Santa Clara County
Committee on School District Organization
Public Hearing
January 23, 2013
5:30 p.m.
Proposed Transfer of Territory from
Oak Grove School District and East Side Union High School District
to
San Jose Unified School District

Location: San Jose Unified School District
855 Lenzen Ave., San Jose

Committee Members Present: Nejleh Abed
Albert Beltran, Jr.
Frank Biehl
Javier Gonzalez
Mandy Lowell
Josephine Lucey
Eleanor Yick
Michele van Zuiden

County Office Staff Present: Suzanne Carrig

Prior to hearing public comments, staff member Suzanne Carrig reviewed the public hearing process and the description of the transfer proposal.

Kuljeet Rai, Chief Petitioner:
Mr. Rai made the following statements:

- Mr. Rai introduced himself and three other homeowners from the transfer area; they represent four of the 6 homeowners in the territory.
- Moved from India to the U.S. in 1969 and grew up in the Blossom Hill area of San Jose.
- In 1987 Mr. Rai and his brother purchased a home off of Graystone Lane; nieces and nephew attended SJUSD schools, for this reason he always believed homes on Graystone Lane were within SJUSD.
- Prior to living on Graystone, Rai family lived in Morgan Hill (1997-2011) and their two daughters attended school in SJUSD on interdistrict transfer agreements.
- Rai Family built a home on Graystone Lane and paid construction fees to SJUSD and daughters attended school in SJUSD.
• On July 18, 2012 he received a letter from Jill Case, Administrator of Student Assignment in SJUSD, stating that the property was actually within OG/ESUHSD boundaries. However, the girls would be able to attend SJUSD schools through high school.

• Currently, the only affected students in the area proposed for transfer are Mr. Rai’s two daughters.

• Neighbors always believed their homes were within SJUSD. In 2003 one neighbor paid construction fees to SJUSD.

• In 2000, the Gustavson Family, who has property adjacent to theirs, transferred their home from OG/ESUHSD to SJUSD.

• Homes on Graystone Lane have an official Graystone Lane address and Graystone Lane is the only access point in and out of the area.

• If kids attended school in OG/ESUHSD they would have to drive through SJUSD and pass their current schools to get there.

• Do not want a one-time exception through interdistrict transfers, future families would be in the same predicament.

Member Nejleh Abed:
Asked where the homes were located in the transfer area. (see attached map.)

There was a discussion regarding home location, access routes, and undeveloped hillside. Mr. Rai stated that much of the surrounding area in non-buildable due to the slope of the hills.

Member Mandy Lowell:
Member Lowell asked the following questions:

• Where the parcels from the 2000 transfer were located.

• Would like to know what the zoning is in the area; how many potential parcels in the area are buildable?

• Is there a back road?

• Why the petitioner chose these parcels for the transfer.

• Are there other potential homeowners who see themselves as part of this community and may want to transfer in the future?

• Did the Gustavons ask anyone on Graystone to be part of their transfer?

Mr. Rai:
Stated that there is only one access point in and out of the transfer area. He mentioned that there is a legally abandoned driveway that is narrow and used for emergency vehicles.

Mr. Rai also stated that all home on Graystone Lane have been included in the transfer request and that the Gustavons live on another road – Scenic Vista – and their property cannot be accessed from the transfer area.
Ms. Arleen Runels, Resident:
Ms. Runels stated that she is a homeowner in the area and owns three separate parcels, however there is only a home on one of the parcels as the other two are unbuildable.

Dale Nakashima, another homeowner, stated that she owns 150 acres but is unable to build another home on the other parcels.

Committee Chair, Frank Biehl:
Mr. Biehl clarified with the chief petitioner that the only access in and out of the transfer area was through Almaden Valley within SJUSD, that the petitioner always believed he was within SJUSD, and that the request is to correct this.

Member Abed:
Asked if the territory was in the unincorporated area of the county.

Mr. Rai stated that the homes are in the unincorporated area and under the sphere of influence of San Jose.

Member Lowell:
Asked what district the residents vote in.

Staff stated that the Registrar of Voters shows the properties voting within San Jose Unified.

Member Lowell asked staff to contact SJUSD staff to find out if there are other similar issues in the district.

Member Javier Gonzalez:
Stated that as the committee and staff are looking at boundaries, take a close look at the area on the other side of the hill and determine the ingress/egress and make sure they’re not part of this.

Member Lowell asked that staff make a note of the previous transfer of Scenic Vista noting the different entrance ways.

Member Abed asked that staff find out what types of properties are on the other side of the transfer area and to notice that the residents in the transfer area pay their property taxes to OG/ESUHSD but vote in the SJUSD.
Arleen Runel, Resident:
Clarified the property locations and the road ways into and out of the properties. Ms. Runel also described the surrounding roads and access points and lack thereof into and out of the property proposed for transfer.

Statements from the Affected Districts

There were no statement made from the affected districts.

Annie Jonasson, resident:
Ms. Jonasson stated that her late father owned the property for over 30 years and she now owned the property. She has a total of three parcels – two on Graystone Lane and one with an address on Colleen Drive – two of the parcels are unbuildable.

Dale Nakashima, resident:
Stated that the elevation of her property was about 278 feet (corrected by Mr. Kai, 500-900 feet) and that the grade of the property is steep. She stated that much of the property is on a slope and not buildable. The creek is a natural boundary between the home and the OG/ESUHSD. She concluded that there is only one house on the property, she would be able to build an in-law size unit but the property is only zoned for one residential home.

The public hearing ended at 6:20 p.m.