighborhood over the past five years, and the type of school they attended are shown here. More attendance details	25 160 213	29 121 . 205	28 107 -184	22 107 473	25 109 140	26 110	with a grant of the field of the	المراجع (مراجع	Naturke Elmoste vis valdgedet för	an Disk connert
are on page 3.	474	464	463	516	579	642				
	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
And a second	K-8	K-8	K-8	K-8	K-8	K-8				
Other	25	29	28	22	25	26	and the second second second second	************************************	and the second	
Special Program/Focus	160	121	107	107	109	110			a contactor for the contactor	
Cther Neighborhood School	213	205	184	173	140	130				and a state of a second second second
Own Neighborhood School	474	464	463	516	579	642				
Total Neighborhood	872	819	782	818	853	908			1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1	
Projection	718	742	756	802	830	883	904	913	908	913

PLOOP CEDERN'S UNIZATIONS

As of September 2012, there are 30.4 teachers at Beverly Cleary, which has 33 potential classrooms larger than 450 square feet. Average classroom square footage is 920, not including gymnasiums.

Utilization, which is the number of teachers divided by the number of classrooms, is 92%. This calculation does not include other programs and instructional needs, such as counselors, instructional specialists and school psychologists. Special education teachers are counted and ESL teachers are weighted at .5.

Beverly Cleary

- dente

ninte.

1110 ind lou 10 m in in 100 TIC Ŋ

9 3

4. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Achievement - % Meeting or Exceeding Benchmarks

	3rd C	Grade	5th C	Frade	8th Grade		
Year	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	
2009-2010	84.8%	86.4%	>95%	93.8%	87.2%	92.3%	
2010-2011	>95%	90.9%	>95%	79.7%	>95%	93.6%	
2011-2012	93.4%	84.2%	83.8%	82.4%	88.9%	83.3%	

For detailed achievement information go to: http://www.pps.kl2.or.us/depts-c/rne/results/ In 2010-11 the percent meeting or exceeding in Math declined at many schools because of a higher threshold for "Meeting" In 2011-12 the percent meeting or exceeding in Reading declined at many schools because of a higher threshold for "Meeting"

Update

5. SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT

2011-2012	School	Comparable District Average
Highly Qualified Teaching Assignments	100.0%	99.4%
Teacher Experience (Average in years)	15.1	13.0
Substitute Usage (Average in days)	24.7	15.5
Average Daily Attendance	96.0%	94.3%
Average Class Size	28.4	23.8
Stability Index	98.2%	92.5%
Student Expulsions	0.0%	0.1%
Student Suspensions	2.2%	6.1%

October 2012 Enrollment	Number of Classrooms	Density Index
730	33	22

6. ENROLLMENT INDICATORS

Student 1. Poly and the second s	
Student loss >5% since 2011 AND >15% since	ce 2008?
Neighborhood students attend it	No No
Neighborhood students attending Beverly Cl	eary below 55%?
Building density index below 15 or above 20?	LAO .
g and much below 15 of above 20?	Ves

7. COMMENTS/ISSUES

Beverly Cleary has an overall ESEA rating of Level 5 as of October 2012.

Beverly Cleary has two sites. K-1 is on the Hollyrood campus, and 2-8 is on the Fernwood campus.

Smart-Growty Plans Are a Failure in Portland - By Randal O'Toole This article appeared in the Houston Chronicle on November 14, 2009.

Some people have suggested that Houston could have avoided the Ashby high-rise controversy if it had more planning and smart growth. In fact, the opposite is true: Smart-growth planning makes land-use debates even more contentious.

Smart-growth planners believe that Americans live the wrong way, and they use land-use regulation to impose on others what they believe is the right way to live. Surveys consistently show that all but 15 percent to 25 percent of Americans want to live in single-family homes with a yard, but planners think we would be better off if a much higher percentage lived in high-density apartments or condos.

Consider my former hometown of Portland, Ore., which many consider the nation's leader in smart-growth planning. To increase urban densities, planners are turning dozens of neighborhoods of single-family homes into apartments and condos. While past land-use rules set maximum densities, Portland's rules set minimum densities.

This means if your neighbors own a vacant lot, they cannot build a single-family house on it; they must build a rowhouse or apartment. In some cases, regulation is so strict that, if your house burns down, you cannot rebuild it; you must replace it with an apartment.

Portland planners soon decided that rowhouses and low-rise apartments were not dense enough, so they increased height limits to 50 feet or 60 feet to allow four- and five-story mid-rise apartments. Even that isn't dense enough, so now they are beginning to encourage high-rises.

After the first high-density developments saturated the demand, planners supplemented land-use mandates with tax breaks, below-market land sales and other subsidies to developers who built high-density housing. This means Portland neighborhoods continue to be invaded by mid-rise and high-rise developments, even though there is no more demand for dense housing.

Many of these developments are in transit corridors. Yet independent studies reveal that the people living in them don't ride transit significantly more than residents of single-family neighborhoods.

Portlanders did not welcome densification. Almost all of the targeted neighborhoods fought it; almost all of them lost. Planners followed a divide-and-conquer strategy, taking one neighborhood at a time so opponents could not build up enough momentum to stop the process.

Increased densities destroyed the small-town atmosphere that once made Portland attractive. Congestion is worse, housing and consumer costs are high, and urban services such as fire, police and schools have declined as the city took money from these programs to subsidize high-density developers.

Despite these problems, scores of cities from Missoula, Mont., to San Diego, Calif., have passed similar smartgrowth regulations. Planners want to use smart growth everywhere they can, including Houston.

To get out of Portland, I moved to an exurban neighborhood 150 miles away. Like many Houston neighborhoods, we have a homeowners association and deed restrictions, so we will never have to worry about outside planners imposing some unwanted development on us.

Unlike most other cities, Houston makes it easy to create homeowners associations in neighborhoods that do not have them. Houston's system of deed restrictions puts you and your neighbors in charge of your neighborhood's future.

By contrast, smart-growth planning puts your neighborhood's future in the hands of people who may know little about you or your neighbors and whose ideas about how you should live may be very different from yours. If you want to protect your neighborhood from high-rises and other unwanted developments, then smart-growth planning is the last thing you need.

Moore-Love, Karla

From: Sent: To: Subject: Heather Leek [theleeks@yahoo.com] Thursday, April 25, 2013 9:50 AM Moore-Love, Karla City Council Mtg 5/1 @ 2

Karla,

I am going to take Joy Stoelting's 3 minute talking spot at the City Council Mtg May 1st at 2 pm. I am Heather Leek and live at 2414 NE 36th Ave, PDX 97212. My phone numbers are (503 317-3166 Cell / (503) 460-9191 Home. Cell is definitely the way to reach me. And I would like to address the council about the Increased density in Portland and infrastructure support.

Thank you Karla. If you need any further information please advise.

Heather Leek

Request of Heather Leek to address Council regarding increased density in Portland and infrastructure support (Communication)

MAY 01 2013

PLACED ON FILE

Filed

APR 26 2013

LaVonne Griffin-Valade Auditor of the City of Portland By

COMMISSIONERS VOTED AS FOLLOWS:							
	YEAS	NAYS					
1. Fritz							
2. Fish							
3. Saltzman							
4. Novick							
Hales							