

**SAN DIEGO COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION  
SAN DIEGO COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION**

Minutes of the Special Meeting May 7, 2014 – 6:00 p.m.  
East County Regional Education Center – Board Room  
924 East Main Street  
El Cajon, CA 92021

**I. OPENING PROVISIONS**

- A. Call to Order and Roll Call – 6:00 P.M.

Members Present: Anderson, Hartley, Jones, Neylon, Robinson  
Secretary: Ward  
Recording Secretary: Bowers

- B. Pledge Of Allegiance To The Flag

- C. Approval of Agenda

MSC (Anderson/Robinson) to approve the agenda. The motion passed by unanimous vote (5-0).

- D. Review of Guidelines for Public Hearing

President Hartley welcomed the audience and reviewed the order of speakers and guidelines to be followed during the Public Hearing.

- E. Public Comment on Agenda Items

Public speaker cards and comment cards were collected at this time and throughout the meeting.

**II. CONVENE THE MEETING OF THE COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION**

- A. OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING on the Petition for the Unification of the Alpine Union School District and that Portion of the Grossmont Union High School District

Chairwoman Hartley opened the public hearing. This is the second of two scheduled public hearings on the proposed unification. The first public hearing was held in Alpine on April 29, 2014. San Diego County Office of Education's Assistant Superintendent of Business Services, Lora Duzyk, provided opening remarks and recapped the history of actions taken since October 23, 2013 when the petition was submitted to the County Superintendent of Schools to reorganize territory within the Grossmont Union High School District to create the Alpine Unified School District. Ms. Duzyk then reiterated the unification process and the authority of the County Committee to make a recommendation to the State Board of Education after making determinations required by Education Code section 35707, as to: (1) Whether the unification would adversely affect the school district organization of the county; and (2) Whether the unification substantially meets nine criteria that are specified in Education Code section 35753. The nine criteria are:

1. The reorganized districts will be adequate in terms of number of pupils enrolled.
2. The districts are each organized on the basis of a substantial community identity.
3. The proposal will result in an equitable division of property and facilities of the original district.

4. The reorganization of the districts will preserve each affected district's ability to educate students in an integrated environment and will not promote racial or ethnic discrimination or segregation.
5. Any increase in costs to the state as a result of the proposed reorganization will be insignificant and otherwise incidental to the reorganization.
6. The proposed reorganization will continue to promote sound education performance and will not significantly disrupt the educational programs in the districts affected by the proposed reorganization.
7. Any increase in school facilities costs as a result of the proposed reorganization will be insignificant and otherwise incidental to the reorganization.
8. The proposed reorganization is primarily designed for purposes other than to significantly increase property values.
9. The proposed reorganization will continue to promote sound fiscal management and not cause a substantial negative effect on the fiscal status of the proposed district or any existing district affected by the proposed reorganization.

The County Committee must make determinations as to whether each of the nine criteria is substantially met. An independent contractor will conduct an in-depth study, on behalf of the County Committee, to evaluate the proposal on the basis of each of the nine criteria. School Services of California has been selected to conduct this study. It is expected that the County Committee will make its determination at the regular board of education meeting to be held on August 13, 2014.

2. Spokespersons for the Chief Petitioners

Spokespersons in support of the petition included Sal Casamassima (President of the Alpine High School Citizens Committee); Chris Loarie (Alpine resident and business owner); and Al Haven (Chief Petitioner)

3. Spokespersons for the Alpine Union School District

Spokespersons in support of the petition included Eric Wray, Alpine Union School District (AUSD) Board President; Tom Pellegrino, AUSD Superintendent; Mark Price, former trustee and community member; Travis Lyon, Alpine Community Planning Group; and Bruce Cochrane, AUSD Director of Human Resources and Pupil Services.

4. Spokespersons for the Grossmont Union High School District

Spokespersons opposing the petition included Dick Hoy, Grossmont Union High School District (GUHSD) Board Vice President; Scott Patterson, GUHSD Deputy Superintendent, Business Services; Rob Shield, GUHSD Board President; and Mary Collins, Esq., GUHSD Bond Counsel, Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP.

5. Spokesperson(s) for Any Other Affected School District

None.

6. Public Comment – Individual Speakers Called from Cards

Twenty-one public speakers including teachers, parents, grandparents, GUHSD and AUSD residents, and members of the Viejas Tribal Council, Sycuan Tribal Government, Alpine High School Citizens Committee, Alpine Parents Coalition, Alpine Education Foundation, and Alpine Chamber of Commerce spoke in support of the petition. Speakers included: The Honorable Dianne Jacobs, Supervisor, County of San Diego; The Honorable Cita Welch; Robert Scheid, Chuck Taylor, Adam Day, Bill Weaver, The Honorable Priscilla Schreiber; Beverly Keller, George Barnett, Lin Moody, Collin Campbell, Nick Marinovich, Chris Newcomb, Sharon Haven, Jim Lunquist, Michael Waterman, Robert Ring, Diana Tompkins, Jenna Weinert, Bill Baber, and Ryan T. Holmes. GUHSD Board President Robert Shield spoke in opposition of the unification. Additionally, cards with written comments (all supporting) to be considered were received from John Hank, Brian Lane, Albert Haven, Alex Yankopoulos, and Bill Weaver.

7. Questions from County Committee Members

Members of the Committee inquired regarding a) when we would have the report from School Services of California, the independent contractor hired to evaluate the proposal on the basis of each of the nine criteria (mid-July); b) if there was any way to expedite the State's process; c) if voting boundaries could be requested; d) diversity issues.

8. Close the Public Hearing

There being no further comment, Chairwoman Hartley closed the public hearing.

III. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.