

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE

FOR THE

REORGANIZATION OF SCHOOL
DIST. 1939-1962

1939/1940 1959-1962

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE
For the
REORGANIZATION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Name	Address	Phone No.
Ray Swanson (Chairman)	Res. Address - Noti Bus. Address - Noti	Res. Ph. WE 5-2677 Bus. Ph. WE 5-2231
Edgar Rickard (Vice-Chairman)	Res. Address - 235 W. 12th, Cottage Grove. Bus. Address -	Res. Ph. WH 2-8150 Bus. Ph. DI 3-6131
William L. Wilt	Res. Address - Marcola Bus. Address - Weyerhaeuser Timber Co., Springfield	Res. Ph. WE 3-2355 Bus. Ph. RI 6-2511
John J. Swift	Res. Address - Creswell, Rt. 2, Box 410	Res. Ph. RI 7-2664
John M. Brewer	Res. Address - Swisshome, P. O. Box 55 Bus. Address - RESIGNED	Res. Ph. Mapleton 3-4529 Bus. Ph. Mapleton 3-4332
F. Earl Garoutte	Res. Address - 397 Cal Young Rd., Eugene RESIGNED - May 19, 1959	Res. Ph. DI 3-6482
Marvin Hendrickson	Res. Address - 330 Bethel Dr., Eugene	Res. and Bus. Ph. DI 5-4889
Edward Efteland	Res. Address - 1442 Barton, Eugene	Res. Ph. DI 3-9710
Paul Ehinger	Res. Address - Westfir Bus. Address - Hines Lumber Co., Westfir	Res. Ph. Oakridge 2-2501 Bus. Ph. Oakridge
Clarence Jackson <i>Dove Burrill</i>	Res. Address - Creswell APPOINTED - May 19, 1959	Res. Ph. Twilight 5-2801
Winifred Hult <i>Gordon Hale</i>	Res. Address - Horton APPOINTED - June 16, 1959	Res Ph. Walnut 5-3196

Joint Meeting
Lane and Linn County Boards of Education and
Local Boards of: Coburg, Wyatt, Harris,
Harrisburg Elementary and Harrisburg
Union High School Districts

Monday, December 17, 1962 - Harrisburg Union High School

Minutes
in brief

1. Attendance

1. Joint meeting of the Lane and Linn County Rural School Boards, and the Coburg, Wyatt, Harris, Harrisburg Elementary and Harrisburg Union High School District Boards, was held in the Harrisburg Union High School with the following Lane County Board Members present: Laura Johnson, Ray Swanson, Dorothy Leeper and Vera Hansen; Also present from Lane County were Dale Parnell and Aubrey Trimble.

Dr. David Reid, Chairman of the Linn County Board served as chairman of the meeting.

2. Discussion
of Coburg-
Harrisburg
Reorgani-
zation

2. Each board member was given an opportunity to express the sentiment of his board and his own personal sentiments. Most of the board members expressed their personal opinions on the matter of reorganization.

There was general agreement that reorganization would be beneficial to all of the school districts involved; that a vote should be taken; that a seven or nine member board should represent zoned areas of the new district; and that a new high school would probably need to be constructed. There was no general agreement concerning which rural board the new district, if formed, should report to, nor the general location in which new high school, if built, should be located.

The group decided to take a secret ballot on the question, "Would you favor a reorganization plan if it was understood that a new high school would be built halfway between Harrisburg and Coburg?" The result of the ballot was 13 "NO" and 8 "YES" votes.

Coburg Board
Asked that
Plan be
Dropped

Mr. Stanley Jensen, Chairman of the Coburg Board, held a short caucus with the other members of the Coburg Board and then moved that the Lane County Rural Board consider dropping further discussion of a Coburg-Harrisburg Reorganization plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lake and passed by the Coburg board.

3. Meeting
Adjourned

3. The chairman stated that in view of this development he felt there was little need for further discussion and declared the meeting adjourned.

Laura Johnson, Vice-Chairman

Dale Parnell, Secretary

LANE COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
Rural School District
Monday, December 10, 1962

Minutes
in brief

1. Attendance
1. The regular meeting of the Lane County Board of Education for the Rural School District was held in Harris Hall, Courthouse, Eugene, with the following members present: Chairman Joe Richards, Laura Johnson, Vera Hansen, Milton Turay, Dorothy Leeper, Marvin Hendrickson, Ray Swanson, and Secretary Parnell. Also present were Register Guard reporter Sam Frear, and Aubrey Trimble, County School Office. In the absence of Joe Richards at the first part of the meeting Vice-Chairman Johnson presided as Chairman.
2. Minutes Approved
2. Director Hendrickson moved that the minutes of November 8th and November 27th be approved as mailed. The motion was seconded by Director Hansen and carried.
3. Reports
3. Board Members commented generally on the State School Boards' Convention. It was the consensus of opinion that this was the best convention yet.

Secretary Parnell presented a letter from the Lane County Historical Society telling of their project to preserve and repair the 100 year-old Lane County Clerk's building that was the seat of Lane County government for some years.

Secretary Parnell presented a letter from the principal of the Monroe Union High School asking what the Board would charge Monroe to use the Lane County Instructional Materials Center.

Secretary Parnell reported on the article appearing in "Trends", a publication of the N.E.A., relative to the brochure "Vital Link" on the services provided by the Lane County Board of Education.

Secretary Parnell presented a weekly cumulative report on the use of the IMC.
4. Financial Report
4. Financial report of the Board operation for the month of November was presented and discussed. Secretary Parnell reported that the County Treasurer had been requested to invest \$25,000 of cash on hand for interest purposes for a period of four (4) months. Secretary Parnell also reported that budget items Nos. 122, 221, 222, 852.1, 855, 1277 and 1278 series, had been closed to charges unless emergency items and then on the approval of the secretary and Board.
5. Bills Approved
5. The bills for the month were presented and discussed. Director Turay moved that the bills as presented be approved for payment. The motion was seconded by Director Leeper and carried.
6. Marcola-Springfield Reorganization Election Lost
6. The votes were canvassed from the Springfield-Marcola Reorganization election held on December 3, 1962, and the results were found to be as follows:

6. Contd.

6. Contd. Canvass of votes:

	<u>For Reorganization</u>
School District No. 19 -----	YES 125 - NO 100
School District No. 79 -----	YES 64 - NO 269

Director Turay moved that the canvass of the votes be accepted and the election be declared lost. The motion was seconded by Director Hendrickson and carried.

7. Coburg-Harrisburg Reorganization

7. The Board agreed to meet with the local boards of the districts comprising the Harrisburg Union High School and Coburg, and the Linn County Rural School Board on Wednesday, December 19th, at the Harrisburg Union High School. (Subsequently changed to Monday, December 17th at 7:30 PM).

8. Civil Defense

8. Secretary Parnell reported that Colonel Koepke, Director of Civil Defense, had agreed to put the County Superintendent's office on high priority for notification of any type of emergency. Each local district administration office will then be notified in turn.

9. Audit and Filing Fees Paid

9. Secretary Parnell presented a statement from Lemon, Rowan, Iskra and Babcock, Certified Public Accountants, listing the amount due for the Boundary Board audit charges of second-class districts in the amount of \$4,319.00. Also, presented a statement from the Secretary of State listing the financial report filing fee charge for second-class districts in the amount of \$80.00. This involves School Districts Nos. 32, 43, 66, 71, 79, 90 and 117.

Director Hendrickson moved that the audit charges and filing fee be paid and the amounts charged against specific district be deducted from their December apportionment of the County School Fund. The motion was seconded by Director Hansen and carried.

Secretary Parnell presented a billing from the Secretary of State in the amount of \$20.00 due for the financial report filing fee of the Rural School District.

Director Hendrickson moved that the filing fee be paid. The motion was seconded by Director Hansen and carried.

10. Proposed Legislation

10. The Board agreed to ask Tom Rigby of the School Boards' Association, to pursue legislation which would authorize the County Treasurer to handle early apportionment of funds as discussed earlier. It was reported by the Superintendent that a meeting had been held with the auditors, treasurer and district attorney on this subject. It was the district attorney's opinion that the treasurer does not now have legal authority to make such apportionments.

11. Tax Analysis

11. An analysis of the 1962-63 Rural School District tax was presented and discussed. The true cash value per pupil in each of the eighteen districts of Lane County has been changing rapidly in recent years. There was a 1 to 33 ratio in 1957 and today this has dropped to a 1 to 4 ratio.

12. Recommendations for 1963-64 Budget

12. The Directors discussed the 1963-64 Rural District budget with an eye toward making some Board recommendations for budget committee consideration. Aubrey Trimble, Administrative Intern, presented information on the possible uses of data processing by local school

12. Contd.

districts, also the County office operation. Some of the uses indicated were: payrolls, accounting, inventory, census, student scheduling, report cards, attendance and attendance reports, class lists, financial reports, teacher information and personnel records plus other side benefits.

After considerable discussion Director Richards moved (Director Turay was acting as temporary chairman) that the Board adopt the following budget recommendations and that the Superintendent be instructed to prepare preliminary budget information on this basis. The motion was seconded by Director Hansen and carried.

Recommendation "A"

Consider maintaining the regular office budget (general fund items 100 through 1400) to operate for 1963-64 at the present millage level. Consider redefining one professional position plus other minor adjustments, up and down, within the present financial framework.

Recommendation "B"

Consider the examination of four new services with local districts and this Board. These would operate on a contractual basis with the local districts. (These to be particularly defined and discussed at the January 3rd Budget Committee-Superintendents meeting.)

- a. Data Processing
- b. Printing
- c. Teacher Materials Production
- d. Electronic Maintenance and Repair

Recommendation "C"

Consider setting up a separate budget for a "Service Bureau" operation which would be a revolving or clearing account to finance the above contractual services plus the joint purchasing program. It may take a modest amount of money to stake a Service Bureau for the first year of its operation.

Recommendation "D"

Explore with the County Commissioners the following two items:

- a. Joint Service Bureau operation with the County
- b. Housing and facilities situation for 1963-64.

13. Lane Co.
Historical
Society

13. Director Hansen moved that a letter be sent to the Lane County Historical Society commending them for their move to preserve and restore the old Clerk's building; that this idea plus the present Pioneer Historical Museum is of definite educational value to our region. The motion was seconded by Director Hendrickson and carried.

14. IMC Ser-
vices for
Monroe

14. Director Turay moved that Instructional Material Services be extended for the 1963-64 school year to the Monroe Union High and Grade School Districts at the rate of \$3.00 per A.D.M. child and to be contracted only if both districts participate. The motion was seconded by Director Leeper and carried.

15. Meetings

15. Secretary Parnell called attention to the following meetings:

a. January 3, 1963 - 6:30 P.M. at Ford's Dinner House - dinner meeting of Superintendents and Budget Committee.

b. December 17, 1962 - 7:30 P.M. at Harrisburg Union High School comprising boards of the districts making up the Harrisburg Union High School District, the Coburg board, the Linn and Lane County Boards.

c. January 14, 1963 - 1:30 P.M. - next regular Board meeting in Harris Hall.

16. Adjourn

15. Meeting adjourned.

Joe Richards, Chairman

Dale Parnell, Secretary

COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
(Joint Meeting of Linn and Lane County Boards)
Rural School District
Tuesday, November 27, 1962

Minutes
in brief

1. Attendance
1. A joint meeting of the Linn and Lane County Boards of Education for Linn and Lane County Rural School Districts was held at the Country Squire Restaurant near Coburg, with the following members present: Linn County: Vice-Chairman Ed Poland, Wm. C. Grenz, Thomas Elder, Don Penfold, Wade Isom, and Secretary William H. Dolmyer. Lane County: Chairman Joe Richards, Laura Johnson, Ray Swanson, Vera Hansen, Milton Turay, Marvin Hendrickson, Dorothy Leeper, and Secretary Dale Parnell. Margaret Blanton, Administrative Assistant from Lane County was also present.
2. Purpose of Meeting
2. Meeting was called to discuss a possible plan to form an administrative school district comprising territory making up the Harrisburg Union High School District and the Coburg School District, lying in Linn and Lane Counties.
3. Discussion
3. Secretary Parnell, Lane County, presented the second draft of a possible joint statement which had been prepared in the Lane County Office, including recommendations made by the boards of the districts involved.

Chairman Richards, Lane County, asked first of all if the two boards had some duty to submit a plan or if they have some reservations about plan if it was adopted?

Secretary Parnell, Lane County, pointed out that the Coburg and Eugene districts had voted twice on a plan, comprising the two districts, which was defeated both times, and both times the question of the Coburg-Harrisburg area being made an administrative district had been brought up. The Lane County Board feels Coburg should be included with Eugene but many people at both of the elections indicated they wish a Coburg-Harrisburg district. From an educational standpoint, such a district wouldn't be too bad. The Coburg Board have asked that the people be allowed to vote on such a plan as they do not wish to build a new high school in Coburg and are looking for an alternative.

Director Swanson, Lane County, called attention to ORS 330.610. He pointed out that this plan is being explored at the recommendation of the Coburg Board.

Director Hendrickson, Lane County, pointed out that the Lane County Board had received petitions requesting transfer of territory from Coburg to Eugene, which they had tabled. He felt that these petitions must be considered in the not too distant future.

Discussion
continued

Secretary Dolmyer, Linn County, pointed out that Linn County Board had received petitions requesting transfer of territory from Coburg to Linn County. He stated that the possibility had also been suggested to expand the Harrisburg Union High School District to include the Coburg High School, leaving the Coburg School District with only a grade school.

Chairman Richards, Lane County, asked if they wished to go ahead with the plan if they felt it was going to be defeated, and if so, for what reason? Also, asked if the Linn County Board had considered the problem?

Wade Isom, Linn County, felt the plan has a very poor chance of passing. Harrisburg Union High has even discussed splitting their district, part going to Junction City and part to Central Linn.

Ed Poland, Linn County, pointed out that should an election carry on this proposal and petitions be submitted for boundary changes both on the north and south, this would crucify the new district. Pointed out that the assessed value per pupil of children living in the southern end of the proposed district is considerably lower than that of children living in the northern end of the proposed district, where there are large farms with a high valuation and a small number of children.

Chairman Richards, Lane County, asked boards to pass on whether or not they favor presenting this plan. Those present voted unanimously to pursue formulation of a joint statement for a Coburg-Harrisburg plan.

Ed Poland, Linn County, pointed out that the new district should report to Linn County since the majority of the valuation is in Linn County.

Marvin Hendrickson, Lane County, pointed out that the Coburg Board had requested strongly for such a proposed district to be a part of the Lane County Rural School District.

Secretary Dolmyer, Linn County, submitted four points which the Linn County Board had passed on recently:

1. Were in general agreement on plan presented.
2. District be divided into seven zones.
3. Assets and liabilities pooled.
4. District come under County having the greatest assessed valuation and largest number of students.

Mr. Dolmyer suggested that the local school boards of the districts involved meet and discuss the plan.

Secretary Parnell, Lane County, suggested the following alternatives:

1. Drop plan altogether.
2. Two Boards agree on boundary changes and arbitrate Rural District issue and call for a public hearing.

Discussion
continued

3. As Mr. Dolmyer suggests, Rural Boards not decide details here, but call a meeting of the local school boards involved to assist in working out a plan. If a plan can be worked out satisfying most of the local directors, then hold a hearing.

It was agreed that the two issues that need to be resolved by the two County Boards before the next meeting are:

1. Such a new district would become a part of which Rural School District, Linn or Lane?
2. The attitude of County Boards regarding boundary changes in this area?

4. Meeting
with Local
Boards

4. It was agreed that a meeting with the local boards be called on Wednesday, December 19th, at the Harrisburg High School at 6:30 P.M. as a dinner meeting if it can be arranged. The purpose of the meeting would be to have the local district boards discuss the details of drawing up a plan.

Mr. Isom volunteered to make the arrangements at Harrisburg Union High for the meeting.

Meeting adjourned.

Joe Richards, Chairman

Dale Parnell, Secretary

LANE COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
Rural School District
Monday, October 22, 1962

Minutes
in brief

1. Attendance

1. The regular meeting of the Lane County Board of Education for the Rural School District was held in Harris Hall, Courthouse, Eugene, with the following members present: Chairman Joe Richards, Laura Johnson, Ray Swanson, Vera Hansen, Milton Turay, Marvin Hendrickson, Dorothy Leeper, and Secretary Dale Parnell. Also present were Register Guard reporter Sam Frear, Tom Rigby, Executive Secretary of the Oregon School Boards' Association, Aubrey Trimble and Jim McDonald, County School Office, and auditor Ronald Babcock.

2. Minutes
Approved

2. Director Johnson moved that the minutes of September 24th be approved with the following addition on Page 4, bottom of page under Dr. Goldhammer's remarks (6th line):

"However, having a school directly across the street from the people that will eventually build homes on the dairy property and not allowing these residents to send their children to this school will add up to trouble and if this change is not made you will have this problem back in your laps in a few years. The choice is not an easy one but it would appear best to transfer this property at this time before housing develops in the area."

Also, that the word "surmountable" on line 17, Page 3, of the September 24th minutes be corrected to read "insurmountable."

The motion was seconded by Director Leeper and carried.

Director Leeper moved that the minutes of October 8th be approved as mailed. The motion was seconded by Director Turay and carried.

3. Reports

3. Secretary Parnell presented a letter from Dr. Paul Jacobson, Dean of the School of Education at the University of Oregon, requesting that Jim McDonald be granted permission to teach the Instructional Materials course at the University of Oregon for the Winter and Spring terms. The County School Board would be reimbursed for his released time on the same basis as is being used in Eugene School District with their personnel. (The class is tentatively scheduled for one day a week from 3 P.M. to 6 P.M.)

Secretary Parnell presented a request for the number of board members who would attend the various sessions and activities of the Oregon School Boards' Convention on November 15th and 16th.

Secretary Parnell presented a letter from Better Homes and Gardens magazine citing the award made to the Eugene School District for "Outstanding Achievement in Action in Education." The Eugene Board had been nominated for this award for their significant "action in education" in initiating the "Eugene Project." Chairman Richards was asked to make this presentation.

Secretary Parnell reported that the office brochure "VITAL LINK" had been distributed to all schools in Lane County. This is another effort to depict the role of the County Board in the educational organization.

Secretary Parnell read a letter relative to attendance at the American Education Week Dinner on November 5th. Chairman Joe Richards agreed to attend from the Board of Education.

4. Audit Report

4. Auditor Ronald Babcock presented the audit report for the Lane County Board of Education for the year ending June 30th, 1962. He pointed out that we had previously felt each school district would get 100% of offset to which they were entitled. However, we have found districts will not receive 100% due to the 3% discount if taxes are paid prior to November 15th and there is no provision in the law for the Rural Levy to include an amount for this discount. At present the only way to take care of this is for the districts to include the 3% in their district levy.

Mr. Babcock also called special attention to a possibility of allocating the unsegregated Rural Tax money prior to said monies being posted in the County Treasurer's office, as outlined on pages 9 and 10 of the audit report. He also pointed out that in prior years unsegregated monies had been invested by the County Treasurer prior to posting but all interest was credited to the County general fund.

After considerable discussion Director Hendrickson moved that to direct the Superintendent to pursue the proposition of making a determination of total property taxes collected by the County Sheriff shortly after the November 15th deadline; the percentage that the rural school levy is to the entire amount levied in the County for all public bodies could be applied to the total property taxes collected. After allowing some margin for possible actual allocation differences, this amount could be turned over immediately to the school districts. Perhaps one-half of the Rural Levy receipts could be allocated within a week following November 15. This same procedure could be followed one month later, or sooner, if warranted, as the unopened mail containing property tax payments was cleared from the Sheriff's office. Director Leeper seconded and the motion carried. (Note: It was agreed that the County Superintendent, the County Commissioners, the County Auditor, and the County Treasurer, pursue the above.)

5. Budget Committee

5. Director Swanson nominated Don Davidson of Mapleton to be appointed as a member of the budget committee.

Director Hendrickson nominated Wendell Wick of the Bethel School District to be appointed as a member of the budget committee.

Director Johnson moved that the appointments of Don Davidson and Wendell Wick be approved. The motion was seconded by Director Turay and carried.

6. RSB Budget Calendar

6. Secretary Parnell requested the type of budget process and timing the Board wished to pursue for the 1962-63 budget.

Director Turay moved that Secretary Parnell be instructed to set up the following budget calendar:

January and February --- Formal budget sessions.
 December --- Board discussion of various budget problems.
 January --- Board - Local Superintendents - Budget members in-
 formal dinner meeting to discuss the general needs
 and services.

The motion was seconded by Director Swanson and carried.

7. Next Meeting
 7. Secretary Parnell pointed out that the next regular meeting of the Board falls on November 12th, which is a legal holiday. Director Johnson moved that the next meeting of the Board of Education be held on Thursday, November 8th, at 1:30 P.M. The motion was seconded by Director Hendrickson and carried.
8. McDonald Teaching
 8. Director Leeper moved that the Board approve Jim McDonald teaching the Instructional Materials class at the U. of O. on a released time basis and directed the Superintendent to negotiate with the University on this matter. Director Johnson seconded and the motion carried.
9. Marcola-Springfield Reorganization
 9. Director Hansen moved that the Plan for the reorganization of the Marcola and Springfield school districts be submitted to the State Board of Education. The motion was seconded by Director Swanson and carried.
 Note: In the discussion on this motion questions were raised about the advisability of going ahead with this election in view of the seeming majority opposition to the plan among the Marcola residents. However, it was felt that an election should be held to allow the citizens an opportunity to vote by secret ballot, and also to help give the Marcola Board guidance in their planning for the years ahead.
10. Coburg-Harrisburg Reorganization
 10. It was agreed to set the date for a joint meeting with the Linn County Board after local comments and suggestions are received from each of the Boards involved.
11. Intermediate Unit and Interim Committee
 11. Secretary Parnell commented on the Intermediate Unit Law from Michigan. He pointed out that the Oregon State Interim Committee is ending their work soon.
 Tom Rigby, Executive Secretary of OSBA, reported that the present recommendation of the Interim Committee relative to the County Office is to retain an intermediate unit with a minimum of services to be included in the county-wide tax and all other services of the intermediate unit to be made on a contractual basis.
 Director Leeper expressed her concern over the Rural School District valuation in view of the timber tax law change.
 Tom Rigby reported that the Interim Committee had no intention of doing away with the equalized levy as such but only as it applies to the County Office operation.
12. Observations
 12. Secretary Parnell made the following observations about some things the Interim Committee had apparently not discussed:

- a. Decentralization of the State Department of Education by allowing the State Board to delegate some State functions to various Intermediate offices on a regional basis.
- b. Apparently no provision is being made to force or even interestingly entice various Intermediate offices together.
- c. O.R.S. 329.130 might be repealed whereby the County Commissioners would no longer have to provide building space for the operation.

Director Richards asked how the activities and services of the County Office be carried on if we would have to contract for everything excepting the superintendent and a secretary.

The Board directed Secretary Parnell to draft a letter to the Interim Committee stating the Board opposition to the one man - one secretary financing proposal.

13. Evaluate Materials

13. Jim McDonald, Director of IMC, reported that he had been requested by the K and E Drafting and Overhead Visuals Company, to examine in content 130 overhead visuals on new materials relating to the teaching of Physics. The Company would reimburse the County Board for any extra help of teachers and clerical incurred in this work, which would be done on Saturdays and evenings. Mr. McDonald recommended that we evaluate these materials by this arrangement for this time.

Director Hendrickson moved that the Board approve the plan as outlined by Mr. McDonald. The motion was seconded by Director Hansen and carried.

14. Adverse Weather

14. Director Hansen questioned the role of Civil Defense relating to adverse weather and other emergencies which might affect school children.

Secretary Parnell reported that arrangements have been worked out that in the event of adverse weather, the Weather Bureau will call the County Office and the office will in turn get word to all schools within 5 minutes. Local school districts have adopted generally the policy of getting children to their homes as fast as possible in event of emergency.

Meeting adjourned.

Joe Richards, Chairman

Dale Parnell, Secretary

COUNTY HEARING ON PROPOSED PARTIAL PLAN
OF SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION R-9 - Lane County
Mohawk High School Gym - October 17, 1962

Minutes
in brief

1. Hearing
Attendance

1. A public hearing was held in the Mohawk High School gymnasium, Marcola, Oregon, on October 17, 1962, commencing at 8:00 P.M. for the purpose of discussing Proposed Partial Plan of School District Reorganization R-9, Lane County, comprising School Districts No. 19 and 79. The hearing was attended by approximately 125 patrons.

County School Superintendent Dale Parnell opened the meeting, explained the procedure for conducting the hearing and introduced Mr. Joe Richards, Chairman of the Lane County Board of Education.

Superintendent Parnell introduced members of the Lane County Board of Education: Mrs. Laura Johnson, Vice-chairman; Mrs. Dorothy Leeper; Mrs. Vera Hansen; Mr. Joe Richards, Chairman; Mr. Milton Turay; Mr. Ray Swanson; Mrs. Margaret Blanton, acting as secretary. He also introduced Marcola Board Members: Mr. Leo Paschelke; Mr. William Wilt; Mr. Leland Downing; Mrs. Ida Dustrude; Marcola Superintendent Berry Mauney; Springfield School Board Member Donald Ebbert; Springfield Superintendent Walter Commons; Springfield Assistant Superintendent Tom Williams.

2. Purpose of
Hearing

2. Superintendent Parnell stated that this meeting is held to hear comments that patrons have in regard to the merger of the Springfield and Marcola School Districts; that based on the minutes of this hearing the County Board will construct a plan. The plan will be sent to the State Board of Education, who will call a state hearing. After their hearing, if the State Board approves, an election will be held.

3. Plan
Presented

3. Superintendent Parnell presented the Proposed Partial Plan R-9, comprising component School Districts No. 19 and 79, Lane County, Oregon.

4. Local
Committees
Introduced

4. Superintendent Parnell introduced members of local sub-committees appointed by the Marcola School Board to work on various phases of information to be considered in this proposal:

Curriculum - Mrs. Paschelke, Mrs. Young, Mrs. Wilkins. Reported that committee has visited schools in Springfield and Marcola; that they had especially checked the school and equipment at Hamlin Junior High School and Thurston High School; compared difference of curriculum now offered. Committee had not yet completed work.

Follow-up of Students - Mrs. Ratterree, Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Foster. Reported that Committee had visited Springfield Schools and were checking drop-outs in both districts.

Transportation - Mrs. Davis, Mrs. Green. Had talked with Joe Dolan of Springfield, and information will be forthcoming soon.

If Not Consolidation, What? - Mrs. Hambill, Mrs. Shields, Mrs. Wilkins. Working on tentative figures as to what it would cost to bring High School up to what it should be in buildings, teachers, science, etc.

Extra-Curricular Activities - Mrs. Carlson, Mrs. Teel. Made comparison between Springfield and Marcola Schools of the Extra-Curricular activities offered.

How Teachers Feel - Mr. Foster, Mr. Eymann. Checking on statistics provided on two schools relating to certification, classes, small school versus large school, etc.

Taxes - Mr. Eymann, Mr. Martin. Whole revenue is derived from the following: Basic School Support; Rural School Tax; Local Property Tax. Our question is what changes can be expected with or without consolidation. Problems facing the Marcola district: Rate at which timber is being removed; New growth needed as timber is removed; Effect on remaining taxpayers to stay as they are or consolidate.

Looking Into Other Districts - Mrs. Watts, Mrs. Shields, Mrs. Green. Visited other districts that have reorganized and areas that have consolidated with the Springfield School District.

Superintendent Parnell reported that these Committees will make a report on facts as they see them, but will not make a recommendation.

Board Member
Comments

Mr. Paschelke, Marcola - His personal feeling regarding reorganization was that schools are manufacturing students and the most important thing is wherever the children can obtain the best education.

Mr. Ebbert, Springfield - The Springfield Board wished to remain neutral. Parents of children involved should decide what is the best education for their children.

5. Hearing
Opened

5. Mr. Joe Richards opened the hearing for comments and questions

Mr. Don Teel, Marcola - The Marcola Committee and Board have put in a lot of work, and asked when the report of the local committee would be available?

Superintendent Parnell - The report will probably be presented at the State Board hearing sometime the early part of November.

Mrs. Anderson, Marcola - Asked why consolidation is coming up again. Has been voted down twice. Survey taken showed 83% opposed reorganization.

Superintendent Parnell - Was recommended by the Reorganization Committee and Marcola Board needs guidance for planning in the years ahead.

Mr. Paschelke, Marcola - There is some expense involved in holding elections. Asked if public should bring out a petition prior to election to serve as a poll?

Mrs. Helen Bell, Marcola - Asked how they arrived at 83% opposition.

Mrs. Anderson, Marcola - Survey was taken several years ago and included 83% of the adult residents of the district who indicated they were against consolidation.

Mrs. Young, Marcola - If consolidation is voted down, can we be assured it won't come up every two or three years?

Mrs. Vera Hansen - A petition is not a true indication how people really feel. Something done two or three years ago might not indicate feeling of people at present.

Mr. Paschelke, Marcola - If we can be sure this election will be the end of it we will probably start on a building program.

Mr. Ray Swanson - We can only hold an election on the same plan twice. If the same plan is presented a third time it must first have the approval of the State Board.

Unidentified man from Marcola - If we are free of bonds, did not see why they could not bond to build. Should Marcola consolidate with Springfield they would have to build more buildings. If people want to send their children to Springfield, why don't they.

Superintendent Commons, Springfield - An addition of fifty in the high school would not change building plans. Thirty in the junior high school would have no depreciable effect at the present time.

Mr. Paschelke, Marcola - Should Marcola remain a small school it could gradually be expanded at this location.

Mrs. Helen Bell, Marcola - Asked Springfield's tuition charge?

Superintendent Commons, Springfield - Ordinarily Springfield does not take tuition students. However, if they do accept any, the charge is \$1.00 per day. The board feels that if education is offered in their own district there is no reason they should come to the Springfield district.

Mrs. Dorothy Leeper - Asked if any Marcola students are paying tuition in Springfield at the present time?

Superintendent Commons, Springfield - Reported that there are three elementary students at present.

Mrs. Willard, Marcola - Asked how much tuition Marcola charges for Springfield students attending Marcola?

Superintendent Mauney, Marcola - Two or three students are attending from Springfield and no tuition is charged.

Mrs. Dorothy Leeper - Asked the reason for this?

Superintendent Mauney, Marcola - Students preferred a smaller school.

Mrs. Roebuck, Marcola - Moved from Springfield because children were not receiving individual attention in Springfield.

Mrs. Landreth, Marcola - The Marcola Schools have improved in the last 20 years. If a child wants an education they can get it from the smaller schools. Favors building and remaining as they are.

Mrs. Anderson, Marcola - Should consolidation be voted, does Springfield make any provision for supervision of children participating in athletics prior to the time the bus brings them home?

Superintendent Commons, Springfield - Supervised only when they participate in sports. Has not been a problem.

Asst. Superintendent Williams, Springfield - This has not been a problem. Pointed out that three years ago a girl from Leaburg was Student Body President.

Mrs. Dorothy Leeper - Asked the distance from Marcola to Springfield?

Unidentified lady from Marcola - 14.3 miles one-way from Marcola to Thurston and the time is 35 minutes.

Unidentified lady from Marcola - How many miles from County line to the grade school?

Superintendent Mauney, Marcola - 10.1 miles.

Unidentified lady from Marcola - Heard a rumor that water is over walks at Thurston High School when it rains. Asked if it was true?

Superintendent Commons, Springfield - Not true.

Unidentified lady from Marcola - Asked if any school in Springfield was double-shifting?

Superintendent Commons, Springfield - None.

Unidentified lady from Marcola - In Springfield children living in the same house, one goes to Springfield High School and the other to Thurston High School. Why?

Superintendent Commons, Springfield - Is possible due to establishment of attendance boundaries and students were not in the same grade. Student could have attended Thurston had they requested. Springfield Board tries to make attendance boundary changes as painless as possible. But whenever you build new schools, changes are necessary.

Unidentified lady from Marcola - Asked if her three children of different ages might attend three different schools?

Superintendent Commons, Springfield - This is possible.

Unidentified lady from Marcola - Graduated from Mohawk High School last year. Had a curriculum of basic subjects and received individual help from teachers. Cited other girls attending in Springfield had trouble getting individual help from teachers.

Mrs. Landreth, Marcola - If a child wants an education they can get it here as well as in a larger school.

Unidentified lady from Marcola - Does the three mill serial levy in Springfield cover future building?

Superintendent Commons, Springfield - Three mills is intended to build additions to present buildings and is for a 10-year period. This year is the first year of the ten-year period.

Unidentified lady from Marcola - It is rumored that Marcola will no longer have a post office if consolidation takes place.

Superintendent Commons, Springfield - Cited that Thurston is in the city limits of Springfield and still maintains a post office.

Unidentified lady from Marcola - Reorganization is undergoing changes. Felt there is much to be said on this. Favored keeping smaller schools. Small schools may not be as bad as people have thought.

Mrs. Dorothy Leeper - Asked what the tax picture would be like if Marcola and Springfield do not consolidate?

Mr. Richard Eymann, Marcola - Committee hasn't reached final conclusion on this.

Mrs. Laura Johnson - Enrollment in Springfield High Schools is not too large. You really cannot call Springfield or Thurston High Schools excessively large.

Superintendent Commons, Springfield - We have many classes under 20.

Unidentified man from Marcola - Marcola has lost a lot of valuation. We can't go on and on losing valuation and maintain a grade "A" school. How low can valuation drop before something happens?

Superintendent Parnell - Total valuation of a school district is not related to rating of a school district. Requirement for accreditation is not less than 5 teachers.

Mr. Paschelke, Marcola - Regarding the raise of taxes, they have increased all over. Marcola School District isn't alone in that respect.

Mrs. Anderson, Marcola - Asked how many schools will be built in Springfield in the future - in the next 10 years?

Superintendent Commons, Springfield - Could not project for 10 years but for several years. New site just purchased for a new high school which will probably be needed by 1968; site for a junior high school purchased in 1956 which will probably be built in another year; sites purchased for three elementary schools and one building will be needed in the fall of 1964. Growth will depend other future buildings.

Mrs. Helen Bell, Marcola - Asked what one mill would raise in each district.

Superintendent Parnell - One mill would raise \$1,600 in Marcola and \$40,000 in Springfield.

Unidentified lady from Marcola - Asked how reorganization is working in outlying schools in eastern Oregon? Are they getting districts so large they actually room and board children during the week?

Unidentified lady from Marcola - We have conducted a study using data from University of Oregon. No other area has problems as compare exactly with ours. Their problem has been transportation, due to great distance. However, we have found little dissatisfaction after the consolidation step has once been taken.

Unidentified man from Marcola - Pointed out that at Crane, children are boarded rather than transported such a great distance.

Mrs. Paschelke, Marcola - Asked purpose in changing the plan this time so that only the 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th grade will go to Springfield?

Superintendent Parnell - One purpose was to utilize the Marcola High School. Marcola Elementary School would benefit building space-wise.

Superintendents Commons and Mauney - Agreed to this.

Mr. Paschelke, Marcola - If consolidated, a new board would be elected and they would have the right to make this decision.

Unidentified lady from Marcola - Asked if the new board would be elected at large?

Mrs. Roebuck, Marcola - Would like figures on drop-outs. Felt this question would face them in consolidation.

Mrs. Anderson, Marcola - From figures available, 33-1/3% drop-out in Springfield and 19½% drop-out in Marcola.

Superintendent Parnell - Disagreed with these figures. Stated that figures in his office are: 24 or 25% in Springfield and Marcola is parallel to this. This is a difference between withdrawal and students who actually drop from school altogether. This must also be considered class-by-class.

Unidentified student (boy) from Marcola - Asked if they consolidate, would boys have a chance on athletic teams in Springfield. They have a good chance in Marcola. Asked if Marcola would sustain interest in athletics?

Mrs. Roebuck, Marcola - Did not feel so.

Unidentified student (boy) from Marcola - Asked if an athlete made the team in Springfield, how late would he get home?

Unidentified lady from Marcola - Read activity bus schedule. Springfield runs two activity bus schedules to meet this need.

Mrs. Case, Marcola - In the Springfield retarded classes, does a child stay in his own class or go to a special teacher? Also, does the slow student, who is not retarded, get special help?

Superintendent Commons, Springfield - Under the Oregon Program, we will start a non-graded class in the grade school where students will travel on their own level (for normal student slower than other students).

Unidentified lady from Marcola - Has two daughters who attended Hamlin before coming to Marcola and they had to work very hard. Since attending Marcola they have been doing marvelously. Their minds have been stimulated and they are learning for the first time.

Mr. Paschelke, Marcola - Commended Marcola Superintendent and teachers.

Unidentified student (girl) from Marcola - Asked what would happen to Marcola students taken from Marcola and sent to Springfield, a small school to a large school where individual interest is not shown?

Unidentified man from Marcola - Asked how long the Marcola staff would be adequate to teach the subjects offered in Marcola?

Superintendent Parnell - New law was passed which will make it harder for teachers to teach a large number of subjects. This law will become mandatory in 1965 through grades 1-12.

Mr. Ray Swanson - Agreed we all want the best education possible we can give with our limited resources. Our aim is not to make large schools larger and do away with the small schools. However, the price in inconvenience can sometimes be worth it. Are courses worth the price to get the areas of education that are going to have to last a life time. A good small school can be much better than a poor large school. This depends on the board, teachers, superintendent and you. You have to make the decision. Hope your committee can give you the information you need. Weigh your decision carefully. Our aim is to see each child, regardless of where he lives, get a good education. Cautioned that in figuring drop-outs the same standards are used. If this comes to an election, do not make snap judgement - weigh your decision carefully.

Mr. William Wilt, Marcola - Regarding our paying the bill if we decide to stay here. We are backing the election to know where we go from here. Suggested everyone read committee's reports, which will come out soon. People are reluctant to change. In regard to taxes, what is this going to cost us? Suggest you read this report as to where our value is. Weyerhaeuser holds 60% of Marcola's valuation at the present time. We lost 25% of our valuation in one year. The load can shift fast. Marcola was hit harder than any other district in the state on the new timber law.

Mrs. Vera Hansen - Stated that she lives in Springfield and her children had attended both the large and small school. Springfield has many wonderful facilities available to students. Springfield has a high quality of education. Children must face the world as it is today.

Mr. Ivan Luman, State Department of Schoolhouse Planning, State Department of Education - Had been checking the schools in Marcola. Was proud to see so many people participating in a problem that is theirs. Offered assistance of the State Department.

6. Meeting
Adjourned

6. Mr. Richards thanked the patrons for attending and expressing their comments.

Meeting adjourned.

Mr. Joe Richards, Chairman

Mr. Dale Parnell, Secretary

LANE COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
Rural School District
Monday, September 24, 1962

Minutes
in brief

1. Attendance
1. The regular meeting of the Lane County Board of Education for the Rural School District was held in the County School Office, Courthouse, Eugene, with the following members present: Vera Hansen, Laura Johnson, Dorothy Leeper, Ray Swanson, Milton Turay, Chairman Joe Richards, and Secretary Dale Parnell. Also present were: Mr. and Mrs. Dick Reed, Dr. Keith Goldhammer, Howard Buford, Jim Izett, Springfield News reporter Barbara Cloud, and Register Guard reporter Ralph Olive.
2. Boundary Board and Reorganization
2. Chairman Richards called the meeting to order and stated this meeting of the Lane County Board of Education was for the purpose of considering Boundary Board and Reorganization business.
3. Minutes Approved
3. Director Leeper moved that the minutes of the September 10, 1962 board meeting be approved as received by mail. Director Johnson seconded and the motion carried.
4. Boundary Board Business
4. Chairman Richards stated that the Boundary Board business is the consideration of the petition for the transfer of certain territory from School District No. 4 to School District No. 19; that Dr. Goldhammer of the University of Oregon and Howard Buford of the Planning Commission had been requested to attend the meeting.

Chairman Richards administered the oath to Dr. Goldhammer who gave the background as how he proceeded in his study on the boundaries of the metropolitan area school districts.

He stated that on this particular study of Districts No. 4, 19, and 52 the three boards got together and discussed plans to have a study made jointly for the development of a master boundary plan for this area. In February, 1960 he submitted copies of the report. At that time he recommended that the whole area that is now East of the freeway and South of the McKenzie River be transferred from District No. 4 to District No. 19. This would take into consideration Game Bird Village and Deadmond's Ferry area.

Director Swanson pointed out that the Boards of Districts No. 4 and 19 endorsed the Goldhammer Report but on this petition we find a difference of opinion. He asked if there is a proposal for an elementary school in this particular area and where it would be located?

Dr. Goldhammer did not know of any plan of District No. 4 for a school in this area. He pointed out that schools should be located for the best education of the children and the proper development of the community so the educational function can be utilized to the greatest efficiency of the taxpayer. He asked about the location of the Guy Lee

Boundary
Board
Business
Continued

school in relation to this transfer and pointed out that a school across the street from residents whose children cannot attend usually adds up to trouble. The issue is not future plans but the current situation. Children associate with each other on all bases, not only schools. A bus runs East on Harlow Road to Springfield and West on Harlow Road to Eugene. The dollar for education is scarce. It is not good business to run buses in this manner. He is not in favor of a street being the boundary line for education units. "In the projections that we have made we know that eventually there will have to be several schools located in this area. We question there is a sufficient number of children in Game Bird Village and Deadmond's Ferry area for a single elementary school. We would envisage this as the dairy property to be served by the Lee School and another school to serve the North part of Game Bird Village and Deadmond's Ferry area in about 1980; another junior high school to serve the area known as the North Fifth and Page; a third high school for Springfield located in the area of the Page school. Thus, the whole area should be included in District No. 19 and not in District No. 4. Traffic is always a hazard for children, but I do not think the traffic on Harlow Road is too hazardous. A child on foot is in less danger than a child in a vehicle. Mr. Buford and I are in agreement with our pattern in this area. I have seen no evidence since presenting the report that would make me change my mind."

Director Leeper asked Dr. Goldhammer if he used this development plan dated 1959? Did you agree with the neighborhood areas. That Beverly Park would be served by the Lee School?

Dr. Goldhammer projected 259 children for Beverly Park. He pointed out that elementary schools for metropolitan areas should not have more than 500 children. Beverly Park will have less than a full school. Deadmond's Ferry and Game Bird Village area will have more than enough for one school but not enough for two.

Director Johnson asked if the dairy is being subdivided?

Dr Goldhammer - "My supposition is that this whole area will be divided. When I refer to the Game Bird Village I refer to everything North of Harlow Road. Everything that is approximately North of Q Street and West of the Farm Road as extended, that area would require two elementary schools and 2/5 of a junior high school. We are talking about 25 years into the future on this, based upon studies made by the Planning Commission.

Director Johnson asked how many houses were in the tentative plan?

Dr. Goldhammer - "For each elementary school we project somewhat less than .6 of a child per residential development. For 500 children you would have to have over 800 homes. It takes approximately 1000 homes to require an elementary school at the size we would consider for this area."

Dick Reed stated that his property contains 170 acres and if subdivided there would be between three and four houses per acre. This allows for streets and a park. There has to be a division somewhere between schools.

Boundary
Board
Business
Continued

Chairman Richards administered the oath to Howard Buford of the Planning Commission, who generally agreed with the proposals contained in Dr. Goldhammer's report.

Director Leeper asked Mr. Buford which was most hazardous, foot traffic or the freeway?

Mr. Buford pointed out that there is much congestion on Harlow Road; that it was highly desirable to make it unnecessary to cross this street. He stated he would rather have children in a bus crossing a freeway that independently going across the street.

Chairman Richards asked Mr. Buford that on the Reed property drawing was there some discussion as to plans for a school in this area?

Mr. Buford replied that at the Southwest corner of Game Bird Village, which Mr. Reed referred to, was an imaginative proposal of the Planning Office for a school.

Director Hansen suggested that Student Patrols operated in the area would be very beneficial and that the road hazard on Harlow Road did not appear any more surmountable than other areas of our county.

Mr. Buford stated that what Dr. Goldhammer states in his report calls for less than an 18-20 room school to serve each of these areas. If anything, it is an underestimate of what is going to happen. As areas mature the price of land goes up and more units will need the property. The plan Mr. Reed refers to is what we have recommended.

Secretary Parnell asked Mr. Buford if he would foresee a problem involved in a crossing at or near Lee School?

Mr. Buford felt that Harlow Road is going to serve as a major traffic way and will continue.

Director Leeper asked if there might be a possible commercial development of Harlow Road and if so, could this make more dwellings North of Harlow?

Mr. Buford pointed out that commercial developments had already been granted along Harlow Road and he could see little further commercial development.

Chairman Richards administered the oath to Mrs. Dick Reed who asked Mr. Buford if he did not think it would be desirable to keep the dairy and Game Bird Village in one unit and provide a school in this unit?

Mr. Buford stated that all plans he had projected had included this as a unit.

Mrs. Reed pointed out that the "Q" Street-Laura Street area is as large as the dairy area and could not understand why Dr. Goldhammer has not made provisions for homes in this area.

Boundary
Board
Business
Continued

Dr. Goldhammer pointed out that there were some provisions for residential property. Basically, the question you raise, as far as the long-term plan, is true. All of this area should be considered a single area.

Mrs. Reed stated that since there are no children in the area the need is not immediate.

Dr. Goldhammer - "My suspicion is that Springfield purchased the Lee School land prior to actually knowing the location of the children."

Jim Izett, Springfield Board member, stated that the purchase of the Lee School site was done long before any of this thinking. The Plan did not exist when the site was purchased.

Director Swanson asked if there was a conflict between Mr. Buford and Dr. Goldhammer.

Dr. Goldhammer stated that population change takes place over a gradual period. You will have to have two schools in this area before you have three. I agree with Mr. Buford's reasoning but I am thinking in terms of the next 25 years and I can see two schools emerging in this area during that time. Eventually three schools may be desirable - locating the second school much further to the North of Mallard Lane. My answer to your question is that I see two schools for now. Lee School serving its present area plus the dairy property and a new school serving Game Bird Village-Deadmond's Ferry area.

Director Hansen pointed out that all of this area belongs to Willamalane Park and children will avail themselves of the Park's activities.

Mrs. Reed stated that Willamalane also owns a park area on Mallard Lane.

Mr. Buford pointed out that we should look at the Deadmond's Ferry area. He felt it will increase in intensity but not development nearly as rapidly as the rest of the area.

Dr. Goldhammer - "As I see this boundary change proposal, it does not encompass the intention of our report. It changes only one boundary for another boundary which does not encompass the same objective. Our Plan called for the inclusion of the Game Bird Village and the Deadmond's Ferry area into the Springfield School District. Anything other than this would not complete the objective. By doing it piecemeal we have three or four conflicts over the issue instead of one. When housing goes up it will cause friction in the Lee School area. We should consider what is best for children and what we are going to get for the dollar spent on education. Are we making the most effective use of our educational dollar or are we going to put patches on a leaky ship? Eugene and Springfield is one metropolitan area and we should set about to solve this problem. Actually as we look at the metropolitan area, no school district boundaries really make much sense. One school district would serve the metropolitan area most admirably."

Motion
Defeated

Director Johnson moved that the motion be called from the table. The motion was seconded by Director Hansen and carried. Chairman Richards then called for a vote on the motion that petition be granted. The motion was defeated by the following vote:

- 2 - Yes
- 2 - No
- 1 - Abstained
- 1 - "No" vote was cast by Chairman Richards (breaking the tie) who explained his reasons as follows:

There had been insufficient showing of evidence on the part of District No. 19 to show this is the best for the children, or the economic dollar. The evidence is all projected in the future. There appears to be little harm in waiting until the area has developed and there are houses. Then the people involved can decide where they want their children to attend school.

Secretary Parnell thanked Dr. Goldhammer and Howard Buford for appearing before the meeting.

Dick Reed thanked the Board for their time and consideration.

5. Reorgan-
ization

Marcola-
Springfield

5. Secretary Parnell stated that he had met recently with the Springfield and Marcola School Boards and that the Joint Statement of facts, as presented, was approved. The two boards were not recommending the merger, but only agreeing on certain facts as they saw them. It will now be necessary for the Board to draw up the plan and set a date for the County Hearing. He pointed out that the Marcola Board would like this issue resolved before budgets are made for the coming year.

Director Johnson moved that Secretary Parnell make the necessary arrangements for a hearing to be held in the Mohawk High School on Wednesday, October 17, 1962. The motion was seconded by Director Hansen and carried.

Director Swanson moved that Superintendent Parnell be authorized to meet with citizens, at their request, for the purpose of providing pertinent information in making their decisions on reorganization issues. The motion was seconded by Director Turay and carried.

Coburg-
Harrisburg

Superintendent Parnell reported that he had met with the Linn County Superintendent relative to a plan for the Harrisburg-Coburg area. It was felt that it would be best to hold a vote on this issue in January or February, prior to making budgets for the coming year. It was recommended that a tentative plan be drawn up and sent to all component districts included, and requesting their suggestions and recommendations. As soon as these are received from the component districts, a joint meeting of the Linn and Lane County Boards will be set up. Secretary Parnell requested that he be authorized to draw up a tentative draft.

Director Turay moved that Secretary Parnell draw up a tentative draft for the reorganization of the Harrisburg-Coburg area and send to the component districts for suggestions. The motion was seconded by Director Swanson and carried.

6. Letter from Olga Freeman
6. Secretary Parnell read a letter addressed to the Board from Olga Freeman, County Clerk, relative to proposed legislation whereby all elections would be held on the same date.
Director Turay moved that the Board oppose this proposal due to many complications that can be foreseen. Director Swanson seconded and the motion carried.
7. Brochure on Services
7. Secretary Parnell presented a tentative draft of a brochure entitled "Services of the Board of Education."
Director Leeper moved that the Board authorize the publishing of the Services Brochure. Director Hansen seconded and the motion carried.
The chair was vacated by Chairman Richards and Vice-Chairman served as Chairman for the balance of the meeting.
8. Film Racks
8. Secretary Parnell reported that he had contacted the Finance sub-committee since the September 10th meeting requesting the purchase of four additional film racks. The sub-committee gave their approval for the purchase. (Price: Approximately \$180.00 each.)
9. T.V. Program
9. Secretary Parnell reported that the Board would be featured on KEZI, October 8th from 7:00 to 7:30 P.M. Some time was given to the planning of this program.
10. Next Meeting
10. Next meeting of the Board will be held on Monday, October 8, 1:30 P.M. in the County School Office.

Joe Richards, Chairman

Dale Parnell, Secretary

LANE COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
Rural School District
Monday, September 10, 1962

Minutes
in brief

1. Attendance
2. Reading of Minutes
3. Minutes Approved
4. Boundary Board Business

1. The regular meeting of the Lane County Board of Education for the Rural School District was held in the County School Office, Court House, Eugene with the following members present: Vera Hansen, Marvin Hendrickson, Laura Johnson, Dorothy Leeper, Ray Swanson, Milton Turay, Chairman Joe Richards, Secretary Dale Parnell, and several interested citizens.
2. Chairman Richards called the meeting to order and called for a motion to dispense with the reading of the last boundary board minutes. Director Hendrickson moved that we forgo the reading of the minutes. The motion was seconded by Director Hansen and carried.
3. Director Johnson moved that the minutes of August 13, 1962 board meeting be approved as received by mail. Director Turay seconded and the motion carried.
4. Chairman Richards opened the discussion on the proposal from District No. 19 to transfer certain territory from School District No. 4 to School District No. 19.

Secretary Parnell presented the following opinion from Attorney Riddlesbarger regarding the above proposed change:

Legal
Opinion

"In our opinion the fact that there are no children in the area involved in parcel one is not determinative of the right of the district boundary board to make the proposed change. One of the other of the matters set forth in ORS 329.730 (2) (b) is to be found. Thus, if the board found that the proposed change would result in substantial operating economies in the districts affected it would be sufficient, notwithstanding the non-existence of children in one of the areas. This operating economy need not be at the present time, but could be in the future. The decision is discretionary with the board and is only reversible for an abuse of this discretion. If the board after fully considering the matter, finds that the proposed change meets the requirements of ORS 329.730 (2) as set out on page one of this letter, there is no legal reason why the change should not be made."

Further, relative to ORS 329.730 (7) "This subsection requires that the matter be submitted to the voters of the districts if the school district to be annexed has ten (10) or more children of school age. - - - * * * In our opinion this subsection refers only to annexation of a whole district, and does not refer to a boundary change in any portion of a school district. - - - * * *."

Director Hansen moved that the District No. 19 petition be granted. Motion was seconded by Director Swanson.

Director Swanson questioned whether or not the Goldhammer boundary study report included the Reed property in the same school district as the Gamebird Village and Deadmond's Ferry area.

Secretary Parnell read from the Goldhammer report that the property South of the McKenzie River and West of the freeway will probably be solid residential and should be transferred to School District No. 19.

Director Swanson stated he would like more information from Dr. Goldhammer regarding projected location of schools before making a decision. He pointed out that the basic Goldhammer report was adopted by the Eugene and Springfield school boards. We find the Eugene Board not in favor of this piece-meal change and the Springfield Board in favor. The difference between the two boards seems to hang up on this point.

Motion
Tabled

Director Swanson moved that the Board table the motion, pending a conference with Dr. Goldhammer and Mr. Buford of the Planning Commission, until the next regular meeting or a specially called meeting. Motion was seconded by Director Leeper and carried. The Secretary was instructed to arrange for this meeting on September 24th if possible.

Coburg
Board
Letter

Secretary Parnell presented a letter from the Coburg School Board listing the following recommendations adopted at their August 20th board meeting:

- a. Hold up on the consideration of boundary changes in the Coburg District until a Harrisburg-Coburg election can be held.
- b. The Coburg Board has no plans at this time for the calling of a bond issue to build a new high school.
- c. The Coburg Board is in favor of allowing the people to vote on a plan of reorganization between Harrisburg and Coburg school districts.
- d. Another election with Eugene should not be considered at this time, but to consider after a reorganization election with Harrisburg and Coburg.

Director Swanson cited that a consolidation election of Districts No. 4 and 43 lost; that three reorganization elections of Districts No. 4 and 43 lost; that numerous boundary changes have been made.

Director Swanson felt the Committee should now work with the Linn County Board and propose a plan that would offer the people the opportunity to vote on a plan that would combine Harrisburg and Coburg. This is proposed as the law provides that local Boards shall act in an advisory capacity in preparing a suitable plan. If the people do not favor the plan proposed by the Committee; therefore, some alternate plan may be proposed.

Harrisburg-
Coburg Plan
Proposed

Director Swanson moved that we enter into discussion with the Linn County Board concerning a plan of reorganization including the component elementary districts of the Harrisburg Union High School and

Coburg. Motion was seconded by Director Leeper and carried. Secretary Parnell was instructed to set up a meeting with the Linn County Board to discuss the formation of a plan.

Merle Short of the Coburg School District requested the exclusion of his property from such a plan. He stated he was putting his boy in the Eugene schools under a tuition basis. He felt he was entitled to one boy in the Eugene schools for the taxes he pays in the Eugene district. He had no opposition to holding off on his petition, but was interested that it be kept alive.

Director Swanson felt that if the whole Coburg area goes with Harrisburg it should be a Lane County district. He did not feel it is feasible to bite off chunks of the Coburg district by boundary changes. He feels the Coburg-Harrisburg proposal has to be reconciled. Mr. Short's petition is presently tabled pending a basic policy decision of the Board. At the present time it is under study. Mr. Short requested that he be notified before any action is taken.

Mr. Leon Funk, Coburg, asked if the Board had a legal ruling relative to more than 10 people going out of a district.

Secretary Parnell referred him to the legal opinion rendered by Attorney Riddlesbarger quoted previously in the minutes.

5. Financial Report

5. The financial report to September 1, 1962 was presented, discussed, and approved.

6. Bills Approved

6. The bills for the month were presented and discussed. Director Turay moved that the bills as presented be paid. Director Hendrickson seconded and the motion carried.

7. Short Term Loan

7. Secretary Parnell presented a resolution to authorize a short-term loan for the purpose of meeting current expenses between the present time and tax turnover time in December. He explained that previously the County Treasurer had thought she could carry the office until tax turnovers are made but has been advised by her auditor that she cannot do so. The amount needed between now and December is about \$100,000. Mr. Virgil Cameron of the First National Bank had been contacted and stated the interest on the proposal would be at the rate of 3-3/4%.

Director Swanson moved the resolution to authorize a short-term loan with the First National Bank of Oregon in the amount of \$100,000 be approved. Director Hendrickson seconded and the motion carried.

8. P.T.A. State Convention

8. Secretary Parnell informed the board that the County P.T.A. is making a bid for the Oregon Congress of Parents and Teachers to hold their 1963 State Convention in Eugene.

Director Hendrickson moved that the Lane County Board of Education extend an invitation to the Oregon Congress of Parents and Teachers to hold their 1963 State Convention in Eugene. Motion was seconded by Director Leeper and carried.

9. Industry-Education Council

9. Secretary Parnell presented to the Board the idea (as previously discussed last January) of the establishment of a Lane County Industry Education Council. The Board expressed further interest in the proposal and urged the Superintendent to explore the possibilities further.

10. IMC

10. Assistant Superintendent Ruth Gould presented an over-all picture of the present status and progress of the establishment of the Lane County Instructional Materials Center - relating to films, tapes, film strips, great art prints, curriculum aid kits, records, and etc. A policy for use of the Center was discussed.

Director Hansen moved that the use of the films and materials be limited to public schools in the districts comprising the Lane County Rural School District, in accordance with the language contained in the rental and loan agreements. Motion was seconded by Director Johnson and carried.

Relative to the distribution of the catalog it was agreed that a charge of \$1.00 per catalog be made to other than Lane County Public School personnel -- this to be at the discretion of the Superintendent.

11. Marcola-Springfield Proposal

11. Secretary Parnell announced that arrangements had been made for the Marcola and Springfield School Boards to meet jointly on September 17th to draft a final agreement on the reorganization plan including the Marcola and Springfield School Districts. Perhaps the Board might want to consider this plan at the September 24th meeting. The consensus indicated the "green light" on this schedule.

12. Oregon Study Council Invitation

12. Invitation was extended to the members of the Rural School Board to visit the Klamath County School District on September 27th and 28th as sponsored by the Oregon School Study Council.

13. Office In-service Program

13. Secretary Parnell presented an outline of a personnel plan as a portion of the office in-service program for the 1962-63 year.

Director Hendrickson moved that the office in-service program as outlined be approved. The motion was seconded by Director Leeper and carried.

14. Youth Study Board

14. Secretary Parnell introduced Don Call, (Research Director of the Lane County Youth Study Board) who informed the Board that a Youth Study Board was in existence which parallels the Guidance Committee earlier appointed by the Board; that the Youth Study Board is to receive a grant from the Federal Government in the amount of \$192,000 to carry out the project. Mr. Call pointed out that practically all recognized agencies have pledged their support in the project, which includes the study of delinquency and drop-outs. The research grant of \$192,000 is to stretch over an 18 month period.

Gordon Dudley, Director of Pupil Personnel Services, explained the drop-out study previously set up, and with the grant it would appear we have available to us the sources we need to go into it cooperatively.

It was generally agreed that since this opportunity has arisen, that the Superintendent write letters to each of the Guidance Committee people to relate this development and to relate a postponement of further Guidance Committee work until the possibilities of the Youth Study proposals have been ascertained.

It was further generally agreed to offer whatever office support possible to the Youth Study Board.

15. IMC Hours 15. Secretary Parnell announced that part-time help has been secured whereby the office would be open between the hours of 8:00 A.M. and 10:00 P.M., Monday through Thursday; 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. on Friday; and 9:00 A.M. to 11:00 A.M. on Saturdays.
16. Letter to the Editor 16. Director Swanson called attention to a letter to the editor appearing in the Register-Guard relative to helping small schools. The article suggested that more effort be given to building the curriculum in the small schools rather than putting so much effort in building larger schools. Mr. Swanson felt that an answer might be given to this article relating the various County Office aids to such schools.
17. Budget Committee 17. The matter of election of budget committee members was discussed. It was agreed to postpone this until the October 8th meeting.
18. The next meeting of the Board for the consideration of Reorganization and Boundary Board business will be held on September 24th, 1962, 1:30 P.M. The next regular meeting of the Board of Education will be held on October 8, 1962, at 1:30 P.M. Both meetings will be held in the County School Office.

Meeting adjourned.

Joe Richards, Chairman

Dale Parnell, Secretary

MINUTES OF THE LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE
May 15, 1962

Minutes
in brief

1. Attendance
1. The meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the Lane County School Office with the following members present: Chairman Ray Swanson, Edward Efteland, Joe Swift, Marvin Hendrickson, Paul Ehinger, Winifred Hult, and Dale Parnell, Secretary. Other people attending the meeting were: Mr. and Mrs. Allen Lindley of the Chase Gardens area, and Ralph Olive, Register Guard reporter.
2. Minutes Approved
2. Secretary Parnell read the minutes of February 20th. Chairman Swanson moved that the minutes as read be approved. Motion was seconded and carried.
3. Correspondence
3. Secretary Parnell read letters received, as follows:
 - a. Letter from Dennis Patch informing the Committee that the requested extension of time had been granted through June, 1962.
 - b. Letter from Dennis Patch acknowledging receipt of the Lane County School District Reorganization Committee Final Report and Comprehensive Plan and map.

Chairman Swanson read a copy of a letter which he had received from residents of the Gamebird Village and Deadmond's Ferry area, dated February 1, 1962, stating it is the desire of the area to be aligned with Eugene at present and in the future.
4. Financial Statement
4. Secretary Parnell presented the Reorganization Committee's financial statement:

1961-62 Allocation -----	\$ 1,650.00
Spent to May 15, 1962 -----	<u>1,319.94</u>
Balance Unspent -----	\$ 330.06
5. Final Report
5. Motion was made by Chairman Swanson and seconded by Mrs. Hult to incorporate the Final Report of the Lane County Committee in the minutes. Motion carried.

LANE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE
FINAL REPORT AND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

1. Lane County Committee members for the Reorganization of School Districts are: Ray Swanson, Chairman, Noti; William Wilt, Marcola; Joe Swift, Pleasant Hill; Marvin Hendrickson, Bethel; Edward Efteland, Eugene; Paul Ehinger, Westfir; David Burwell, McKenzie; Winifred Hult, Blachly; Gordon Hale, Springfield; and Dale Parnell, Lane County School Superintendent. Other people who have served are: William Woodie, Superintendent (deceased); Clarence Jackson, Creswell (deceased); Edgar Rickard, Cottage Grove; John Brewer, Swisshome; Earl Garoutte, Eugene; and Charles Foster, Vaughn.

2. The Committee has constantly sought the most efficient and effective school districts for Lane County. The Committee has addressed itself to the question: have our schools been organized to provide the following basic requirements?

- a. An excellent basic education in Language (English), Foreign Language, Mathematics, Social Studies, Science, Health, Physical Education, and those subjects that would help high school students develop marketable skills upon graduation from high school.
- b. Equal educational opportunities for all pupils of the county.
- c. Employment and retention of competent, well qualified teachers who are assigned to teach subjects in which they are specifically prepared.
- d. Coordinated administration of a continuous curricular program in grades 1 through 12, as required by the law.
- e. Better educational services at a reasonable per pupil cost.
- f. As great a degree of equalization of financial resources on the local level as circumstances and geography will permit.

3. Today there is evidence that Lane County has moved far in the direction of organizing efficient school districts. This Committee believes that school district reorganization does make a vital difference in the education of the children. There is evidence that *(1) boys and girls in reorganized districts have greater educational opportunities. (2) Reorganized districts produce higher academic achievement as shown by standardized achievement tests. (3) Reorganized districts make no significant changes in social and economic contacts between the rural and metropolitan areas in our county.

Here in Lane County, there is a direct relationship between the size of the school district and the number of subject matter offerings available to students; and conversely, there is also a direct relationship between the size of district and the per pupil cost. In Lane County, the number of subject matter offerings vary from 32 or less in three small high schools to 72 or more in three of the larger high schools. The small high schools pay \$1,000.00 or more per pupil for the 32 or less offerings and the larger high schools pay \$500.00 per pupil or less for course offerings ranging from 72 to 116.

All in all, research has piled up substantial amounts of evidence that reorganization of school districts does improve the education of boys and girls. The kind of school district in which children live does make a difference. Arithmetic scores are higher, total achievement greater, special teachers are available, better instructional materials, better reading comprehension, and greater achievement in science. There is much evidence favoring school district reorganizations.

*This research has been compiled from the "Wisconsin Study" on school district reorganization, and particularly from Special Bulletin #6 authored by Dr. Burton W. Krietlow entitled "School District Reorganization . . . Does it Make a Difference in Your Child's Education?"

4. Variation in property tax wealth behind each child in average daily membership has been reduced in Lane County from \$40.00 to \$1.00 in 1957 to a variation of \$5.00 to \$1.00 in 1962. Also, all of the ad valorem tax sources of the county are paying their proportionate share to support the total educational programs. In some cases, districts with little property wealth have been combined with districts of greater property tax wealth and are thereby helping to equalize the total county-wide financial structure.

5. What has happened in the Past Four Years Since the Beginning of the Reorganization Act:

- a. In 1959 there were 57,000 school districts in the United States. Today, there are 35,000.
- b. In 1957 at the beginning of the Reorganization Act, there were 709 school districts in Oregon. Today, there are 504.
- c. In 1957 Lane County had 47 school districts. Today, there are 18.
- d. All school districts in Lane County are providing education from grades one through twelve in 81 elementary schools, 12 junior high schools, and 20 senior high schools.

6. While all districts in Lane County have achieved a unified status in providing a coordinated educational program for 12 grades, the Committee feels that it is still desirable to attempt to improve the adequacy and efficiency of the educational program as recommended by State Standards. By combining some districts which are operating facilities within a short distance of each other, it would be possible to broaden the curriculum and to allow teachers to specialize in those areas for which they were specifically prepared. The Committee is presently working with the Boards of the following areas: Coburg and Eugene; Marcola and Springfield; Westfir and Oakridge; in studying the feasibility of these districts being joined. The Coburg-Eugene Reorganization will be voted on May 7, 1962.

- a. Florence, Mapleton, Blachly, Junction City, Bethel, South Lane (Cottage Grove), Creswell, and McKenzie have been declared administrative districts. Of these administrative districts this Committee feels that over the next few years further study should be made in the following areas, keeping in mind that the best plans usually result from the citizens of local school districts taking an active and objective interest in reorganization:

- (1). Junction City - Harrisburg (Linn County) and Monroe (Benton County) and perhaps a portion of the Blachly District.

(2). Blachly - There are now 48 high school students in this small, isolated district. If the number of high school students continues to decrease, it would appear that some study should be made with a view towards possibly splitting this district between Junction City and Mapleton.

(3). Creswell - Cottage Grove - It still appears that Creswell and Cottage Grove should be together. The financial situation of Creswell could be aided immeasurably by such a move.

b. Other plans that need another look by the citizens of the areas involved are: Pleasant Hill - Lowell, and Fern Ridge - Applegate.

c. The Committee strongly recommends the consolidation of the following districts: Coburg-Eugene, Marcola-Springfield, and Westfir-Oakridge.

Even though the voters of these areas have not been favorable to such proposed mergers, it is this Committee's conscientious duty to point out the belief that a better total educational program could be carried out if such mergers could be effected.

7. Reorganization has been a continuous process since school districts were first organized. Today, in Lane County there are 18 unified school districts as opposed to 47 districts in 1957 at the beginning of Committee work. Local Boards are to be commended for their excellent cooperation and efforts on behalf of better schools. It is this Committee's belief that local action on reorganization is a must. Someone has to "carry the ball" in the local school district. The best work has been done by the local community under the guidance of the Committee.

The 18 districts each have one Board of Education providing school services, making budgets, and levying taxes for all twelve grades. The School Districts of Lane County Are:

8. Statistical Picture

<u>District</u>	<u>Average Daily Membership</u>	<u>True Cash Value per Membership Child</u>
*Creswell	854.9	\$10,579.25
+Fern Ridge	1,305.6	10,862.58
Coburg	364.2	15,303.61
*Florence	1,213.3	17,503.05
Lowell	657.6	18,819.56
+Springfield	7,213.2	19,821.00
+Pleasant Hill	759.7	20,675.94
*Blachly	191.5	20,702.93
*Mapleton	584.7	22,432.25
+Eugene	14,701.9	23,291.00
*Junction City	1,480.5	23,443.31
*Bethel	2,700.0	24,624.69
Marcola	297.7	26,103.68

Statistical Picture, Contd.

<u>District</u>	<u>Average Daily Membership</u>	<u>True Cash Value per Membership Child</u>
*Cottage Grove	2,861.6	\$28,811.94
Westfir	259.6	29,826.63
+Oakridge	1,150.9	33,806.86
Applegate	459.6	35,963.88
*McKenzie	739.0	53,721.72

*completely reorganized within the law

+these qualify, but have not been declared due to work that yet needs to be done with neighboring districts.

9. This report adopted by the Committee on April 23, 1962, by a 9 for and 0 against vote.

6. Lindley Request for Boundary Change

6. Mr. Lindley, a resident of the Chase Gardens area, presented his request to the Committee for their approval of his request to petition the Boundary Board for transfer of territory from School District No. 19 to School District No. 4. He pointed out that the petition contained the signatures of all but two residents in the area and these had no school age children. His main reason for requesting the change is due to the division made by the freeway. At the present time part of the children attend the Eugene schools and part attend the Springfield schools. The area is closer to grade schools in the Eugene district, closer to Cal Young Junior High School, but may be a little further for those attending North Eugene High School. The area is aligned socially with the Eugene School District.

Letter read from Springfield Board

A letter was read from the Springfield Board indicating their opposition to this change.

Policies of Committee

Chairman Swanson quoted from Policies under date of April 1, 1958, Consolidation and Boundary Changes under Section 42: "---when the Committee finds that such action will not conflict with such reorganization plans of the county. ---"

Lindley Request Approved

Motion was made by Paul Ehinger and seconded by Edward Efteland that the Reorganization Committee give its approval on the Lindley request to transfer territory from School District No. 19 to School District No. 4. Motion carried. Secretary Parnell indicated that the Boundary Board would discuss this at their June 11 meeting and set a date for a hearing.

7. Canvass of #4 and #43 Election

7. The votes were canvassed from the reorganization elections held in School Districts No. 4 and 43 on May 7, 1962, and the results were found to be as follows:

	<u>For Reorganization</u>
School Dist. No. 4 -----	YES - 2589; NO - 1312
School Dist. No. 43 -----	YES - 149; NO - 169

Motion was made by Paul Ehinger and seconded by Marvin Hendrickson to declare the election lost, as a majority of votes cast in School District No. 43 rejected the proposal. Motion carried.

8. Final Meeting

8. In accordance with 330.150 the County Reorganization Committee shall serve until June 30, 1962. The meeting of May 15, 1962 was the final meeting of the Lane County Reorganization Committee and all further reorganization of the Lane County School Districts is transferred to the Lane County Rural School Board -- unless some business should arise between now and June 30 that would necessitate reorganization action. The committee went on record as offering the Rural Board as much help as they need as they assume this duty in the days ahead.

9. Secretary Comments

9. Secretary Dale Parnell made closing remarks indicating his personal pleasure at having served with the group over the past year and a half. He also indicated that the recommendations and work of this Committee would serve as a guideline for many years to come.

10. Meeting adjourned.



Ray Swanson, Chairman

Dale Parnell, Secretary

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION PUBLIC HEARING ON
PARTIAL PLAN OF REORGANIZATION R-4
Coburg High School
March 27, 1962

State Board of Education Hearing on the Lane County Partial Plan of Reorganization R-4, comprising component Lane County School Districts No. 4, Eugene, and No. 43, Coburg.

Hearing was held March 27, 1962 at 8:00 o'clock P.M. in the gymnasium of the Coburg High School and was attended by approximately sixty persons.

Mr. Ray Swanson, Chairman of the Lane County School District Reorganization Committee called the meeting to order and introduced the following: Mrs. Winifred Hult, Marvin Hendrickson and William Wilt, members of the Lane County Reorganization Committee; Dale Parnell, Lane County School Superintendent; Eugene Fisher, member of the State Board of Education; Dennis Patch, State Director of School District Reorganization; and, Margaret Blanton, recorder for the hearing.

Chairman Swanson then introduced Merle Shortt, Stanley Jensen, James Lake, and Claude McKibben, members of the Coburg School Board; Kenneth Williams, Superintendent of Coburg Schools; Dr. Millard Pond, Superintendent of Eugene Schools; Richard Miller, Vice-Chairman of the Eugene School Board; Ray Holcomb, member of the Lane County Rural School Board; Mr. Grimes, Mr. Bowers and Mr. Hollis, Harrisburg School Board members; and Mr. Wasson, Harrisburg Grade School Principal.

Chairman Swanson called upon Dennis Patch, who officially opened the hearing, and stated that this is the 161st State Board hearing held to consider a complete or partial plan of district reorganization submitted by a County Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts.

The Lane County Committee has adopted a plan of school district reorganization that proposes the formation of an administrative school district comprising all territory within the existing boundaries of Lane County School Districts No. 4-Eugene and No. 43-Coburg.

This partial plan of school district reorganization affecting the above listed school districts was adopted by the Lane County Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts, and submitted to the State Board of Education on February 28, 1962.

The Reorganization Act, a statute enacted by the 1957 Legislature, provides that within 30 days following receipt of a partial or complete plan of school district reorganization from a county committee, the State Board of Education, or its authorized representative, shall hold a public hearing on a plan. The purpose of such hearing is to afford to any resident of any school district affected by the plan, or any other interested person, an opportunity to appear before the Board or its authorized representative and be heard regarding the proposed plan.

Such is the purpose of this hearing tonight.

Following this hearing the State Board of Education shall within 60 days meet and review the plan and approve or reject the plan. The county committee must be notified of the Board's action on the plan within 10 days following the Board's action, if the plan is approved, and within 60 days if the plan is rejected.

If the plan is approved, within 60 days following receipt of notification of approval from the State Board an election shall be held at which the legal voters resident in each school district affected may vote to approve or reject the formation of the proposed administrative district.

If the election on the formation of an administrative school district is held between July 1 and April 30, and the voters approve the formation of the district, the new administrative district will go into effect on July 1 following the election. If the election is held between May 1 and June 30, and the vote is favorable, the new administrative district becomes effective on July 1 of the following year.

It is the policy of the State Board of Education to have at least one member of the State Board of Education present at each State Board hearing on district reorganization. Mr. Eugene Fisher, State Board member from Oakland, Oregon, is in attendance at this hearing. The State Board has authorized me to conduct this hearing.

The procedure that will be used at this hearing is briefly this: In the interest of providing an opportunity for those interested to speak I shall call the names of those who have requested to speak. This will continue until all who wish to speak or ask questions have been given such an opportunity. Following this any person who has entered late and who is a resident of the affected area will be granted an opportunity to speak.

If you have questions regarding the plan please give them to me and I will direct them to Mr. Swanson, Chairman of the Lane County Committee who will either answer them or refer them to some other member of the County Committee.

So that we may have an accurate record of the proceedings we ask that any person who has not signed to speak, or anyone who wants to ask a question, please stand and give your name and the school district in which you live.

This hearing is for the purpose of affording people residing in the affected districts an opportunity to express themselves regarding the plan, or to ask questions regarding the committee's proposal. This hearing is not a public hearing on the Reorganization Law.

Chairman Swanson called upon William Wilt to review the proposed Plan. Mr. Wilt reviewed the Plan as presented to the State Board.

Mr. Patch called for statements from any patron from the Eugene and Coburg districts, starting with Eugene and rotating by districts.

Richard Miller, Vice-Chairman, Eugene School Board - Was designated by the Eugene School Board to attend meeting. In the event this reorganization is accepted, the Eugene School Board welcomes and Coburg School District and hopes the Coburg School Districts welcomes the Eugene District.

Judy Adair - a 1959 graduate of Coburg High School and at present a junior at Oregon State University. A broader high school curriculum would have helped her in college. Eugene offers more courses in languages, mathematics and other fields. It is difficult to adjust from a small school to a large university. Commended Superintendent Williams on the good job he and the teachers have done but felt the students graduating from Eugene have the opportunity only the larger district can offer.

Merle Short, Chairman, Coburg School Board. Thanked Mr. Miller for welcome from Eugene School Board. Hope people in Coburg will welcome the opportunity the same as I do.

Dr. Millard Pond, Superintendent, Eugene Schools. We have talked with the teachers and feel it would be good for the boys and girls and good for the community.

Mrs. Morneau, Coburg. Thanked Eugene for welcoming Coburg. Feels it is definitely what we need.

Dennis Patch ended rotation method and asked for any comments from those present regarding the proposal.

Ray Holcomb - formerly a member of the Coburg School Board but now a resident of the Eugene School district, brought about by a boundary change. His two children attended Coburg High School but he instigated a boundary change in order that his children could attend the Eugene schools. Coburg may be reluctant to send their children to a large school but my children have adapted very easily and they are very happy at North Eugene High School.

Kenneth Williams, Superintendent, Coburg Schools. Thanked Judy Adair for her comments. Basically, what Judy outlined to you is true and the points she brought out were very well given. Under the present plan we are reaching the law of diminishing returns. We plan to add three more classes to our overloaded program with no added teachers. The per pupil cost in Coburg is low in comparison with schools our size. If we did add additional teachers with our present enrolment we would no doubt get into trouble with the State Department. Believe we are going to have to come to some of the small school philosophies. Small group instruction is essential and is being planned in the Eugene district. We must also take into consideration bonding capacity for Coburg and the cost factor in developing a good educational program. To make a program work we need students and money. Take a good look at what we have here and then take a good look at what we can have with an adjacent district. What we do from that point on is toward a better education. If reorganization is defeated it would be my recommendation to provide the type of education I have outlined tonight.

Lyle Jacobson, Coburg. Feels the plan presented is a loaded document. You are telling us what we haven't got but you haven't pointed out the good things. Perhaps Coburg is short of courses but there are advantages of children being individuals.

Dennis Patch - There are some inherited advantages in a small school that are extensive.

Kenneth Williams, Superintendent, Coburg Schools. Relative to courses offered, Coburg is offering courses we feel meet the minimum requirements for college and vocational program. We are short in offering courses for students in Vocational Training or those going directly to work. Cost angle is something to be taken into consideration. Small district cannot handle. As far as the college students feel we are giving as good a preparation as any high school in Oregon. Haven't had any "flunked out" of college and this speaks well of our program. Competition though, is a needed factor.

Dennis Patch - The Brochure prepared by the Committee is factual and not "loaded". I have worked with 36 County Committees. The Lane County Committee adopted definite policies, had good leadership and I am certain in the future people will appreciate what the County Committee has done. People are the ones to decide this and that is the way it should be.

William Wilt, Lane County Reorganization Committee Member. We are trying to give you the advantages as we see them. In regards to getting specialized teachers in the various fields, it is becoming difficult to find teachers to teach key subjects.

Lyle Jacobson, Coburg. To me it is selling us on a big school idea. Basically, kids are getting the same subjects in the first two years of college as we are offering here. What is the importance of a wide spread of subjects? Cost-wise it is an advantage.

Dennis Patch - It is much more strenuous now for students than it was formerly. If we are to do the job and retain the leadership we had better think in terms of only the "best". I am sure you are doing a good job but I think we could do a better job. Children are the only asset we have in the country and we had better do the best we can for them.

Dr. Millard Pond, Superintendent, Eugene Schools. If we are fortunate enough to get together we will continue as we are now doing in the elementary, junior high and high school. We are planning next year to offer Counseling and Guidance in the elementary schools. Junior and Senior High will have the same program throughout. I think we are going to have to bet on education and bet highly. I think it would be good for the boys and girls and that is what we want.

Ray Swanson, Chairman, Lane County Reorganization Committee. Am gratified with statements made by Miss Adair. There are some advantages of a small school. However, in drafting a plan like this it is more or less a package deal. We have to make a choice and if voted, to make a program to fit your needs. We have to choose one or the other. We are not going to move the Eugene children into the Coburg High School but students from both districts will move into a new high school.

Eugene Fisher, State Board Member. As a State Board Member I am here to listen. I do not know how you are doing it on the price per student. Being a farmer and taxpayer I would be concerned with my ability as a taxpayer to carry the load in the future to educate our boys and girls. As a Board Member, with the junior colleges expanded and elementary and high school programs, costs are going to be high. The small school does have some advantages but I wonder if we can afford those advantages. As a board in Coburg I would seriously think of these problems and study the Plan the Committee has put before you. In the final analysis the decision is in your hands and I hope it will be the right one.

Dale Parnell, Lane County School Superintendent. The Eugene and Coburg Boards met for the purpose of arriving at the facts to present to you in this Plan. There are advantages to both large and small high schools. We must decide the type of education we want to provide for our boys and girls in the future.

Dennis Patch thanked the Coburg School Board and Superintendent Williams for providing the facilities; the Lane County Committee for their presentation; Eugene Fisher for representing the State Board of Education; and, patrons for their interest in attending.

Hearing adjourned.

MINUTES OF THE LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE
October 17, 1961

Minutes
in brief

1. Attendance
1. The meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the Lane County School Office with the following members present: Chairman Ray Swanson, Edward Efteland, Joe Swift, William Wilt, Marvin Hendrickson, and Dale Parnell, Secretary. Other people attending the meeting were: Merle Short and Stanley Jensen, Coburg School Board Members; Kenneth Williams, Superintendent, Coburg Schools; and Don Robinson, Register Guard reporter.
2. Minutes Approved
2. A motion was made by Mr. Swift and seconded by Mr. Wilt, that the minutes of the September 19th meeting be approved as received by mail. The motion was carried.
3. Correspondence
3. Secretary Parnell read letters received, as follows:
 - a. Letter from Dennis Patch informing the Committee that they should request an extension of time for Committee work.
 - b. Letter and Citation Award from The Better Homes and Gardens Magazine in behalf of the work of the Reorganization.
 - c. Letter from Dr. Pond informing the Committee that a joint meeting of the Coburg and Eugene Boards had been set for October 30th in the County School Office.
4. Coburg-Eugene Reorganization
4. The matter of the Coburg-Eugene Reorganization was discussed at length. Two dates had been suggested to the Committee as dates on which to hold the Coburg-Eugene Reorganization election: Monday, May 7, 1962 (which is the annual election date), and Monday, June 4, 1962.

After considerable discussion it was the concensus of opinion of the Committee that they will set the date of the election in accordance with the wishes of the two districts and asked this be discussed at the October 30th meeting.
5. Administrative Districts
5. Secretary Parnell listed the following school districts in Lane County which had not been declared Administrative School Districts to date: Nos. 28J, 66, 19, 79, 1, 71, 117, 76, 43, and 4. No further action was taken on this issue.
6. Future Meetings
6. It was the decision of the Committee to set up future meetings on call of the Chairman. As it now stands, no meetings of the Committee are anticipated until January, 1962.

Meeting adjourned.

Ray C. Swanson

Ray Swanson, Chairman

Dale Parnell

Dale Parnell, Secretary

MINUTES OF THE LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE
January 16, 1962

Minutes
in brief:

1. Attendance
1. The meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the Lane County School Office with the following members present: Chairman Ray Swanson, Edward Efteland, Joe Swift, William Wilt, Marvin Hendrickson, Winifred Hult, Paul Ehinger, and Dale Parnell, Secretary. Other people attending the meeting were: Kenneth Williams Superintendent of Coburg schools; Arthur Moran, Marcola Board member; William A. Lindley, Garden Way (#19); Mrs. Robert Culver, Gamebird Village area, and one other lady from that area; and Ralph Olive, Register Guard reporter.
2. In Memoriam for Clarence Jackson
2. Ray Swanson, Chairman, asked that a moment of silence be held honoring Clarence Jackson, a member of the Reorganization Committee, who passed away recently.
3. Dave Burwell nominated to replace Jackson
3. Secretary Parnell stated that Dave Burwell is the alternate Committee member who would fill Mr. Jackson's unexpired term. Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mrs. Hult, and carried, that Mr. Dave Burwell of Leaburg be seated as a member of the Reorganization Committee.
4. Joint Statement accepted from Coburg-Eugene Boards
4. Joint Statement of the School Boards of Districts No. 4 and 43 was presented and discussed. The Statement generally included the same proposals as formerly submitted, with the statistics and information brought up-to-date. No comments were made by those present, outside the Committee, regarding the Joint Statement.
5. Coburg-Eugene Election set for May 7, 1962
5. Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Hendrickson and carried, that the election on the R-4 Plan comprising School Districts No. 4 and 43, be set for Monday, May 7, 1962.
6. Hearing held on February 20th
6. Motion was made by Mr. Hendrickson, seconded by Mrs. Hult, and carried, that the local hearing on the Plan to form an Administrative School District comprising School Districts No. 4 and 43, be held on February 20, 1962.
7. Hearing at Coburg
7. Motion was made by Mr. Efteland, seconded by Mr. Swift, and carried, that the local hearing on Districts No. 4 and 43, be held in the gymnasium, Coburg High School, commencing at 8:00 P. M.
8. Petition request approved
8. Secretary Parnell presented a petition from Mitchell Fox requesting a transfer of 80 acres from School District No. 1 to School District No. 71.
Motion was made by Mr. Hendrickson, seconded by Mr. Wilt, and carried, that the petition be presented to the District Boundary Board with the approval of the Reorganization Committee.

of this. The present problem is the building situation -- mainly the erection of a Junior High School. Generally, the Board and staff at Cottage Grove are to be commended on the smooth transition. This has all the elements for a very strong school district.

13. Pleasant Hill

13. Mr. Swift asked if the members of the Committee wished to receive the Pleasant Hill papers in the future. The Committee indicated they would appreciate being kept on the mailing list.

14. Citizen speaks

14. Mrs. Robert Culver, residing in the Gamebird Village area, expressed her appreciation for the kind consideration given her and other parties relative to the first proposal to transfer the Gamebird Village area to District No. 19. She commended the Committee for their excellent work.

15. Next Meeting

15. The next meeting is set for February 20, 1962, at 8:00 P.M. at Coburg High School.

LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE



Ray Swanson, Chairman

Dale Parnell, Secretary

9. Petition
dropped

9. Secretary Parnell presented a petition, signed by three members of the Springfield School Board, including a request for transfer of territory from School District No. 19 to School District No. 4; and, the transfer of territory from School District No. 4 to School District No. 19. (Secretary Parnell showed the territory proposed in the petition on an overhead projector.)

Mr. William Lindley, a resident of the Garden Way area, included in the portion proposed to be transferred from School District No. 19 to School District No. 4, stated that he would like to receive more information regarding this proposal. General feeling was that the majority of people do not wish to change from District No. 19 to District No. 4. He felt that there was no problem of access, as there is an overhead pass at Chase Gardens which makes it convenient to the Springfield schools. He stated this involves from 15 to 17 acres with 7 ownerships.

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Efteland, and carried, that the above petition be dropped until further interest is shown by people who live in the area, or by the combined School Boards.

10. Springfield-
Marcola meet-
ing set for
January 22nd

10. Secretary Parnell informed the Committee that the Marcola School Board had instructed their Superintendent to arrange a meeting with the Springfield Board to discuss action on the former Plan, including School Districts No. 19 and 79. The date of this meeting has been set for Monday, January 22nd, at Mohawk Elementary School.

Chairman Swanson suggested that the Committee request the School Boards of Districts No. 19 and 79 to develop a joint statement on proposed R-9, similar to the joint statement issued by the Eugene and Coburg School Boards.

Motion was made by Mr. Hendrickson, seconded by Mr. Swift, and carried, to request the School Boards of Districts No. 19 and 79 to develop a joint statement of facts including both districts.

11. Oakridge-
Westfir Boards
requested to
get together

11. Mr. Ehinger suggested that the Committee extend the same recommendation to the School Boards of Districts No. 76 and 117.

Motion was made by Mr. Efteland, seconded by Mr. Hendrickson, and carried, that a letter be sent to the School Boards of Districts No. 76 and 117, requesting that they consider preparing a joint statement similar to that prepared by the School Boards of Districts No. 4 and 43.

12. Cottage Grove
transition

12. Mr. Efteland asked what, if any, is the implication of the tax situation in Cottage Grove? Will the timber re-evaluation hurt them?

Secretary Parnell stated that it will effect them for next year, in particular. Increased evaluation, however, will pick up some

July 6, 1961
Albany, Oregon

The Linn County Reorganization Committee met Thursday evening, July 6th, 1961, at 8:00 p.m., in the Cafetorium of Harrisburg High School with the Lane County Reorganization Committee, and board members representing Harris, Wyatt, Harrisburg Elementary, Harrisburg High School and Coburg. There were approximately 40 present, including the Superintendents of Coburg and Harrisburg High School. Linn County Committee members present were Mr. Detering, Mr. Grenz, Mr. Jenks, Mr. Mullen, Mr. Freaner and W. H. Dolmyer. Lane County Committee members present were Mr. Swanson, Mr. Efteland, Mr. Hendrickson, Mr. Hult, Mr. Wilt, Mr. Swift and Dale Parnell.

Mr. Detering called the meeting to order, and explained the purpose of the meeting.

Mr. Swanson then spoke, explaining Lane County's position. He pointed out that the Goldhammer study and the opinion poll taken at Coburg did not favor Coburg and Harrisburg consolidating. In this original 1959 plan, there was to be a high school at Harrisburg. The plan now was for a new building in the vicinity of Coburg, and arousing more interest, Lane County had an R-4 plan of Coburg joining with Eugene. This was voted on and failed. The Lane County Committee heard through the newspapers of the Coburg-Harrisburg meetings and Coburg's interest in a study being made of Coburg-Harrisburg. Lane County now wants to start a study to see whether they want to recommend the plan. After tonight's meeting, Lane County will want to get an opinionaire from the Coburg people.

Groups present were introduced by the chairmen of these groups and then individuals present that had not been introduced, introduced themselves.

Mr. Swanson questioned the need for classrooms in the Harrisburg area.

Mr. Purvis answered that Harrisburg elementary, had built 4 rooms last summer and that they were not crowded at this time.

Mr. Hakanson reported an increase of 25 students since the study was made. There was no need yet for classrooms, but they did need a music room, lockers and shower rooms.

Mr. Malpass reported that Wyatt School facilities were adequate - with three classrooms and a gym for 50 students.

Mr. Smucker reported on the two room Harris school, stating that the enrollment of 41 seems to run about the same each year.

The chairman from Coburg district reported that the elementary school just added three rooms and they were now adequate. They have 250 elementary ADM. The Coburg High School is condemned and they need to do something. There are 9 rooms in the old building. The high school predicts an enrollment of 118.

Mr. Williams of Coburg stated that the elementary school would be adequate this year only. At present rate of growth, they will need to build in one more year. The high school is growing about 14-15 students per year. If Coburg joined with Eugene, they would move out the 7th and 8th grades too and would not then need to build for the grade school for about three or four years. Mr. Williams further stated that any repair to Coburg High School would have to be major and expensive. They will soon have to re-roof and paint, if they use the building any more. The building has needed to be replaced since 1945.

Mr. Jenks talked of meetings with Coburg and Harrisburg. He feels that the plan suggested is good and that it fills the need expressed by the Reorganization Act. He recommends further study of the plan.

Mr. Parnell suggested finding out how members of the U-5 component districts feel toward building a joint high school in the Coburg vicinity.

Mr. Detering mentioned some Harrisburg people do not favor this, as they feel that the Harrisburg buildings are adequate.

Mr. Swanson read his questionnaire-opinionaire to the group, suggesting they fill it out and let Mr. Parnell have them when filled out, to composite a study. (See attached)

Mr. Grimes spoke regarding the impossibility of setting a site for a new high school now - that it would be up to the voters at a bond election to determine a location.

Mr. Swanson spoke of small high schools having only 40-45 subjects - Eugene has 95. Financially Coburg and Lane County would benefit by joining Harrisburg.

Mr. Dolmyer and Mr. Parnell spoke briefly regarding the size of a high school. Mr. Parnell mentioned the Coburg-Eugene vote - that the people of Coburg and the Lane County Committee want to take a good hard look at the plan and find out how the people of Harrisburg and Coburg feel.

Mr. Purvis asked where the information and ideas of a high school in the Coburg area came from. Mr. Detering said from the Linn County Committee.

Mr. Epling mentioned surprise of the Lane County committee upon hearing of the latest Harrisburg-Coburg plan. He felt that the Coburg board should present to the Lane County committee a formal request, if they want action on such a plan.

Mr. Grimes spoke again regarding the Goldhammer study and the Coburg-Eugene vote. He stated that we need to study the educational plan more and the tax and location less. He mentioned the lack of success in college of the Harrisburg High School graduates. He also quoted national averages of earnings of elementary, high school and college graduates.

Mr. Williams of Coburg was asked to speak briefly. He reviewed briefly the three years of Coburg Reorganization. He mentioned the unfavorable vote of Coburg and Eugene, - a small district, large district vote. He stated that the vote may have taken place at the wrong time of year. He mentioned that the Coburg Board would favor a study of Coburg-Harrisburg under the Lane County Rural School Board with a new high school near Coburg. Mr. Williams stated that we must look at a plan which will work for years - not temporarily. The potential growth around Coburg was great - there is constant talk of sub-dividing farm areas. Coburg and Lane County want to know how the Harrisburg area feels regarding a new school at Coburg - elementary board members as well as high school. He feels that Harrisburg and Coburg could combine and give a good educational program, less expensive than Eugene. Coburg must do something within a year.

Mr. Hakanson spoke also, stating that a combined high school could give a good educational program. By the time school opens they could have 300 or more enrollment. More important than the size of the school is the expectation - will - desire of the community - how good a school they want.

Mr. Swanson was called on and read from the Goldhammer report regarding the utilization of buildings. The Coburg building should be abandoned. The Harrisburg building could be remodelled and used for years - but is not large enough to hold Coburg and Harrisburg. The question now is should Harrisburg abandon an adequate high school to build a new one.


Unless a better plan is presented, the last plans will be represented - Coburg, Marcola, Westfir, and Oakridge.

Another suggestion was that the committee might split Harrisburg - part to Central Linn and part to Junction City.

A Coburg board member mentioned a study to be made for a school in Lane County between Harrisburg and Coburg.

Mr. Swanson then thanked Mr. Detering and Harrisburg for the invitation.

After Mr. Detering thanked all for coming and participating, the meeting adjourned to refreshments at 10:00 p.m.



W. H. Dolmyer, Secretary

MINUTES OF THE LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE
September 19, 1961

Minutes
in brief

1. Attendance

1. The meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the Lane County School Office with the following members present: Chairman Ray Swanson, Edward Efteland, Paul Ehinger, Winifred Hult, Joe Swift, William Wilt, and Dale Parnell, Secretary. Other people attending the meeting were: Merle Short, William Stevenson, Stanley Jensen, Claude McKibben, and James Lake, Coburg School Board Members; Richard E. Miller, Eugene School Board Member; Superintendent Millard Pond and Assistant Superintendent Lloyd Millhollen, Eugene School District; Superintendent Kenneth Williams, Coburg School District; Mr. and Mrs. Ray Holcomb, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Morneau, residents of the Coburg School District; and Ralph Olive, Register Guard reported.

2. Minutes
Approved

2. A motion was made by Mr. Efteland and seconded by Mr. Ehinger, that the minutes of the August 17th meeting be approved as received by mail. The motion was carried.

3. New High
School

3. A scale plan of the new Willakenzie area High School was presented and Dr. Pond and Dr. Millhollen explained the physical facilities of the new high school and answered various questions regarding the building.

4. The R-4
Plan

4. Secretary Parnell presented a recap of the proposed R-4 Plan, consisting of School Districts No. 4 and 43. It was pointed out that after considerable consideration the Committee decided to hold another election to vote on the R-4 Plan, and that this meeting was called to plan such an election.

The opinion of the Committee expressed at the last meeting indicated that the Committee should not digress from the original Plan. It was pointed out by Chairman Swanson that the final decision will be that of the people. The Committee desires complete and accurate information be given to the people so they can make their own decision.

Chairman Ray Swanson stated that the Committee wishes recommendations as to "timing" of County Hearings, State Hearings, and Elections.

5. Statements
from Eugene

5. Dr. Pond, Superintendent of Eugene, stated that Eugene was interested primarily in what it can do for the education of all boys and girls and that space would be available for the Coburg students.

Eugene Board Member Richard Miller, stated that District No. 4 has been hesitant to indicate they are pushing reorganization. The guide is to determine what is best for the education of the children in our County. Eugene is willing to participate in any program that would be best for the children in Coburg. Eugene is not attempting

5. (Continued) to go out and get any school districts. However, Coburg would be welcome and facilities available to the Coburg students. The Eugene Board doesn't want to be looked upon as trying to take over any school district, but would approve the formation of this administrative district.
- Dr. Millhollen stated that Eugene would probably have to make some adjustment if this were effective in 1962, but in 1963 it would work out satisfactorily, should Coburg vote in favor. Eugene would prefer to keep students from Coburg (High) in the same high school building. Junior High students would probably go to Cal Young and the elementary school remain in Coburg. If Coburg approves, it would help if it were done early enough for Eugene to start planning any necessary classrooms (this is started in November of each year).
6. Rulings on Districts over 40,000 census 6. Secretary Parnell read from a letter written by the Attorney General to the effect that school districts with over 40,000 have some different rulings on zoning and board members. In this sized district, zoning is not allowed and there must be seven board members.
7. Statement from Coburg 7. Kenneth Williams, Superintendent of Coburg, stated they are faced with a crisis in the High School building. It is essential that an election be held, the sooner the better as far as the building is concerned. If it passes, Coburg could probably get around the problem for the next year (1962-63). He felt they must have a real strong statement that children will stay in a specific school and not split them. It is desired that students stay together during the school year. It would be desirable to wait another year and move them into the new Willakenzie area high school and know that it is their school. People like to feel close to their school. The feeling of ownership has considerable effect.
8. Discussion of Boundaries for the new high school 8. Mr. Short, Chairman of Coburg Board, asked the question - would the curriculum be different in the three Eugene high schools?
- Dr. Pond said that there would be no significant difference in curriculum. Agriculture is not planned in the new high school for 1963. Agriculture is offered in S.E.H.S., and there are not enough students to expand at the present time. It is not an impossibility, however, to include Agriculture in the new high school if there is a demand.
- Mr. Short then asked, if at the time of the election, could Coburg be assured they would attend the new high school?
- Dr. Pond answered that promises could not be made, however, we can show them this high school is built to serve that area.
- Dr. Millhollen stated that when this high school is completed, the Board will no doubt have to redraw the boundaries for all three high schools. We try to keep geographical areas together, and it would be logical that the Coburg children would attend the new high school.
- Dr. Pond indicated that after talking the problem of "timing" over,

8. (Continued) it would seem, perhaps, that 1963 would be most logical for the effective date if vote passed.
9. Objections to the R-4 Plan
9. Paul Ehinger of the Reorganization Committee asked if there are any objections or support for the R-4 Plan.
Mr. Lake of the Coburg Board, stated they had asked permission to discuss feasibility of Harrisburg and Coburg combining. They held one meeting and felt nothing was accomplished. Lots of people in Coburg are still interested in this Plan. This will cause some resentment on the R-4 Plan. However, the R-4 Plan might have a possibility of passing when the new Eugene high school is built.
10. Boards to get together
10. Mr. Miller of Eugene commented that perhaps the Coburg Board would be willing to meet with the Eugene Board to discuss this Plan. It was agreed this should be done.
11. Difference between May and November elections
11. Mr. Short of the Coburg Board asked what was the difference between May and November elections?
Mr. Swanson answered that if an election is held before April 30th it would become effective July 1, 1962. If election is held after April 30th, it would not become effective until July 1, 1963. He further commented that the people of District No. 4 have indicated "timing" is not a critical factor. The people from Coburg may feel otherwise. He asked the Coburg Board to make a recommendation on this. (The Coburg Board left the room for an executive session to make a decision on this.)
12. Rumors about the new high school
12. Mrs. Morneau of the audience asked to make a comment to the effect that not enough people in Coburg know the facts and the full story. It has been rumored that the new Eugene high school is going to be an experimental school, and the Coburg children cannot attend.
Mr. Miller of Eugene replied that this is not true. The Board was fortunate to get a Ford Foundation grant and made numerous visits to inspect school buildings. The Eugene Project is a utilization of proven programs in the United States, and is not an experiment with children. We do not have the time to experiment with the education of our children. The program has been developed over a period of one year, and if Coburg votes to join with Eugene, we would expect to involve the people of Coburg on lay committees to help give advice on the education of our children.
13. Election timing
13. The Coburg Board and Superintendent were then asked by Chairman Swanson to make a recommendation to the committee on the timing of an R-4 election. The Coburg Board left the room to discuss the matter. When they returned they presented the following statement:
"We, the Coburg School Board, favor an election on the R-4 Plan in May, 1962".

14. Two Boards to present a joint statement on R-4 Plan

14. Mr. Williams of Coburg stated we are working on borrowed time as far as the Coburg High School building is concerned. We will work as hard as we can to do the best we can in our curriculum. We know we are going down a blind alley and it can't go on forever. We feel something has to be done soon.

Dr. Pond of Eugene then proposed that the two boards and two administrators get together and jointly approve a set of statements on the R-4 Plan. It was agreed by all that this should be done in the near future.

15. Next meeting

15. The Committee set Tuesday, October 17th as the date for the next Reorganization Committee meeting, and the meeting adjourned.


Ray Swanson, Chairman


Dale Parnell, Secretary

MINUTES OF THE LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

August 17, 1961

Minutes
in brief

1. Attendance

1. The meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the Lane County School Office with the following members present: Chairman Ray Swanson, Edward Efteland, Paul Ehinger, Marvin Hendrickson, Clarence Jackson, Winifred Hult, Joe Swift, William Wilt, and Dale Parnell, Secretary. Other people attending the meeting were: Mrs. Johnson, Mrs. Leeper, Mr. Holcomb, members of the Lane County Board of Education; Mr. Funk, resident of Coburg; Mr. Downing, Mr. Paschelke, Mr. Moran, Marcola School Board; and Ralph Olive, Register Guard reporter.

2. Minutes
Approved

2. A motion was made by Mr. Swift and seconded by Mr. Jackson, that the minutes of the June 20th and July 6th meetings be approved as received by mail. The motion was carried.

3. Corres-
pondence

3. Secretary Parnell reported that many letters had been received from throughout the state complimenting the committee on the "Report to the People" brochure.

4. Harrisburg-
Coburg
plan
rejected

4. Chairman Swanson called for discussion on the proposed Harrisburg-Coburg reorganization plan as submitted by the Linn County Reorganization Committee. Minutes of the July 6th joint meeting in Harrisburg were reviewed, and each committee member expressed his or her views on this plan. The feelings were generally expressed that there needs to be a clearing of the air in the Coburg area as to what the residents of Coburg would desire. However, after the committee spent considerable time on reviewing the Coburg-Harrisburg reorganization plan, it was felt that this was not the best plan for the Coburg School District, and therefore, the committee is honor-bound to submit the plan they feel is "first best". Comments were heard from Mr. Ray Holcomb, and Mr. Leon Funk, residents of the Coburg area, to the effect that there were divided feelings on the Coburg Board in relationship to this plan. In view of this division, the Reorganization Committee should not wait on the Coburg Board to provide the leadership in the reorganization plan. The committee should proceed by submitting the R-4 plan to a vote of the people again.

It was moved by Mr. Ehinger and seconded by Mrs. Hult that the Lane County Reorganization Committee reject the Harrisburg-Coburg reorganization plan as submitted by the Linn County Committee, and that the Linn County Committee be so notified of this action. The motion was carried unanimously.

5. Timing on a Coburg-Eugene vote

5. Discussion then began on the timing for re-submitting the R-4 Eugene-Coburg Plan to the people for a vote. It was generally agreed that the secretary should write the Coburg Board telling of the action in rejecting the Harrisburg-Coburg reorganization, and asking the Coburg Board to work with the Reorganization Committee in re-submitting the R-4 Plan. The Coburg and Eugene Boards are to be asked to suggest the most reasonable timing for this election. The secretary was asked to invite the Coburg Superintendent and members of the Coburg Board to the next meeting of the Reorganization Committee to be held on September 19th, 1961 in the Lane County School Office, and also to invite Dr. Pond of Eugene to this meeting to discuss this entire situation.

6. Boundary change request

6. Mr. Ray Holcomb requested permission of the Committee to take a Boundary petition to the District Boundary Board that would move his 10 acres, which is in the Armitage Bridge area and contiguous to the Eugene School District. This petition asks that this area be withdrawn from the Coburg School District and added to the Eugene School District. Mr. Hendrickson moved that as this did not seem to conflict with the other reorganization plans and activities, that the Reorganization Committee give its approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ehinger and carried.

7. Marcola-Springfield discussion

7. The Chairman then called for discussion on the Marcola-Springfield reorganization plan. Secretary Parnell reported that the Springfield Board has asked that no action be taken on this until after the first of the year, due to pending bond and serial levy vote to be held in that district. However, the Springfield District is interested and willing to talk or work together with the Marcola Board on holding another election after the first of the year.


There was general discussion by the committee as to whether any of the circumstances in the Springfield-Marcola area had changed since the last election. It was generally agreed that with the addition of the new Thurston High School in the Springfield area that this did, somewhat, change the picture from the last election. It was suggested that the secretary get the board members of the Coburg and Springfield Districts together to discuss this problem sometime during the fall months.


8. Next meeting

8. The committee set the date of the next meeting for Tuesday, September 19th, 1961, in the Lane County School Office.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR
SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION


Ray Swanson, Chairman


Dale Parnell, Secretary

Minutes
in brief

MINUTES OF THE LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE
June 20, 1961

1. Members present
1. Meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County School Office with the following members present:

Ray Swanson, Chairman	William Wilt
Edward Efteland	Winifred Hult
Marvin Hendrickson	Dale Parnell, Secretary
2. Minutes approved
2. Motion was made by William Wilt, seconded by Edward Efteland, and carried, that the minutes of the meetings of May 16, 1961 and May 29, 1961, be approved.
3. Linn County meeting canceled
3. Secretary Dale Parnell reported that the Linn County Committee had requested that the meeting previously scheduled for June 20th, with the Linn County Committee and the school boards of Harrisburg, Ward-Wyatt, and Coburg, be held at a later date, as several members of the committee would be unable to attend. In view of this, it was felt it would be feasible to comply with their request.
4. Report to the People
4. Secretary Dale Parnell presented data to be included in the "Report to the People" brochure. After considerable discussion, a motion was made by Marvin Hendrickson, seconded by Winifred Hult, and carried, that the statements as written and prepared by the Secretary, be approved for inclusion in the brochure and published for circulation.
5. Committee Reactions to Harrisburg-Coburg Plan
5. Members of the Committee reported their feeling on Plan comprising the Coburg and Harrisburg School Districts:

Mrs. Hult - Did not feel a Plan to include Coburg and Harrisburg would be too feasible, and over a period of years, it would not be too practical from a financial standpoint. Questioned that the people of Coburg would be happy with this Plan.

Mr. Wilt - Felt committee should re-submit the R-4 Plan, including Coburg and Eugene. Felt that even though the proponents of the Harrisburg-Coburg Plan proposed the location of the high school in Lane County, that this was only a gentleman's agreement and is not binding action on future boards.

Paul Ehinger (unable to be present, but reported to Secretary Parnell by telephone) - Felt the committee should re-submit the R-4 Plan to the people this fall, before holding a Coburg-Harrisburg election. Felt the committee was honor-bound to submit the plan they felt was "first" best.

Ray Swanson - Felt that the Coburg-Harrisburg proposal does conflict with the criteria and questioned its desirability for the patrons of Coburg in view of the fact that in future elections, Harrisburg would have a majority vote.

5. Continued

Edward Efteland - Pointed out that the policy of the Committee had been to go to the School Boards for their recommendations. Is in sympathy with the R-4 Plan, but could not vote in favor of this until the Coburg-Harrisburg problem is settled. Felt that after the combined meeting of the Coburg, Harrisburg, and Ward-Wyatt boards and the Linn County Committee, the Coburg Board should then be asked to express their desire.

Leon Funk, patron of the Coburg district, was present relative to the Coburg-Harrisburg proposal. Called to the Committee's attention the research made in 1958 by the University of Oregon. Pointed out that Dr. Goldhammer of the University sold both boards on the research; that both boards voted to raise the money on a 50/50 basis; and that they would abide by the program. Program was not circulated widely in district and was more or less laid aside.

6. Harrisburg meeting discussed

6. Discussion was held regarding the type of meeting to be held including the Linn County Committee, and the boards of Harrisburg Union and Elementary, Ward-Wyatt, Coburg, and the Lane County Committee. The Committee favored that the meeting be announced as an open meeting stating, however, that its purpose is to secure the opinion of the Board Members in all the affected districts. That the meeting be open for discussion only after all Board members have been heard.

7. Mapleton-Fern Ridge Boundary Change

7. Superintendent Claude Martin of Mapleton, restated the request of the Mapleton School Board for transfer of territory from the Fern Ridge district to the Mapleton district.

Superintendent Nile Williams of Fern Ridge, presented a cost comparison of the Mapleton and Fern Ridge districts and discussed several aspects of the proposed change.

Ray Swanson reported that most of the land in the area included in the proposed change is owned by U. S. Plywood, Paper Companies, and National Forest. Superintendent Martin was asked to obtain an approximate evaluation of the areas involved for study at a future meeting.

8. Timing of proposed election discussed

8. Secretary Dale Parnell suggested the timing on proposed Plans be considered carefully by the committee and that any plan submitted for a vote on these second votes be carefully constructed with much ground work done before a vote called.

9. Date of next Meeting

9. It was agreed by the Committee to tentatively set the date of the next meeting for sometime in July at Ward-Wyatt School, pending approval of date by the Linn County Committee and the Harrisburg, Coburg and Ward-Wyatt School Boards.

Meeting adjourned.

Note: The date of the next meeting has been set at Harrisburg Union High School on Thursday, July 6th, at 8:00 P. M. (Standard time). The place was changed from Ward-Wyatt to Harrisburg due to painting and construction at Ward-Wyatt.

LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE



Chairman



Secretary

Copies sent to:

Lane Co. Reorganization Committee

Linn Co. Reorganization Committee

Mr. Dolmyer, Linn Co. Supt.

Mr. Dennis Patch

Mr. Ken Williams

Coburg School Board

Lane County Rural Board

Dr. Millard Pond

Superintendents at:

Harrisburg Union High School

Harrisburg Elementary School

Harris Elementary School

Ward-Wyatt, Chairman of board.

News media:

~~Newspapers~~ Ralph Olive

Radio Stations

TV Stations.

Springfield News

Oakridge Telegram

Florence News

Cottage Grove Sentinel

Emerald Empire News

Junction City Times

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY SCHOOL REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

May 29, 1961

1. Special meeting
1. This was a special meeting of the Lane County School District Reorganization Committee, meeting with members of Linn County School District Reorganization Committee and the Coburg School Board.
2. Members present
2. Members present:

<u>Lane County Reorganization Committee</u> Ray Swanson, Chr. Ed Efteland Joe Swift Winifred Hult Clarence Jackson Bill Wilt Dale Parnell, Supt.	<u>Linn County Reorganization Committee</u> Gerald Detering, Chr. William Grenz Wm. Dolmyer, Supt.	<u>Coburg School Board</u> Ray Holcomb, Chr. Claude McKibben Merle Short James Luke Ken Williams, Supt.
---	---	--
3. Linn Co. Committee would like to go ahead on plan
3. Lane County Chairman, Ray Swanson, called the meeting to order, and called upon Mr. Detering of the Linn County Committee to give the background for the meeting. Mr. Detering explained that the Linn County School District Reorganization Committee would like to take a Harrisburg-Coburg Reorganization Plan beyond the talk stage and submit it to a vote of the people in the area.
4. Goldhammer report discussed
4. Discussion followed about the Goldhammer report that explored many proposals in 1958. The various factors leading up to a Harrisburg-Coburg reorganization plan were discussed. It was explained by Mr. Lake of the Coburg Board and Mr. Detering that in their opinion some factors have changed since 1958 and the group should take a new look.
5. Coburg board position
5. The members of the Coburg Board reported on their consideration of the Coburg-Harrisburg plan. The chairman, Ray Holcomb, of the Coburg School Board reported that the Coburg Board is interested in studying the situation at present. However, some action on reorganization should be brought to a head as soon as possible.
6. Chain of events leading up to present
6. Superintendent Ken Williams of Coburg reported on the chain of events leading up to tonight's meeting. He gave several figures that have been presented to the Coburg School Board relative to a Harrisburg-Coburg consolidation. The projected assessed value of the Harrisburg-Coburg School District, if consolidated as proposed, would be \$5,343,341. The new high school would be built in Lane County in the Coburg School District, and it would be built for approximately 300 students for around \$400,000. The cost of educating the children in Coburg for the Coburg tax payer would be similar whether the Coburg District went to Eugene or Harrisburg.

7. Linn Co. Committee offers to draw up & present plan

7. Chairman Gerald Detering of the Linn County Committee indicated at this point that the Linn County group is now waiting for the Lane County Committee to give the green light to a Coburg-Harrisburg Reorganization. If the Lane County group can give approval to the project, the Linn County Committee is willing to draw up the plan, hold the hearings, and the myriad of details connected with holding a reorganization election.

8. Questions on the plan

8. At this point, there was much discussion about the Harrisburg-Coburg Plan. Some of the questions raised were:

- a. Which Committee is legally responsible for submitting such a plan to the people? It was agreed that the law specifically states when the districts are in two counties it must be a joint plan.
- b. Could there be any legal assurances, that were such a plan voted, that the proposed new high school would be built in the Coburg School District? It was agreed that there could be no legal provision for this, but only a recommendation in the plan, and would have to be a gentlemen's agreement among all the various boards.
- c. Did the people of Coburg realize they would be a minority group in such a reorganization, for due to the size the voting power would lie in the Harrisburg area. The Coburg Board said they felt this was realized.
- d. Did the people of Harrisburg realize the financial implications of such a reorganization? The Linn County group felt that Harrisburg would go along with the plan.
- e. Would a reorganization plan be best, or might the group consider the local boards getting together, under the old law, and holding a consolidation election? This was not answered nor discussed fully.
- f. If the plan were a reorganization plan, to which county would the district be responsible? It was generally agreed that the district would be responsible to Lane County and be a member of the Lane County Rural School District under the Lane County Board of Education.

- 9. Education
Primary
Concern

- 10. Meeting
Scheduled
June 20 at
Ward-Wyatt
School


9. It was generally agreed among everyone present that the primary concern of all groups was the education of boys and girls and that all plans should be looked at in the light of education. as the first objective.

10. The Lane County Committee felt they would like to feel the pulse of the people in the area a little more before making a decision. Therefore, they decided to hold a June 20 meeting at 7:30 P. M. in the Ward-Wyatt School and have present the following groups: Lane County School District Reorganization Committee, the Coburg School Board, the Linn County Reorganization Committee, Harrisburg Union High Board, Harrisburg Elementary Board, Ward-Wyatt Board, and the Harris Elementary Board. The Linn County Committee is asked to contact the various school boards that lie in Linn County and ask them to attend the meeting. It was agreed that this was to be a town hall type meeting held in the usual reorganization hearing pattern. The entire proposal is to be discussed on this evening, and the various board members are to be asked specifically if they favor such a proposal. The Lane County group agreed that this meeting would serve as a guide line for action they may take on the plan.

Meeting adjourned.



Ray Swanson, Chairman



Dale Parnell, Secretary

MINUTES OF THE LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

August 17, 1961

Minutes
in brief

1. Attendance
1. The meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the Lane County School Office with the following members present: Chairman Ray Swanson, Edward Efteland, Paul Ehinger, Marvin Hendrickson, Clarence Jackson, Winifred Hult, Joe Swift, William Wilt, and Dale Parnell, Secretary. Other people attending the meeting were: Mrs. Johnson, Mrs. Leeper, Mr. Holcomb, members of the Lane County Board of Education; Mr. Funk, resident of Coburg; Mr. Downing, Mr. Paschelke, Mr. Moran, Marcola School Board; and Ralph Olive, Register Guard reporter.
2. Minutes Approved
2. A motion was made by Mr. Swift and seconded by Mr. Jackson, that the minutes of the June 20th and July 6th meetings be approved as received by mail. The motion was carried.
3. Correspondence
3. Secretary Parnell reported that many letters had been received from throughout the state complimenting the committee on the "Report to the People" brochure.
4. Harrisburg-Coburg plan rejected
4. Chairman Swanson called for discussion on the proposed Harrisburg-Coburg reorganization plan as submitted by the Linn County Reorganization Committee. Minutes of the July 6th joint meeting in Harrisburg were reviewed, and each committee member expressed his or her views on this plan. The feelings were generally expressed that there needs to be a clearing of the air in the Coburg area as to what the residents of Coburg would desire. However, after the committee spent considerable time on reviewing the Coburg-Harrisburg reorganization plan, it was felt that this was not the best plan for the Coburg School District, and therefore, the committee is honor-bound to submit the plan they feel is "first best". Comments were heard from Mr. Ray Holcomb, and Mr. Leon Funk, residents of the Coburg area, to the effect that there were divided feelings on the Coburg Board in relationship to this plan. In view of this division, the Reorganization Committee should not wait on the Coburg Board to provide the leadership in the reorganization plan. The committee should proceed by submitting the R-4 plan to a vote of the people again.

It was moved by Mr. Ehinger and seconded by Mrs. Hult that the Lane County Reorganization Committee reject the Harrisburg-Coburg reorganization plan as submitted by the Linn County Committee, and that the Linn County Committee be so notified of this action. The motion was carried unanimously.

5. Timing on a Coburg-Eugene vote

5. Discussion then began on the timing for re-submitting the R-4 Eugene-Coburg Plan to the people for a vote. It was generally agreed that the secretary should write the Coburg Board telling of the action in rejecting the Harrisburg-Coburg reorganization, and asking the Coburg Board to work with the Reorganization Committee in re-submitting the R-4 Plan. The Coburg and Eugene Boards are to be asked to suggest the most reasonable timing for this election. The secretary was asked to invite the Coburg Superintendent and members of the Coburg Board to the next meeting of the Reorganization Committee to be held on September 19th, 1961 in the Lane County School Office, and also to invite Dr. Pond of Eugene to this meeting to discuss this entire situation.

6. Boundary change request

6. Mr. Ray Holcomb requested permission of the Committee to take a Boundary petition to the District Boundary Board that would move his 10 acres, which is in the Armitage Bridge area and contiguous to the Eugene School District. This petition asks that this area be withdrawn from the Coburg School District and added to the Eugene School District. Mr. Hendrickson moved that as this did not seem to conflict with the other reorganization plans and activities, that the Reorganization Committee give its approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ehinger and carried.

7. Marcola-Springfield discussion

7. The Chairman then called for discussion on the Marcola-Springfield reorganization plan. Secretary Parnell reported that the Springfield Board has asked that no action be taken on this until after the first of the year, due to pending bond and serial levy vote to be held in that district. However, the Springfield District is interested and willing to talk or work together with the Marcola Board on holding another election after the first of the year.


There was general discussion by the committee as to whether any of the circumstances in the Springfield-Marcola area had changed since the last election. It was generally agreed that with the addition of the new Thurston High School in the Springfield area that this did, somewhat, change the picture from the last election. It was suggested that the secretary get the board members of the Coburg and Springfield Districts together to discuss this problem sometime during the fall months.


8. Next meeting

8. The committee set the date of the next meeting for Tuesday, September 19th, 1961, in the Lane County School Office.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR
SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION


Ray Swanson, Chairman


Dale Parnell, Secretary

Copies sent to:

All Superintendents

Clerks

Ralph Olive

Springfield News

Oakridge Telegram

Cottage Grove Sentinel

Florence News

Dennis Patch

Reorganization Committee

Rural Board

Bill Dolmeyer

Radio Stations and TV

MINUTES OF THE LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

May 16, 1961

1. Committee members present
 1. Meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County School Office with the following present:

Ray Swanson, Chairman	Clarence Jackson
Winifred Hult	Marvin Hendrickson
Paul Ehinger	Edward Efteland
William Wilt	Dale Parnell, Secretary
2. Minutes Approved
 2. Motion was made by Clarence Jackson, seconded by Winifred Hult, and carried, that the minutes of the meetings of March 22, 1961 and April 25, 1961 be approved.
3. Request for Bdy. chgs. in Lowell-Pleasant Hill area
 3. Mr. Hague, and two patrons of the Lost Creek area, were present, and requested the transfer of Sections 2, 3, 4, 10, 11, 33, 34, and 35, Township 20 South, Range 1 West, from Pleasant Hill School District No. 1 to Lowell School District No. 71. Mr. Hague stated that at the recent election held in the area, they were refused a right to vote by the Election Board on the grounds that they were not residents of the Pleasant Hill Union High School District. This was the election on voting down the Curriculum in Union High No. 1. Mr. Hague requested that the legal lines be defined as to where he lives.

John Luvaas, Attorney, was present and requested that no boundary changes be made until the bond issues are completed in both School Districts No. 1 and 71.

Paul Ehinger asked that the Secretary obtain further facts on this matter in order to get the full picture and report at the next meeting.
4. Mapleton request for Bdy. chgs. in Linslaw area
 4. Claude Martin, Superintendent, and Don Davidson, Chairman, Mapleton School District, were present and requested transfer of territory from School District No. 28J to School District No. 32. He requested that Secretary Dale Parnell read letter sent previously to the Committee relative to this request. The letter indicated the following reasons why the Mapleton Board feels that a portion of the former Linslaw School District (now in Fern Ridge 28J) should be transferred to Mapleton.
 - a. Reorganization and consolidation was effectively and purposely done so that all school age children residing in 102J would attend the Mapleton Schools.
 - b. The major share of the valuation fell to 28J without its being responsible for the education of any school age children.

- c. Valuation of that part of 102J reorganized with 32 is less than the respective districts.
- d. If school age children move into the area proposed to annexation it would be necessary for them to be transported through the Mapleton District to reach school.

Claude Martin, Superintendent District No. 32, reviewed the history of the R-6 Reorganization and presented figures substantiating the information included in the letter.

Don Davidson, Chairman District No. 32, stated he is rather reluctant to face taxpayers in his district with the increase in millage since reorganization became effective. He stated they got all the children from Linslaw, but only about one-third of the valuation. Of the \$650,000 valuation of District No. 102, District No. 32 got only \$198,000 of that amount.

After considerable discussion, the Chairman called on Mr. Nile Williams, Superintendent of the Fern Ridge School District to comment on this Boundary request. Mr. Williams asked that a letter from the Fern Ridge Board be read and included in the record. This letter opposed the Boundary Change on the following basis:

- a. Before the annexation of the Deadwood area and division of 102J, the true cash value behind each census child in the Mapleton School District was \$13,619.15. as against \$7,045.15 in the Fern Ridge District. After the annexation of the Deadwood area and the division of 102J, true cash value behind each census child in the Mapleton district was \$17,056.10 as against \$8,526.88 in the Fern Ridge District. These figures show that District No. 32 profited per census child considerably more than did 28J.
- b. The division of assets of 102J were agreed upon by the board of the two districts with affidavits of such approval filed in the County Superintendent's Office. The records indicate no objection to the plan as proposed at the time. Sub-section 4 of ORS 330.620 would indicate that legal opportunity for recourse has expired relative to the division of the 102J territory.

Chairman Swanson stated that we learned sometime ago that the Committee should not make hasty decisions and unless I hear a vote to take some action we will take this matter under consideration. Mr. Swanson thanked Mr. Martin and Mr. Williams for their presentation.

5. Fern Ridge request for Bdy. Chgs.

5. Secretary Dale Parnell reread a letter from Nile Williams, Superintendent District No. 28J, written by Order of the Board of Education, and which was included in the minutes of December 13, 1960, requesting certain boundary changes.

Nile Williams made the following comments regarding the changes requested in their letter

- a. Part of the Seidemann property, for many years, was misassessed in School District No. 139. This year the situation was corrected by the Assessor and property was assessed in District No. 69J in which it is actually located. Also, in checking with the Assessor it was found that the Smirl property is assessed in District No. 28J. The children, however, are attending Fern Ridge Schools.
- b. The request for the Dr. Slocum property transfer from District No. 4 to District No. 28J, has not as yet received the approval of the Eugene School Board. However, the children living on this property are attending the Fern Ridge Schools due to the geographic factors.
- c. Since the R-5 Plan was defeated, that consideration be given to establishing the West Boundary of Applegate District 66 and the East Boundary of Fern Ridge District 28J at Township 19 South, Range 7 West, and Township 20 South, Range 7 West to the Douglas County Line.

After full discussion the committee tentatively endorsed above request, (a) and (b) and rejected (c) at least without a great deal of further study. The Committee asked that items (a) and (b) be presented in the form of legal petitions before further Committee discussion.

Edward Cooper, Superintendent District No. 66 was present, but stated his question was answered by the above statement of the Committee.

6. Mr. Patch
State Director present
& reported
on Legislation

6. Dennis Patch, State Director of School District Reorganization, was present and presented a report on new legislation. He called attention to the following relating to School District Reorganization:

H. B. 1083 (Chapter 229) - Continuation of Existing School Board - if the plan so provides, the existing school board is continued in existence in unified school districts which become administrative districts without a vote. Effective April 17, 1961.

H. B. 1078 (Chapter 285) - Local School Committees - Liberalizes provisions by providing for committee in all or part of attendance units. Also provides for creation or abolishment of same.

H. B. 1422 (Chapter 317) - Rural School District - provides method of placing joint administrative School District in a Rural School District. (Must be adjacent territory.)

H. B. 1460 (Chapter 414) - Amends School District Reorganization Act -

1. Repeals the 60% vote requirement to reject a plan and the 2nd election.
2. Requires rejecting district to petition to be included.
3. Provides for establishment of remaining area in an administrative school district if feasible without a vote if no remonstrance is filed after a hearing.
4. Provides that in the case of an election on a revised plan, the procedure shall be the same as in the original vote.
5. Emergency Clause.

S. B. 478 - Election in Union High School Districts - Provides that if a reorganization plan involves a union high school district and the boundaries of the proposed administrative district coincide with those of the Union High School District, the voting procedure shall follow that provided in ORS 335.500. This requires that the question carries by (1) an over-all majority vote in the entire union high school district and (2) that it carried in a majority of the elementary districts.

H. B. 1076 - Continuation of Program - Continues the Appropriation of \$70,000 per year through 1962-63. After July 1, 1962, the rural school board becomes the county reorganization.

H. B. 1427 - Validation Act - Validates districts formed prior to the effective date of the Act.

H. B. 1276 - Boundary Boards - Makes rural school board the district boundary board. Set up guide lines for changing district boundaries. Provides that changes in Union High School district boundaries be made in similar manner to those in common school districts.

Mr. Patch called attention to the effective date of the above new laws: On those not carrying the emergency clause or an effective date, they will become effective August 10, 1961.

7. "Report to the People" Brochure discussed particularly future recommendations
7. Secretary Dale Prnell asked for suggestions from the Committee relative to information to be included in a Reorganization "Report to the People" Brochure.

Chairman Ray Swanson made the following recommendation relative to Statement No. 5 - Future Recommendations:

"While all districts in Lane County have achieved a unified status in providing a coordinated educational program for 12 grades, the committee feels that it is still desirable to

attempt to improve the adequacy and efficiency of the educational program as recommended by State Standards. By combining some districts which are operating facilities within a short distance of each other, it would be possible to broaden the curriculum and to allow teachers to specialize in those areas for which they were specifically prepared." Mr. Paul Ehinger suggested that we add to this statement that "the Committee intends to work with the boards of the following areas: Coburg and Eugene; Marcola and Springfield; Westfir and Oakridge, in studying the feasibility of these districts being joined and possibly bring one or two of these studies to a vote of the people this fall." There was general agreement that this statement represents the views of the entire committee.

After considerable discussion it was decided that the Brochure should be finalized and presented for final action at the next meeting of the Committee.

8. Letter from Oakridge Board on Westfir-Oakridge Consolidation
8. Secretary Dale Parnell presented a letter from Paul Elliott, Superintendent, School District No. 76, stating their Board favored another vote on a reorganization plan for School Districts No. 76 and 117, but not this fall.
- Paul Ehinger commented on this letter to the effect that he feels consolidation of Districts No. 76 and 117 is just a matter of time, and that another election should be held in District No. 76 and 117 before the Committee terminates its activity in June of 1962.
9. Comments from Mr. Wilt on a Marcola-Springfield Consolidation.
9. William Wilt reported that the District No. 79 board does not feel too optimistic about another election. They feel many people will have to change their minds in order for the Districts No. 19 and 79 consolidation. Pupils are increasing in Marcola and there may be a need for additional grade school facilities. This reorganization will really have to be sold to the people of Marcola, but the people do expect another election this next year.
10. Comments from Mr. Williams on a Coburg-Eugene Consolidation
10. Kenneth Williams, Superintendent District no. 43, was in hopes the Linn County Reorganization Committee would be in attendance to make a report. The fact now is that the Coburg Board is unanimous in a proposal to study the possibilities of an administrative district comprising Coburg, Ward-Wyatt, Harrisburg Grade and Harrisburg High. The Coburg Board action was merely to study the proposal to make a joint unified district of the above named districts. It was the opinion of the Coburg Board that the action should go to Linn County and then they would come to the Lane County Committee with a joint plan.

Paul Ehinger asked if there is a possibility that a plan will be presented to the Lane County Committee for study?

Mr. Williams stated that Coburg will not present a Plan to the Lane County Committee. It will have to come from the Linn County Committee.

Superintendent Parnell asked if the Coburg School Board would desire that the Eugene-Coburg vote not be held within the next year?

Mr. Williams replied that this Harrisburg study does not in any way affect the R-4 Plan.

Mr. Wilt asked who instigated the Harrisburg Plan?

Mr. Williams replied that the pressure had come from the Linn County Reorganization Committee.

Mr. Swanson asked if the Lane County Committee should present the R-4 Plan for a vote?

Mr. Williams Superintendent District 43 said that this is the Committee's decision. Linn County Committee however, has presented plans to Coburg, and Coburg is willing to study it.

Mr. Leon Funk, a patron from Coburg, asked if the Lane County Committee could vote soon on the R-4 Plan and set a time in the fall when there is an election in the Eugene district? If we could pick out a time District No. 4 is going to the polls, it would be good.

Mr. Swanson replied that the Committee would make this attempt, however, we haven't tried to set elections to "rig" the vote.

John Luvaas, Attorney, referred to report made in 1958 by the University of Oregon, Bureau of Educational Research, which made the following recommendations:


- a. That the Coburg High School should be abandoned
- b. That the Harrisburg High School would be adequate with a small addition to take care of the Coburg students. However, that there was general agreement that a new high school of this proposed district would be built in Coburg. With the adequacy of the Harrisburg plant, he couldn't imagine Harrisburg voting to abandon this plant.

Mr. Luvaas further felt the Committee should fully discuss this with the Coburg School Board. The bridge will be open when school opens in the Fall (1961). It is only three miles to North Eugene High School. With the new bridge it will be fine for Coburg. I think it

can be sold but the election should not be held until the Board favors it, perhaps May 1962 (but to check first with District No. 4).

11. Coburg Bd. invited to next mtg. 11. The Committee instructed the Secretary to invite the Coburg Board to attend the next Committee meeting (June 20th) to discuss this entire proposal.
12. Declaration of Administrative Districts 12. Mr. Efteland raised the question as to clarifying the Declaration of all school districts as administrative districts. He particularly mentioned Districts No. 28J, 66, 1, and 71. He asked if the other Committee members felt these should be declared? It was the consensus of the group that this matter will need further study before such declaration could be made.
13. Commendations 13. Dennis Patch, State Director, School District Reorganization commended the Lane County Committee on their accomplishments.
14. Next meeting 14. Next meeting of the Committee was set for June 20th, 1961 in the Lane County School Office at 7:30 P. M.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 P. M.



Ray Swanson, Chairman



Dale Parnell, Secretary

Copies sent to:

All Reorganization Committee members

Superintendents

Clerks

Dennis Patch

Ralph Olive

Springfield News

Rural Board members

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY SCHOOL REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

April 25, 1961

Meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County School Office with the following present:

Ray Swanson
Edward Efteland
William Wilt

Joe Swift
Dale Parnell, Secretary

1. Quorum not present
Since a quorum was not present no official action of the Committee could be consummated. The unofficial activities of the meeting were as follows:
2. Thank you letter to Committee
Letter was presented from Grover B. Kelsay, member of the Pleasant Hill School Board, thanking the Committee for all of the countless hours of dedicated devotion for better educational opportunities donated by them.
3. Extension granted
Letter was presented from the State Board of Education, approving a six-months extension of time - to October 1, 1961.
4. Legislation
A Research Bulletin was presented from Dennis Patch, State Reorganization Director, relative to the latest status of certain legislative bills. It was noted that the following bills have passed: HB 1078, 1083, 1460, 1358, and 1139.

Secretary Dale Parnell reported that he has not as yet received a reply from the Linn County Reorganization Committee regarding the Lane County Committee's request for certain land transfer involving Linn County.
5. Coburg situation discussed
Kenneth G. Williams, Superintendent of Coburg Schools, was present and offered his assistance to the Lane County Committee in future work involving his district. Various possibilities of reorganization for Coburg were discussed.
6. Zoning & election of board members
Secretary Dale Parnell reported that he had been contacted relative to director election in the Cottage Grove Administrative School District. The protest registered was to the effect that members of the board were elected by zone but voted on at large. The person registering the protest felt that the candidates should be voted on by zone rather than at large.

Relative to the above protest the Committee members present requested that the Secretary write to the State Department for a clarification of ORS 330.530, Section 2, Part (c), relative to the election of directors for an Administrative School District.

The problem of electing directors by zones was discussed.

Secretary Dale Parnell presented the following, which might be included in a proposed Reorganization "Report to the People" Brochure.

Statement No. 1

Lane County Committee for the Reorganization of school districts are: Ray Swanson, Chairman, Noti; Willian. Wilt, Marcola; Joe Swift, Pleasant Hill; Marvin Hendrickson, Bethel; Edward Efteland, Eugene; Paul Ehinger, Westfir; Clarence Jackson, Creswell; Winifred Hult, Blachly; Gordon Hale, Springfield; and Dale Parnell, Lane County School Superintendent.

Statement No. 2

The committee has constantly sought the most efficient and effective school districts for Lane County. The committee has addressed itself to the question: Have our schools been organized to provide the following:

- A. An excellent basic education in Language (English), Foreign Language, Mathematics, Social Studies, Science, Health, Physical Education, and those subjects that would help high school students develop marketable skills upon graduation from high school.
- B. Equal educational opportunities for all pupils of the county.
- C. Employment and retention of competent, well qualified teachers who are assigned to teach subjects in which they are specifically prepared.
- D. Coordinated administration of a continuous curricular program in grades 1 through 12, as required by law.
- E. Better educational services at a reasonable per pupil cost.
- F. As great a degree of equalization of financial resources on the local level as circumstances and geography will permit.

7. Report to people Brochure discussed

Committee Members

Reorgani- zation criteria

Statement No. 3

Progress
up-to-
date

Today, in Lane County there are 18 unified school districts as opposed to 47 districts in 1957 at the beginning of committee work. Local School Boards are to be commended for their excellent cooperation and efforts on behalf of better schools. The 18 districts each have one Board of Education providing school services, making budgets, and levying taxes for all twelve grades. The School Districts of Lane County are:

<u>District</u>	<u>Average Daily Membership</u>	<u>True Cash Value per Membership Child</u>
*Creswell	854.9	\$10,579.25
+Fern Ridge	1,305.6	10,862.58
Coburg	364.2	15,303.61
*Florence	1,213.3	17,503.05
Lowell	657.6	18,819.56
+Springfield	7,213.2	19,821.00
Pleasant Hill	759.7	20,675.94
*Blachly	191.5	20,702.93
*Mapleton	584.7	22,432.25
+Eugene	14,701.9	23,291.00
*Junction City	1,480.5	23,443.31
*Bethel	2,700.0	24,624.69
Marcola	297.7	26,103.68
*Cottage Grove	2,861.6	28,811.94
Westfir	259.6	29,826.63
Oakridge	1,150.9	33,806.86
Applegate	459.6	35,963.88
*McKenzie	739.0	53,721.72

*completely reorganized within the law

+these qualify but have not been declared

Statement No. 4

Does Reorg-
anization
make a dif-
ference in
education
of boys and
girls

Today there is abundant evidence that Lane County has moved far in the direction of organizing efficient school districts. The people of Lane County are to be commended for this vision. This committee believes that school district reorganization does make a vital difference in the education of the children. There is evidence that (1) boys and girls in reorganized districts have greater educational opportunities. (2) Reorganized districts produce higher academic achievement as shown by standardized achievement tests. (3) Reorganized districts make no significant changes in social and economic contacts between the rural and metropolitan areas in our county. All in all, research has piled up substantial amounts of evidence that reorganization of school districts does improve the education of boys and girls. The kind of school district in which children live does make a difference. Arithmetic scores higher, total achievement greater, special teachers available, better instructional materials, better reading comprehension, greater achievement in science. There is powerful evidence favoring school district reorganization.

Future
Recommend-
ations

Statement No. 5

This committee feels there are still some high schools in Lane County that are too small to provide the most efficient and effective high school education. Therefore, this committee proposes a vote on the following: (The committee asked that this be a top priority agenda item for the next meeting. All committee members are asked to come to the next meeting with recommendations in mind.)

Time-
Table

Statement No. 6

Lane County School District Reorganization Time Table -

1. August 20, 1957 - effective date of the Act.
2. October 20, 1957 - 9-man Committee was elected
3. October 20, 1957 to October 20, 1958 - research and preliminary plans were formulated.
4. January 5, 1959 to March 9, 1959 - Public hearings were held on preliminary plans.
5. January 6, 1959 to March 30, 1959 - Public hearings held on revised plans.
6. April 20, 1959 - Final plans were sent to the State Board of Education for approval.
7. May - June, 1959 - State Board of Education held local hearings on the various plans.
8. July 30, 1959 - State Board gives approval to all plans.
9. September 30, 1959 - was the deadline for first election in the proposed districts to approve or reject the plans.
10. July 1, 1960 - All original plans were completed.
11. July 1, 1961 - Final plans to be presented for the last year of committee action.
12. November to December, 1961 - Second elections might be held in certain districts.
13. March 1, 1962 - Final report and final recommendations to be sent to the State Board of Education on Reorganization of school districts in Lane County.
14. July 1, 1962 - Reorganization committee responsibilities transferred to the County School Superintendent and County Board.

The past
4 years
of
progress

Statement No. 7

What has happened in the Past Four Years Since the Beginning of the Reorganization Act:

1. In 1959 there were 57,000 school districts in the United States. Today there are 35,000.
2. In 1957 at the beginning of the Reorganization Act, there were 709 school districts in Oregon, today there are 504.
3. In 1957 Lane County had 47 school districts and today, 18.

- 4. All school districts of Lane County are providing education from grades one through twelve in 81 elementary schools, 12 junior high schools, and 20 high schools.

8. Research Film shown

A 15 minute film on recent research findings in school district Reorganization was shown. This film was from the University of Wisconsin showing some effects of school reorganization in that state.

9. Declaring Administrative districts


The Committee members present reaffirmed the Committee intention of working closely with local school boards on timing and all possibilities before declaring a present school district an administrative district.

Next meeting

The next committee meeting has been set for Tuesday, May 16, 1961 in the County School Office - 7:30 P.M.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION



 Ray Swanson, Chairman



 Dale Parnell, Secretary

LANE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE
FINAL REPORT AND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

In brief

1. Committee
Members

1. Lane County Committee members for the Reorganization of School Districts are: Ray Swanson, Chairman, Noti; William Wilt, Marcola; Joe Swift, Pleasant Hill; Marvin Hendrickson, Bethel; Edward Efteland, Eugene; Paul Ehinger, Westfir; David Burwell, McKenzie; Winifred Kault, Blachly; Gordon Hale, Springfield; and Dale Parnell, Lane County School Superintendent. Other people who have served are: William Woodie, Superintendent, (deceased); Clarence Jackson, Creswell (deceased); Edgar Rickard, Cottage Grove; John Brewer, Swisshome; Earl Garrouette, Eugene; and Charles Foster, Vaughn.

2. Guidance

2. The Committee has constantly sought the most efficient and effective school districts for Lane County. The Committee has addressed itself to the question, have our schools been organized to provide the following basic requirements?

- a. An excellent basic education in Language (English), Foreign Language, Mathematics, Social Studies, Science, Health, Physical Education, and those subjects that would help high school students develop marketable skills upon graduation from high school.
- b. Equal educational opportunities for all pupils of the county.
- c. Employment and retention of competent, well qualified teachers who are assigned to teach subjects in which they are specifically prepared.
- d. Coordinated administration of a continuous curricular program in grades 1 through 12, as required by the law.
- e. Better educational services at a reasonable per pupil cost.
- f. As great a degree of equalization of financial resources on the local level as circumstances and geography will permit.

3. Reorganization
Makes a
Difference
in the
Education
of Boys
& Girls

3. Today there is evidence that Lane County has moved far in the direction of organizing efficient school districts. This Committee believes that school district reorganization does make a vital difference in the education of the children. There is evidence that *(1) boys and girls in reorganized districts have greater educational opportunities. (2) Reorganized districts produce higher academic achievement as shown by standardized achievement tests. (3) Reorganized districts make no significant changes in social and economic contacts between the rural and metropolitan areas in our county.

Here in Lane County, there is a direct relationship between the size of the school district and the number of subject matter offerings available to students; and conversely, there is also a direct relationship between the size of district and the per pupil cost. In Lane County, the number of subject matter offerings vary from 32 or less in three small high schools to 72 and more in three of the larger high schools. The small high schools pay \$1,000.00 or more per pupil for the 32 or less offerings and the larger high schools pay \$500.00 per pupil or less for course offerings ranging from 72 to 116.

All in all, research has piled up substantial amounts of evidence that reorganization of school districts does improve the education of boys and girls. The kind of school district in which children live does make a difference. Arithmetic scores are higher, total achievement greater, special teachers are available, better instructional materials, better reading comprehension, and greater achievement in science. There is much evidence favoring school district reorganization.

*This research has been compiled from the "Wisconsin Study" on school district reorganization, and particularly from Special Bulletin #6 authored by Dr. Burton W. Krietlow entitled "School District Reorganization . . . Does it Make a Difference in Your Child's Education?"

4. Reorganization
Makes a
Difference
in Financial
Reserves
of Local
District
& County

4. Variation in property tax wealth behind each child in average daily membership has been reduced in Lane County from \$40.00 to \$1.00 in 1957 to a variation of \$5.00 to \$1.00 in 1962. Also, all of the ad valorem tax sources of the county are paying their proportionate share to support the total educational programs. In some cases, districts with little property wealth have been combined with districts of greater property tax wealth and are thereby helping to equalize the total county-wide financial structure.

5. What has Happened

5. What has happened in the Past Four Years Since the Beginning of the Reorganization Act:

- a. In 1959 there were 57,000 school districts in the United States. Today, there are 35,000.
- b. In 1957 at the beginning of the Reorganization Act, there were 709 school districts in Oregon. Today, there are 504.
- c. In 1957 Lane County had 47 school districts. Today, there are 18.
- d. All school districts in Lane County are providing education from grades one through twelve in 81 elementary schools, 12 junior high schools, and 20 senior high schools.

6. Committee Recommendations for the Future

6. While all districts in Lane County have achieved a unified status in providing a coordinated educational program for 12 grades, the Committee feels that it is still desirable to attempt to improve the adequacy and efficiency of the educational program as recommended by State Standards. By combining some districts which are operating facilities within a short distance of each other, it would be possible to broaden the curriculum and to allow teachers to specialize in those areas for which they were specifically prepared. The Committee is presently working with the Boards of the following areas: Coburg and Eugene; Marcola and Springfield; Westfir and Oakridge; in studying the feasibility of these districts being joined. The Coburg-Eugene Reorganization will be voted on May 7, 1962.

a. Recommendations for Future Study

- a. Florence, Mapleton, Blachly, Junction City, Bethel, South Lane (Cottage Grove), Creswell, and McKenzie have been declared administrative districts. Of these administrative districts this Committee feels that over the next few years further study should be made in the following areas, keeping in mind that the best plans usually result from the citizens of local school districts taking an active and objective interest in reorganization:

- (1) Junction City - Harrisburg (Linn County) and Monroe (Benton County) and perhaps a portion of the Blachly District.

(2) Blachly - There are now 48 high school students in this small, isolated district. If the number of high school students continues to decrease, it would appear that some study should be made with a view towards possibly splitting this district between Junction City and Mapleton.

(3) Creswell - Cottage Grove - It still appears that Creswell and Cottage Grove should be together. The financial situation of Creswell could be aided immeasurably by such a move.

b. Another Look Needed

b. Other plans that need another look by the citizens of the areas involved are: Pleasant Hill - Lowell, and Fern Ridge - Applegate.

c. Recommendations

c. The Committee strongly recommends the consolidation of the following districts: Coburg-Eugene, Marcola-Springfield, and Weston-Oakridge.

Even though the voters of these areas have not been favorable to such proposed mergers, it is this Committee's conscientious duty to point out the belief that a better total educational program could be carried out if such mergers could be effected.

7. The Picture Today

7. Reorganization has been a continuous process since school districts were first organized. Today, in Lane County there are 18 unified school districts as opposed to 47 districts in 1957 at the beginning of Committee work. Local Boards are to be commended for their excellent cooperation and efforts on behalf of better schools. It is this Committee's belief that local action on reorganization is a must. Someone has to "carry the ball" in the local school district. The best work has been done by the local community under the guidance of the Committee.

The 18 districts each have one Board of Education providing school services, making budgets, and levying taxes for all twelve grades. The School Districts of Lane County Are:

8. Statistics

8. Statistical Picture

check this ←

District	Average Daily Membership	True Cash Value per Membership Child
*Creswell	854.9	\$10,579.25
+Fern Ridge	1,305.6	10,862.58
Coburg	364.2	15,303.61
*Florence	1,213.3	17,503.05
Lowell	657.6	18,819.56
+Springfield	7,213.2	19,821.00
+Pleasant Hill	759.7	20,675.94
*Blachly	191.5	20,702.93
*Mapleton	584.7	22,432.25
+Eugene	14,701.9	23,291.00
*Junction City	1,480.5	23,443.31
*Bethel	2,700.0	24,624.69
Marcola	297.7	26,103.68
*Cottage Grove	2,861.6	28,811.94
Westfir	259.6	29,826.63
+Oakridge	1,150.9	33,806.86
Applegate	459.6	35,963.88
*McKenzie	739.0	53,721.72

* completely reorganized within the law

+ these qualify, but have not been declared due to work that yet needs to be done with neighboring districts.

9. Report
Adopted

9. This report adopted by the Committee on April 23, 1962 by a 9 for and 0 against vote.

Chairman

Secretary

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY SCHOOL REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE
March 22, 1961

Board Minutes
in Brief

Regular meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County School Office with the following present:

Ray Swanson	Joe Swift
Edward Efteland	Marvin Hendrickson
William Wilt	Dale Parnell, Secretary

1. Minutes

Motion was made by Marvin Hendrickson, seconded by Joe Swift, and carried, that the minutes of the meeting of February 7, 1961 be approved.
2. Letter from State

Letter was presented from Dennis Patch relative to the election in Union High School District No. 1, voting the curriculum downward, and congratulating the Committee for their fine work over-all in the county.
3. Thanks to Committee

Chairman Swanson felt that the Pleasant Hill Union High School Board should be commended for taking their stand and carrying through their desired plan.
4. Request for Land Transfer to Marcola

Joe Swift thanked the Committee, at the request of the Pleasant Hill Union High School Board, for their cooperation relative to the election held recently in Union High No. 1.

Letter was presented from the School Board of School District No. 79, Marcola, signed by the district clerk, requesting that in any plan for reorganization of School District No. 79, that the land described below be added to School District No. 79: (All in Linn County - Harrisburg.)

 1. In Township 15 South, Range 2 West of the Willamette Meridian; East 1/2 of Section 10; all of Sections 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 22, 27: Northeast 1/4 and South 1/2 of Section 28; All of Sections 32, 33, and 34.
 2. In Township 16 South, Range 2 West of the Willamette Meridian; All of Sections 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Relative to the request of the School Board of School District No. 79, Lane County, to add certain described territory located in Linn County to any plan of reorganization for School District No. 79, Motion was made by William Wilt, seconded by Marvin Hendrickson, and carried, to request concurrence of the Linn County Reorganization Committee to add this territory to a Lane County plan of reorganization, as proposed by the School Board of School District No. 79 dated March 21, 1961. The Secretary was directed to include the following reasons for requesting the approval of the Linn County Committee:

1. Territory has no access to district of which it is now a part.
2. Completely isolated from Linn County.
3. Is tributary to District No. 79, Lane County,
4. Serviced by Fire Patrol stationed in Lane County.

5. Financial Statement

Financial Statement was read, stating that to date the Lane County Committee had \$1,431.27 unexpended in their 1960-61 allocation. Superintendent Parnell reported that according to the Treasurer's book, expenses have included: Mapping, Committee mileage, office supplies, clerical, and legal notices. He also reported that the following is anticipated for future expenditures: Office supplies (Thermo-fax paper, duplicating paper, etc.) handout maps, Election Department charges, brochure development expense, clerical, and development of various studies (which includes progress report and future proposals of the Committee).

6. Boundary Board Action

Superintendent Parnell reported to Committee that on March 13th, the District Boundary Board approved the following petitions pending approval of the Reorganization Committee:

1. Withdrawal of the following from Union High School District No. 9: Section 14 and the South 1/2 of Section 15, T18S RLW; and the North 1/2 Section 22, T18S RLW, WM.

2. Addition of the following to Union High School District No. 1: Section 14 and the South 1/2 of Section 15, T18S RLW; and the North 1/2 of Section 22, T18S RLW, WM.

Motion was made by Joe Swift, seconded by Marvin Hendrickson and carried, to approve the withdrawal of said two sections from Union High School District No. 9 and the addition of the same two sections to Union High School District No. 1.

Superintendent Parnell reported that the Boundary Board had received a petition and set a hearing on same for March 29th, requesting the withdrawal of that territory in School District No. 71 included in Union High No. 1 (Dexter - Lost Creek area.)

Motion was made by Marvin Hendrickson, seconded by Edward Efteland, and carried, to approve the withdrawal of this territory from School District No. 71.

7. Applegate Fern-Ridge Reorganization Election Canvassed

The votes were canvassed from the elections held in School Districts No. 28J1, Lane and Douglas Counties, and School District No. 66, Lane County (R-5), on March 20, 1961, and the results were found to be as follows:

	<u>To Approve</u>	<u>To Reject</u>
School District No. 28J1 - - -	YES - 147	NO - 61
School District No. 66 - - -	YES - 12	NO - 477
	159	538

According to the above results, Motion was made by Marvin Hendrickson, seconded by William Wilt, and carried, to declare the R-5 election LOST.

8. Extension of Committee Time Requested

Motion was made by William Wilt, seconded by Marvin Hendrickson and carried to request from the State Department of Education, a six-month extension of time in which to complete the final phase of district reorganization (from April 1, 1961 to October 1, 1961).

9. Recent Research Indicates Reorganization does Make a difference in Education of Children

Superintendent Parnell analyzed a recent report relative to a 11 year study made in Wisconsin on "Does Reorganization Make a Difference?" The following were noted in the report:

1. Boys and girls in reorganized districts had greater educational opportunities.
2. Reorganized districts produced higher academic achievement as shown by standardized achievement tests.
3. Instruction in reorganized districts costs \$12 more per elementary pupil per year.
4. Reorganizing districts made no significant changes in social and economic contacts between farmers and the village center.

All in all, this research has piled up a substantial amount of evidence that reorganization of school districts does improve the education for boys and girls -- the kind of school district in which children live does make a difference.

Arithmetic Scores Higher
Total Achievement Greater
Special Teachers Available
Better Instructional Materials
Better Reading Comprehension
Greater Achievement In Science

There is a Pile Up of Evidence Favoring School District Reorganization

10. Legislation

Chairman Swanson referred to the March 13th OSBA Bulletin on Legislation -- a copy of which was distributed to each member. It looks very favorable for passage of most reorganization legislation.

11. Brochure to be prepared on Reorganization Status.

Committee directed Superintendent Parnell to prepare a rough draft "Status Report of the Committee", including information on reorganizations to date and direction the Committee will take from hereon on districts not administrative districts. (This draft to be presented at the next regular Committee meeting.)

12. Next Meeting April 25

Motion was made by Marvin Hendrickson, seconded by William Wilt, and carried, that the next regular meeting of the Committee be held on April 25th.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION

Ray C. Swanson

 Chairman

Dale Parnell

 Secretary

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

February 7, 1961

Regular meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County School Office with the following present:

Ray Swanson
Winifred Hult
Edward Efteland
William Wilt
Joe Swift

Paul Ehinger
Marvin Hendrickson
Clarence Jackson
Gordon Hale
Dale Parnell, Secretary

Secretary Parnell informed the Committee that he had received proposed Partial Plan R-5 on February 1, 1961, and that said Plan was approved by the State Board of Education.

Motion was made by Paul Ehinger, seconded by Marvin Hendrickson, and carried, that the minutes of the meeting of December 13, 1960, be approved.

Mr. Merle Short, Chairman of Coburg School Board, was present and made suggestions and requested information on the Reorganization law. He asked whether or not there had been any move to consolidate the school districts having 200 or less pupils, or the "B" League schools. He felt there might be interest in consolidating these districts rather than leaving them to fight their own battles and more or less fight against each other, i.e. teacher-wise, etc.

It was Mr. Short's suggestions to put the "B" League schools under one head for administrative purposes and have a principal in each school.

Ray Swanson pointed out that the Committee is working as directed by the Legislature and that there is no provision for this type of organization.

Edward Efteland asked Mr. Short if he was in sympathy with the Reorganization Plan to include Districts No. 4 and 43.

Mr. Short felt that the majority of the people in the Coburg District feel that when there is a high school built in the Willakenzie area they would be in favor of such a plan. He stated he was not in favor of transporting their high school pupils to either South Eugene High School or North Eugene High School.

Mr. Short was asked whether or not Coburg was interested in going to Harrisburg and he responded that he did not feel they were interested in going that direction.

Paul Ehinger - Assuming the Committee held a Reorganization election in the spring, it would place Coburg over into the fall of 1962 before Reorganization could be effected. Eugene might operate the plant one more year before transferring them into another high school building.

Edward Efteland reported that the Santa Clara bridge is to be completed in the fall. With the completion of this bridge, it would be only one or two miles further to North Eugene High School than the proposed high school on Queen's Way.

Edward Efteland asked Mr. Short if his opinion was that of the entire Coburg School Board.

Mr. Short replied that it was not of all the members.

Edward Efteland suggested that the proposals made by Mr. Short be tabled until the entire matter could be explored.

Mr. Short stated that he appeared before the Committee mainly for his own information.

Ray Swanson - Your proposal could be explored by the Committee as far as legal aspects are concerned. Your Board might consult with other "B" League school districts regarding this.

Ray Swanson - It is an informal proposal that the same Plan be submitted with the provision that the Committee is open to suggestions from the two districts.

Edward Efteland - Feeling of the Committee to hedge on Plan until legislation would force action.

Ray Swanson stated there was question on the validity of counting ballots on the second election. Committee is waiting clarification of the Legislature on this matter.

The election date for the proposed R-5 Plan, comprising School District No. 66, Lane County, and District No. 28J1, Lane and Douglas Counties, was discussed.

Motion was made by Paul Ehinger and seconded by Gordon Hale, that the Secretary and Chairman be authorized to set the date of the R-5 election within the limits of the law. Motion carried.

Joe Swift reported that the election in Union High No. 1, to extend the Curriculum downward, was set for February 21st.

Secretary Parnell thanked Mr. Jackson and Mr. Efteland for attending the Board installations in A.S.D. Nos. 40 and 45. He reported that both districts are functioning and have already appointed their Superintendents.

Ray Swanson thanked Mr. Jackson, Mr. Efteland, and Mrs. Hult for attending the R-5 State Hearing at Elmira on January 12th.

Ray Swanson and Dale Parnell reported on proposed legislation relative to School District Reorganization and presented portions of the Interim Committee Report.

Paul Ehinger asked if there had been any reasonable proposal regarding the equalization of funds.

Ray Swanson stated that he understood several bills had been proposed but did not have them available.

Ray Swanson suggested that voting proposal be submitted to provide for the same regulation as that of Union High School districts voting their curriculum downward, with the exception that the Committee petition rather than the Union High Board.

Motion was made by Mr. Wilt and seconded by Mrs. Hult, that the following recommendation be submitted: When only component districts of a Union High School district are included in a proposal, that the voting provision provided in ORS 330.500 be incorporated. Motion carried.

Motion was made by Paul Ehinger and seconded by Joe Swift, that the voting procedures be clarified with respect to the first and second election -- that the first and second vote be consistent with each other and that a letter relative to the same be submitted to Donald Husband with a copy to Dennis Patch. Motion carried.

Committee agreed they were of the unanimous opinion that they would not submit the same plan for a second vote until the legislature clarifies the voting procedures with respect to the second election.

William Wilt presented proposal to add territory from Linn County to District No. 79, Marcola -- said parcel contains 4,739 acres with an assessed valuation of \$40,298.00 (mostly logged off and tributary to District No. 79).

Paul Ehinger suggested that the Board of District No. 79 make request to the Committee for this boundary change.

Next regular meeting of the Reorganization Committee was set for Wednesday, March 22nd.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION

Ray C Swanson
Chairman

Adel Pennell
Secretary

MINUTES OF THE LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

Minutes
in brief

February 20, 1962

1. Meeting
Attendance

1. The meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the Coburg Elementary School with the following members present: Chairman Ray Swanson, David Burwell, Edward Efteland, Joe Swift, William Wilt, Paul Ehinger, Secretary Dale Parnell, and Coburg Superintendent Ken Williams.

2. Minutes
Corrected
and
Approved

2. A motion was made by Mr. Swift and seconded by Mr. Wilt that the minutes of the January 16th meeting be approved as received by mail with one correction by inserting the word tentatively on item 5, to make that motion read, "Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Hendrickson and carried, that the election on the R-4 Plan comprising School District No. 4 and 43 be tentatively set for Monday, May 7, 1962." The motion carried.

3. R-4 Plan
sent to
State
Board

3. A motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, and seconded by Mr. Burwell that the R-4 Plan as presented at the public hearing be sent to the State Board of Education for approval. The motion was carried

4. Meeting adjourned.

Mr. Ray Swanson, Chairman



Mr. Dale Parnell, Secretary

COUNTY HEARING ON PROPOSED PARTIAL PLAN
OF SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION R-4 - Lane County
Coburg High School Gym - February 20, 1962

Minutes
in brief

1. Hearing
Attendance

1. A public hearing was held in the Coburg High School gymnasium, Coburg, Oregon, on February 20, 1962, commencing at 8:00 P. M. for the purpose of discussing proposed Partial Plan of School District Reorganization R-4, Lane County. The hearing was attended by approximately 125 patrons.

Mr. Ray Swanson, Lane County Committee Chairman, opened the meeting and reviewed history of the Coburg district relative to reorganization, consolidation and boundary changes.

Mr. Ray Swanson introduced Mr. Dale Parnell, County School Superintendent and Secretary of the Reorganization, who in turn introduced the following:

Reorganization Committee Members - Ray Swanson, Paul Ehinger, Joe Swift, Edward Efteland, William Wilt, and Dave Burwell.

Coburg Board Members - Stanley Jensen, James Lake, and Merle Short.

Coburg Superintendent of Schools - Kenneth Williams

Assistant Supt. of Schools, Eugene - Lloyd Millhollen

Secretary, O. S. B. A. - Tom Rigby

2. Reorganization
Committee
Work
Reviewed

2. Mr. Parnell called attention to the Better Homes & Gardens Certificate of Achievement for Action in Education awarded the Lane County Reorganization Committee, and the article appearing in the February issue of this magazine relative to the reorganization work in Lane County.

Mr. Parnell showed various transparencies on the overhead projector depicting comparison of the Lane County School Districts relative to financing, High School courses per ADM, High School cost per year by ADM, and valuation per ADM.

3. Plan
Presented

3. Mr. Paul Ehinger presented the proposed partial plan R-4 comprising component School Districts No. 4 and 43, Lane County, Oregon.

4. Hearing Opened
4. Mr. Ray Swanson opened the hearing for comments and questions -
5. Comments from Mr. Williams
5. Kenneth Williams, Superintendent, Coburg - Gave personal observations as a taxpayer, administrator and parent in three categories:
- a. Educational Values - indicated that there had been a tremendous change in philosophy to handle teachers and grouping of children to receive the greatest benefits. Indicated that staff employment is a problem, that the High School program offered by District No. 4 is a good basic program. Parents were asked what they wanted educationally for their children?

Stated they have given them the best possible in the Coburg size of high school, but fall short in many areas. He felt it was an opportunity to become a part of District No. 4's program.
 - b. Financial Status - If Coburg does not vote the Plan then it would perhaps take a \$400,000 bond issue to build a new High School. This would mean about 45 mills for the kind of a program we should have. He stated that we should first figure the type of program we wish to offer, figure the cost and then decide if we are willing to pay the price. We have to train our boys and girls for the challenge set today.
 - c. Attitudes - He commented that for 3 1/2 years we have witnessed old bonded friends giving way to harsh feelings -- forgetting "love thy neighbor." We live in America so let us act like Americans and do the type of job we have to do with friendliness and respect for all.
6. Mr. Jensen Comments
6. Stanley Jensen, Board Member, Coburg - Commented on the joint statement relative to safety of the Coburg High School. Stated that fire safety is adequate but sanitation facilities are very poor.
7. Mr. Short Comments
7. Merle Short, Board Member, Coburg - The prime interest of the Coburg citizens is replacement of the high school. The Reorganization Committee's main interest is a good educational program. We should put the students in a high school where they will get a good education. If we build a new building it would be only to preserve the Coburg High School. We should first consider the children educationally and give them a break to go to a decent school.

8. Mrs. Morneau
8. Mrs. Morneau, Coburg, asked the opinion of the other Coburg board members.
9. Mr. Lake Replied
9. Mr. James Lake, Board Member, Coburg - The Eugene and Coburg board members were to be non-partisan and is up to the voters to decide. We want to know the desire of the people of the district.
10. Question from Mr. Holcomb
10. Ray Holcomb, District No. 4 - Please give percentage of votes needed to carry this election.

Mr. Swanson - Under ORS 330.630 it requires a majority in each district to reject or approve. If rejected, a petition may be filed within 30 days after the election, signed by 50% of those voting in the first election, calling another election in the rejecting district. If the second election is favorable it would come into existence.
11. Dr. Millhollen Comments
11. Dr. Lloyd Millhollen, Eugene - This reorganization affects Coburg much more than Eugene. I am sure our voters will turn out and vote with concern. It is a decision that must be made by Coburg and we would be happy to have you. It is not any more Coburg joining Eugene than Eugene joining Coburg.
12. Mr. Brodick
12. Jim Brodick, Coburg - Regarding new Sheldon High School, is bonding complete?

Mr. Ray Swanson - Bonds have been voted and sold. The proposed plan includes the provision that the combined districts would assume the combined assets and liabilities.
13. Procedure Outlined
13. Mr. Swanson outlined the procedure of reorganization following this hearing.

a. Adoption of plan by Committee and forwarding to State Board.

b. Hearing would be held by the State Board sometime in March or April.

c. If State Board approves plan after hearing, an election would be called. The target date for this election is May 7, 1962.
14. If Plan Fails?
14. Mrs. Chambers, Coburg - If this plan is turned down, what then?

Mr. Swanson - I do not know what the alternatives would be.

Mr. Stanley Jensen, Board Member, Coburg - Regarding Harrisburg --- Harrisburg is not a unified district. If we should go with Harrisburg it would be by a vote to combine districts and then a vote would be held to choose a site. Harrisburg could outvote us and the building would no doubt go to Harrisburg. I can't see going 12 miles when we can go across the River to Sheldon High.

15. Mr. Funk

15. Mr. Funk, Coburg - Can millage be determined for the building of a new high school here in Coburg?

Mr. Swanson - This is not possible due to so many variable factors. How much would it cost? What would be the assessed valuation?

Mr. Paul Ehinger - Westfir district has a valuation of around \$2,000,000.00. To pay off the bonds for building our high school costs around 15 mills each year, and this building was built seven years ago.

16. Meeting
Adjourned

16. Mr. Swanson thanked Superintendent Williams and the Coburg Board for providing the facilities and the patrons for their attendance.

Meeting adjourned.

Mr. Ray Swanson, Chairman


Mr. Dale Parnell, Secretary

**STATE HEARING ON PROPOSED PARTIAL PLAN OF SCHOOL DISTRICT
REORGANIZATION R-5, Lane County
Elmira High School - January 12, 1961**

A public hearing was held in the Elmira High School, Elmira, Oregon, on January 12, 1961, commencing at 8:00 o'clock P.M. for the purpose of discussing proposed Partial Plan of School District Reorganization R-5, Lane County. The hearing was attended by approximately 70 patrons.

Mr. Ray Swanson, Lane County Committee Chairman, opened the meeting and introduced: Committee Members Winifred Rult, Clarence Jackson, and Edward Efteland; County School Superintendent Dale Parnell, and Secretary Margaret Blanton.

Mr. Edward Efteland reviewed the proposed Plan R-5, comprising component School District No. 66, Lane County, and School District No. 28J1, Lane and Douglas Counties.

Mr. Ray Swanson then introduced Ralph Stuller, Member of the State Board of Education, and Dennis Patch, State Director of School District Reorganization, and turned the meeting over to Mr. Patch.

Mr. Patch commented on the good turnout, which he felt indicated their interest in education.

Mr. Patch stated that this hearing was the 120th State Board hearing on a complete or partial plan of School District Reorganization as proposed by a County Committee; that this partial Plan of Reorganization was adopted by the Lane County Committee on December 13, 1960 and forwarded to the State Board of Education on December 14, 1960 -- said Plan consisting of component School District No. 66, Lane County, and School District No. 28J1, Lane and Douglas Counties. The law provides that upon the State Board's receipt of the Plan they must call a hearing on said Plan. The Reorganization Act provides that following this hearing the State Board must meet within 60 days and review the Plan and approve or reject it. If the Plan is approved the State Board of Education shall notify the Committee or Committees concerned within 10 days of such approval.

The purpose of this hearing is to provide interested persons in this area an opportunity to appear before the Board and make statements and ask questions or seek information regarding the proposal. If the State Board approves the Plan the law provides they must send approval to the County Committee within 10 days and the Committee within 30 days must call a special election in said proposed Administrative School District -- said election must be held within 60 days from the date the County Committee receives the approved Plan.

The vote on an Administrative School District Plan must be held in each of the affected districts. If the vote is favorable in the entire area, the new Administrative School District shall be organized. If any district rejects by 60% or more, the organization of the new administrative school district shall be delayed for a period of 30 days. During the 30-day period a petition against the formation of the new Administrative School District may be filed by the legal school voters of any rejecting school district. If such a petition is filed within the 30-day period signed by a number equal to 50 percent or more of the legal voters who voted in the rejecting school district, another election shall be held in such rejecting school district within 60 days after the date of the election on the formation. If a majority of votes cast at any election is against the formation of the Administrative School District, within 30 days the Committee may submit to the State Board a Plan including the districts who voted in favor at the first election. If the State Board approves, an election shall be held in the proposed Administrative School

District. If half or more of the vote is against, the Committee shall proceed with the preparation of a new comprehensive Plan.

The law provides if an election is held between July 1 and April 30, inclusive, the new administrative school district shall come into existence effective on July 1 next following the election. If the election is held between May 1 and June 30, inclusive, the new administrative school district shall come into existence effective on July 1 of the following year.

Mr. Patch stated that it was the policy of the State Board to have one member of the State Board present at each State Hearing - Mr. Stuller being present at this meeting.

Mr. Patch declared the hearing officially opened, and informed those present that it was his intention to call for statements from each common school district starting with the lowest numbered district and rotating until all had had an opportunity to be heard. He requested that each person wishing to be heard should state their name and district number.

#28J - No question.

#66 - Ted Biggs - In proposed Plan I do not see anything about allocation of students after this reorganization goes through.

Edward Efteland - The Committee recommends that the elementary schools in district and high schools be continued in use until the board of the administrative school district can review the combined districts needs.

Dennis Patch - The Administrative School District Board elected by the people will be the governing Board for the entire district and carry that responsibility.

#66 - Ted Biggs - It should be a little more clear about the upper grades.

Edward Efteland - If we had the power we could include further information, but that is left to the jurisdiction of the new A.S.D. Board. You have a right to make changes as population increases.

#66 - Ted Biggs - You did propose up to the 6th grade on the allocation of students. Why not have a proposal for the upper grades.

Dennis Patch - The Committee has certain responsibilities. Some are mandatory and some are recommendations.

#66 - Ted Biggs - Why couldn't they complete their proposal?

Ray Swanson - Called attention to the following objective: "A better and more equalized educational opportunity for all children in the state through the creation of administrative school districts sufficiently large to insure the best possible curricular offerings." Called attention to course offerings in Lane County and pointed out the size in comparison with courses offered. He also pointed out that the combined ADM of Districts No. 28J and 66 would equal about the same as District No. 69J, Junction City. At present there are 42 courses in Elmira High and 34 in Crow. They are considerably below what District No. 69J, Junction City, offered in

1958-59. The pattern throughout Lane County is consistent. We would assume this Board would follow the pattern of others and you would find your High Schools to be combined. The Committee did not recommend this as it was not within the scope of the Committee's power. The Committee first proposed a Junior High School at Crow but abandoned this in presenting this Plan. The Committee does not have the power to tell you what your Administrative School District Board should do in the future.

#28J - No one spoke.

#66 - Clinton Boehringer - Asked for the best estimate on the current and proposed cost of education.

Dale Parnell - Suggested they contact the administrators in both districts for average cost per pupil.

#66 - Ed Cooper - I think Dale Parnell is going to make a superior County School Superintendent - the way he passed the buck.

#28J - Nile Williams - Elmira per pupil high school cost is approximately \$4.14.

#66 - Ed Cooper - Definite figures are not available.

Ray Swanson - Crow High School's per pupil cost for 1958-59 was \$3.97.

Dennis Patch - Definite figures are not available.

#66 - Carl Boehringer - Asked question since Committee is charged with presenting information on this.

Dennis Patch - Figures are often presented as the districts are at the present time. When consolidations occur it does not take care of this situation. Frankly, it has not proved too successful in giving people something definite as it is an estimate on anticipated cost. It is possible there could be some savings or increases in cost.

#66 - Carl Boehringer - In this Plan the friction between two districts came as the vast majority in District #66 feel that their only real reason for this proposal, regardless of figures, is not for any other reason than that of tax equalization. Feels it is necessary to have these figures. Does not feel they should be expected to give up what they have and/or lower standards to equalize tax burden.

#28J - Dale Lewis - Regarding statement to lower standards, I don't think that remark is necessary. As far as tax equalization he may be right. As far as cash value per pupil there is not too much difference there.

#66 - Carl Boehringer - Lowering the standards was a poor statement for me to make and I apologize.

#66 - Mrs. Dale Riddle - Moved here 2½ years ago from California to better the school situation. Pointed out that dollars do matter. If districts are combined according to the Plan there would be:

2 directors from District #66.
2 directors from remainder of the area

If it is rejected in one district would it go again to a vote?

Dennis Patch - If this proposal is approved by the State Board it will go to an election. If the over-all majority is in favor, the election carries. The law provides that the votes cast in each common school district shall be counted separately and if 60% or more of the votes cast within any one or more of such common school districts are against the Plan, the organization of the Plan shall be delayed for a period of 30 days. During the 30-day period a petition against the formation of the new administrative school district may be filed by the legal school voters of any rejecting school district. If such a petition is filed within the 30-day period signed by a number equal to 50 percent or more of the legal voters who voted in the rejecting school district, another election shall be held in such rejecting school district within 60 days after the date of the election on the formation.

#66 - Mrs. Dale Riddle - Is it true in District No. 66 that we have less population and more area? If we have more area and less representatives what representation would we have? I am sure we are going to grow. If Elmira is the High School we will have children going 35 miles to High School. Suggested putting study hall teacher on the buss.

Dennis Patch - The Law provides that district be zoned as nearly equal, as feasible, according to census children. We have to build on faith. I think in all these matters there has to be some faith that things will work out.

Ray Swanson - Answering Mrs. Riddle, the law provides that if a Plan is rejected the Committee has two alternatives: 1. To submit the same Plan not earlier than one year. 2. Committee may devise a new Plan they feel will be more acceptable. One reason the Committee has stuck with the Plan is that it meets the criteria as set up. I know that the people in District #66 are concerned with the Plan in Cottage Grove. The people at Cottage Grove has recourse through the courts. They were all component districts of a Union High School district and could not meet state standards otherwise. Proposals have been made to the Legislature to help clarify this situation. If the first Plan is rejected I would be for considering a Plan to divide the districts.

#66 - Mrs. Dale Riddle - Was not condemning Committee.

Dennis Patch - Regarding Mr. Swanson's proposal on Plans submitted a second time, I have received information that the proposal is receiving some acceptance within the Legislature.

#66 - Stephen Ford - You brought procedure up to a second or revised Plan. What is the procedure from thereon?

Dennis Patch - It depends on whether the first Plan was rejected on an over-all majority vote. The procedure for the second Plan regarding the voting procedure, is an over-all majority vote and there is no rejecting district provision, according to the recent Attorney General's opinion.

#66 - Stephen Ford - I am assuming this would come up for election - that the district rejects but majority vote is in favor - that petition is presented from the rejecting district for another election and it is rejected by a majority in the rejecting district. Can the Committee then recommend that part of the

district go ahead leaving out the rejecting district or may present a new Plan? What majority and how is the new Plan rejected?

Dennis Patch - Committee may propose approving districts into a new Plan if they submit it within 30 days. If State Board approves Plan then goes back to a vote in the districts. If Committee does not feel this is sound they may propose an entirely new Plan.

#66 - Stephen Ford - What is the procedure on a complete new Plan?

Dennis Patch - If Committee proposes a new Plan more acceptable to the people they would abide by Attorney General's opinion which would require an overall majority vote in the proposed district. The Attorney General's opinion is the law and on the second vote there is no provision for a rejecting district.

Dennis Patch - There was submitted from the District #66 area, a petition to the State Board of Education about 18 months ago, disapproving the Plan -- the Plan discussed prior to this Plan. Requested Ray Swanson to read petition:

Ray Swanson -

"This petition, sponsored by the Applegate P.T.A., the Lorane P.T.C., the Crow Grange, and the Lorane Grange and signed by legal voters within District #66, respectfully requests the State Board of Education to turn down the present plan for R-5 submitted by the Lane County School Reorganization Committee and asks that a substitute plan be called for, taking into account the following considerations:

1. (a). The purpose of including District #66 in R 5 seems to be to secure its evaluation for tax purposes without taking into consideration the welfare of District #66, and
- (b). Equalization of taxes would be within the proposed R 5 only but would not result in parity with certain other Lane County districts.
2. Based on the limited information supplied by the committee, it would seem
- (a). that if District #66 were willing to sacrifice its school system for the larger reorganized district, we would then be a part of a large but relatively poor district with added transportation and housing problems and not enough money to improve to any appreciable degree our educational program, and
- (b). This new district would still have a relatively small high school enrollment.
3. The accusation that we are opposed to this plan simply because it would increase taxes or that we are against reorganization or consolidation per se is without foundation. A study of the history of the district for the last nine years refutes this charge.

Within that time we have built, without the aid of the reorgani-

zation laws, a consolidated district comprising seven former districts. Our school provides education for 12 years in two new, modern eight-grade schools and a 10 teacher high school housed in a new building and providing a broad course of study. We offer this as conclusive evidence that the people of District #66 are not afraid of consolidation and/or increased taxes if the end result justifies them.

We are naturally proud of what we have and are very reluctant to sacrifice these gains to support a program, which, by the evidence presented, cannot substantially improve our economic, scholastic or social position as a community or as a part of the proposed reorganized district."

Ray Swanson - Read the following objective as it is contained in the Plan: "As great a degree of equalization of financial resources at the local level as can be effected by school district reorganization."

The Committee originally proposed 12 Plans. Proposed combining high school districts only where high schools were close. Equalization is not the only criteria but is one that is required. Presented True Cash Value per census figures as follows:

#28J1 - \$ 9,247.89

66 - 28,018.05

Lane County - 15,379.74

Commented on No. 3 of the petition filed with the State Board and stated that the minutes of the Committee's meetings had been checked and no member of the Committee had made any such acquisitions.

#66 - Ed Cooper - In the Brochure I was asked to furnish a list of subjects at Crow High. I furnished such a list and the two lists were put together. The list does not accurately portray the subjects at Crow High. In the case of Shop, we have more than one Shop class. Our total number of subjects would be larger than shown.

#66 - Paul Blazer - Afraid of irritation that might develop about communities. Since District #66 will probably turn this down perhaps we had better not bring it up. From this point of cold war there are loads of things I disagree with. I did not vote for a program under this setup. I can see the advantage of both sized districts. Am definitely opposed to being taken into larger organizations. It isn't because we don't like the people in neighboring districts. Think it is a mistake to try a reorganization and had better leave it the way it is. I think a small district can do a lot for themselves if they want to. I don't believe the big schools will give individual attention to their children.

Dennis Patch - School systems are just as good as the people want to make them.

#28J- Mrs. Prutsman - Where subjects lists "0" does it mean they do not offer this course?

Ray Swanson - Means it is not offered. In different years different courses are offered.

#28 - Mrs. Pruitsman - How are our kids rated in college? If it isn't the quality -- it seems funny that three kids should fail the first term of college. If the two schools combine perhaps we can offer more subjects.

#66 - Ted Biggs - So far in this discussion they have made some very definite statements that it might save money in the long run. I don't see on what you base your recommendation. Transportation will probably cost more and the advantages and disadvantages to families picking up children would pay more. The overall picture would not indicate better schools by consolidating. The districts are both so large now I don't see the advantage of consolidation. It is going to hit the taxpayer's pocketbook anyway. It isn't going to save any money.

Edward Efteland - I don't think the Committee is so dumb they don't see how the people in District No. 66 are going to vote. Pointed out that the Liberty district joined Junction City even though it cost them around \$6,000.00 in equalized levy. If we have to make a recommendation on another Plan at a later date, called attention to Section 2 of the law and pointed out also that the Committee could have presented a County Unit Plan, but did not do so.

#66 - Ted Biggs - I am not against reorganization but if there are advantages I would like to see them. I don't see where it would benefit any of my kids.

Dale Parnell - This isn't to say one thing would be better than another but first of all, relating to taxable wealth, if we could have:

1. Prediction of Committee - it would be difficult to predict what will happen in the secondary school situation. It would seem good practice to allow the local people to decide what kind of organization they would like in their district regarding high school education.
2. Cost - apologized for not getting out figures. However, if program stayed with approximately 59 subjects the cost would remain relatively the same.
3. Growth prediction - At the rate of present growth, you have grown about 6% average a year. The district the Committee has proposed would be about 3500 children -- 650 - 700 High School students in 1970, projected upon the present 6% increase -

#66 - 190-200 H.S. students

#28J- 460-500 H.S. students

The ideal size of a High School is between 800 to 1000 students, based upon good administration and taxable wealth.

4. There are some advantages and disadvantages to a large school. Pointed out the possible size of various classes in combined district and the ability to hire specialists in the teaching field.

Ralph Stuller - I like everything I have heard at this hearing. Some people say 800-1000 is a good sized High School and some say it isn't.

#66 - Mrs. Dale Riddle - It we were consolidated and if it would benefit all of our

students I am sure everyone in our area would be receptive. We would like our school to stay small. I do feel the children at Crow are getting a lot of advantages. Our school wasn't built by the sawmill -- sure taxpayers did their part. We don't want the huge schools.

#66 - Mr. Liles - We are happy to be here. We have hashed and rehashed and there is no use to continue.

Ralph Stuller - This is American Democracy and the various things people have said are true.

Mr. Patch thanked Superintendent Williams and Board for providing facilities; Ray Swanson and Members of the Lane County Committee, Dale Parnell, Margaret Blanton, Ralph Stuller, and patrons for their attendance.

Mr. Patch stated that whether or not you are aware of it, you have one of the finest Committees working on Reorganization in the State. They know what they are doing and I think the people of Lane County should be very proud of them. If the Plan is approved, you people have the prerogative to vote on what you want to do.

Meeting adjourned.

Minutes submitted by Margaret Blanton.

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE
December 13, 1960

Regular meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County School Office with the following present:

Ray Swanson
Paul Ehinger
Marvin Hendrickson
Winifred Hult

Edward Efteland
Clarence Jackson
William Wilt
Ruth Gould, Secretary

Motion was made by Clarence Jackson, seconded by Paul Ehinger, and carried, that the minutes of the meeting of November 15th be approved.

Letter was read from Gerald W. Detering, Chairman of the Linn County Reorganization Committee, inviting the Lane County Committee to a joint meeting with the Linn County sub-committee for the Harrisburg-Coburg area, to be held at the Harrisburg Union High School at 8:00 p.m., December 22, 1960. Several members indicated they would attend.

Edward Efteland reported on the joint meeting with the Douglas County Committee held in Roseburg on November 28th, at which time the Douglas County Committee voted to concur with the Lane County Committee in the canvass of the ballots that were cast in the matter of the reorganization election effecting Latham School District (ASD No. 45) held on September 28, 1960.

Letter was read from Nile G. Williams, Superintendent of District No. 28J and written by Order of the Board of Education, making the following proposals:

1. The property west of Coyote Creek in Sections 1, 2, and 11 in Township 18 South, Range 5 West, now in Lane County District No. 4, be included in the R-5 Plan.

Reason: The road access to this property is through Lane County School District 28J and is now traveled by School District 28J buses. Also, this would create a natural geographic boundary.

2. An evaluation of Sections 4 and 5 in Township 17 South, Range 5 West, and Sections 32 and 33 in Township 16 South, Range 5 West.

Reason: Request has been made by Henry Seidemann that consideration be given to a boundary change that would place all of his property in School District 28J. Seidemann and C. P. Smirl have been sending children to Elmira to school and, until this year, according to Mr. Seidemann, their taxes have been assessed for the Elmira schools. However, the 1960-61 tax roll indicates the majority of their property is in Lane County District 69J.

3. Should the R-5 plan be defeated or changed, consideration be given to establishing the west boundary of Lane County School District 66 at the east boundaries of Township 19 South, Range 7 West, and Township 20 South, Range 7 West to the Douglas County line. This proposal was presented to the County Committee at the R-5 hearing held in Crow on October 24, 1960.

Reasons:

- a. "As great a degree of equalization of financial resources at the local level as can be effected by school district reorganization."

b. This would also establish a consistent boundary line.

No action was taken on the requests from District No. 28J.

The minutes of the October 24, 1960 hearing at Crow were reviewed and the R-5 Plan was discussed at length.


Motion was made by Clarence Jackson and seconded by Marvin Hendrickson, to submit Partial Plan R-5 to the State Board without revision.

YES ----- 6
NO ----- 0
ABSTAINED ----- 1 (Ehinger)
Motion carried.

Motion was made by Paul Ehinger and seconded by Marvin Hendrickson, to set the date of January 11, 1961, for the election of directors for A.S.D. No. 40 and A.S.D. No. 45.
Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION



Chairman


Secretary

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

November 15, 1960

Regular meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County School Office with the following members present:

Ray Swanson
Joe Swift
Gordon Hale

William Wilt
Edward Efteland
Paul Ehinger
Ruth Gould, Secretary

Motion was made by Mr. Joe Swift, seconded by William Wilt, and carried, that the minutes of the meetings of September 20th and October 19th be approved.

Letter was read from the Douglas County Reorganization Committee requesting Mr. Swanson and Mrs. Gould to attend a meeting of the Douglas County Committee on November 28th, 7:00 P.M. to consider the matter of the concurrence of the Douglas County Committee with the Lane County Committee in regard to Lane County A.S.D. No. 43. It was agreed that Mr. Swanson and Mrs. Gould would attend this meeting.

Ray Swanson introduced Gordon Hale who is replacing Edgar Rickard as a member of the Committee. Mr. Swanson explained that Edgar Rickard could no longer serve as a member of the Committee due to his accepting a contract to teach part-time at the Cottage Grove High School.

Mr. Adams requested the Committee's approval to transfer a small portion of territory from School District No. 52 to School District No. 4. He stated that the request represents an area including 10 homes and approximately 35 acres; that 9 home-owners wish the transfer and one is a renter having no children and is neutral on the matter. Mr. Adams gave the following reasons for requesting the above transfer of territory:

1. Convenience -- access through School District No. 4.
2. Petitions have been circulated to be included in the Santa Clara Water district.
3. Safety factor - railroad crossing is hazardous.
4. Would involve no change in District No. 4 bus schedule.
5. No significant financial change.

Mrs. Yates, one of the signers of the petition, stated that the area is less than one mile to Santa Clara and is three miles to the Fairfield School.

Mr. Adams - there are 7 school age children involved. Had met with the Eugene School Board six weeks ago and were told they had the yellow light to proceed.

Motion was made by Paul Ehinger, seconded by Edward Efteland, that the petition requesting the transfer of territory from School District No. 52 to School District No. 4, be presented to the District Boundary Board with the approval of the Reorganization Committee. Motion Carried.

Letter was read from the clerk of Union High School District No. 1 asking that the agenda for the November meeting include the petition on file from Union High No. 1 requesting permission for an election to lower the grades to include Grades 1 to 12; also requesting approval to hold this election immediately after their bonds are sold.

Ray Swanson asked for comments from patrons. Three were present from Union High No. 1-Pleasant Hill; twelve were present from the Fall Creek-Lowell area.

Richard McIntyre, Supt. #71 - Would like clarification on voting procedure, relative

to extending the curriculum downward in Union High No. 1.

Ray Swanson - Only those could vote who reside in component elementary districts comprising Union High No. 1.

Wm. Kidder, #71 - Requested the reading of the law - voting part.

Ray Swanson - Read ORS 335.490 and 335.495.

Wm. Kidder, #71 - If this election is voted down in Dexter-Zion but carries over-all, would it carry?

Ray Swanson - No, it would fail.

Wm. Kidder, #71 - Could we then extend the Union High No. 9 course? We had asked previously for action on this area but have heard nothing. If this is voted down in Dexter-Zion could we ask for a unification?

Ray Swanson - You have a right to make requests to the Committee.

Edward Efteland - Union High School Districts were established by law after the establishment of regular school districts.

Ray Swanson - One problem, when people become a part of any school district, they assume certain obligations. Any division of area would also make them responsible for their share of the bonded indebtedness.

Wm. Kidder, #71 - Won't you consider the damage you would do if you grant the U-1 petition? You would be tearing down one district to build up another.

Ray Swanson - Committee is still in favor of the R-1 Plan.

Wm. Kidder, #71 - If this is voted down are you going to put another R-1 Plan up for vote?

Ray Swanson - At this point we will put up another R-1 plan.

Wm. Kidder, #71 - We have already paid for a building at Lowell and if we go to Pleasant Hill we will be bonded to build another school. In either case we will lose.

Duane Brown, #U-1 - It is the feeling of the boards of District No. 1 and U-1 that the R-1 Plan is their choice. They also felt that it would be no damage to District No. 71 in taking the 200 students, as the area is rich in children and poor in valuation. Pleasant Hill wants to straighten out boundary purely for educational gain, not financial. We felt by putting it up to a vote in the area we would know where the majority of the people would like to go.

Ray Swanson - Recalled that the request from District No. 71 was for a solution to this area.

Earl Drury, #67 and U-9 - Overlapping districts is a source of difficulty. To my knowledge there is no indication of favor of the R-1 Plan.

Ray Swanson - Cited problem of a vote on a second Plan, according to the recent Attorney General's opinion. The Committee does not wish to get into this situation until the Legislature meets and clarifies the law.

George Crampton, #71 - The Dexter-Zion area, District No. 71, still has three houses that are in U-9. Committee should bear in mind that one situation involves 200 children and the other 80 children. As far as R-1, Lowell has been accused of voting it down. The first Plan included the building of the High School at Dexter. Pleasant Hill did not favor

this. In the consolidation election Pleasant Hill voted in favor.

Charles Funk, Supt. #1 and U-1 - The factor of education is most important. Pleasant Hill wants better schools and is willing to do this. Pleasant Hill is going forward in education. Wish to have this settled so that Pleasant Hill can go ahead.

Ray Swanson - Committee is interested in the education of our children. Cited Committee's O.K. on the authorization of the consolidation election in Districts No. 67 and 71, and this was done in the prime interest of education.

Ray Swanson - Read 1957-58 summary of courses offered in both U-1 and U-9.

Charles Funk, Supt. #1 and U-1 - Union High No. 1 is now offering 46 courses.

Wm. Kidder, #71 - Everything would be better if we could get R-1 than what is proposed at this time.

Charles Funk, Supt. #1 and U-1 - This request does not eliminate R-1.

Paul Ehinger - Regardless of where line is drawn, some people will say they are robbed.

Wm. Kidder, #71 - I have tried for years to get this straightened out and got nowhere.

Duane Brown, #U-1 - We are not asking the Reorganization Committee to award this area but merely to let people vote whether they wish to go to Pleasant Hill or Lowell.

James Wiemers, #71 - Why did you reject proposal to divide this area?

Ray Swanson - More in favor of R-1 Plan. The Committee did not accept proposal of the division.

James Wiemers, #71 - Thinks R-1 Plan has less chance since Pleasant Hill is building a high school in their area. If we are going to do anything it would seem fairer to divide this area.

Ray Swanson - If the election were allowed and it carries, the result would be the unification of the two districts and a change of boundary could more easily be attained through operation of law.

Wm. Kidder, #71 - If this vote comes up it will be harder to get the unification of the two districts.

F. Wagner, #71 and U-1 - Have been contacted by people who live in both areas. Guess I will trade by property and move to Lowell where I wish my child to attend school.

Mrs. John Duncan, #71 and U-9 - Requested that previous minutes be corrected as to the district in which she resides. Does not think R-1 is dead. If Dexter-Zion is taken out of District No. 71 they are in a good position of not having to build. I think when District No. 67 and No. 71 consolidate their taxes are going to go up. Is in favor of R-1 Plan.

Ray Swanson - Felt Committee would sit tight until after the legislature makes some changes, as far as submitting R-1 Plan again.

Edward Efteland - When is the earliest the U-1 people would like to call an election on their proposal?

Charles Funk, Supt. #1 and U-1 - January 15th or after the bonds are sold.

Edward Efteland - What would be a convenient transition time?

Charles Funk, Supt. #1 and U-1 - Probably February 1st.

Ray Swanson - If you hold an election and it is successful would it involve another building program?

Harold McLeod, #U-1 - Yes.

Charles Funk, #1 and U-1 - Probably around \$350,000.

Harold McLeod, #U-1 - About voting - we really got out and tried to educate the people.

Edward Efteland - If this committee makes a decision would you feel that you could rally enough support and go to the legislature and show them the inequity in the law in looking at your problem?

Wm. Kidder, #71 - Yes and no. I might write some letters but I do not pull a lot of weight. All of the people in District #71 are owners of their school. Anytime you go messing with that district all of the people are involved. It is a bad situation.

Gordon Hale - Cited experience in District #19 of building a second high school - met antagonism, especially attendance unit basis, but it has worked out.

Wm. Kidder, #71 - Children get adjusted to a new situation pretty quick - whether Pleasant Hill planned this on purpose or by accident - it doesn't make people happy.

James Wiemers, #71 and U-9 - If you allow this election I do not see any inequities to the people in Dexter-Zion, as they would be voting separately and making their decision as to where they wish to be included.

Ray Swanson - Explained the final effect on U-9. If the vote carries in Districts No. 67 and 71 and the curriculum is extended downward in U-1, this would automatically dissolve U-9 and make District #71 a unified district. Could you wait until another vote is held on R-1, which would probably be after the legislature meets and clarifies the law?

Charles Funk, Supt. #1 and U-1 - I do not think R-1 would have a chance without a lot of work.

Mrs. Duncan, #71 and U-9 - If District No. 71 becomes unified then wouldn't R-1 be dead?

Paul Ehinger - Is there any sentiment in Districts No. 67, 71 and U-9 to go along with the U-1 proposal?

Mitchell Fox, U-9 - Let them decide for themselves. Does not think we are hurting Pleasant Hill by going ahead with our building program.

Duane Brown, #U-1 - If Districts No. 67 and 71 consolidate and the 200 students in Dexter-Zion are out, District #71 would probably not have to build. Would it not be better to solve the U-1 proposal before District #71 bonds to build?

Edward Efteland - The Committee tries to exhaust every means in reaching a decision.

John Kohl, Prin. U-1 - If the District #71 and District #1 boards are willing to bring this to a vote can the committee not now allow this to come to a vote?

Robert Bucler, Supt. U-9 - How soon would U-1 be ready to assume the Grade School children at Lowell if election passed? Would they be ready by July 1st?

Charles Funk, Supt. #1 and U-1 - I am sure we can come to some arrangement with Lowell. There might be a short time we would have to tuition or double-shift.

Robert Butler, Supt. U-9 - It appears (on my own observation) that if those students remain at Lowell it would still leave Lowell Grade over-crowded.

Richard McIntyre, Supt. #71 - District #71 board would go along as far as they could. The board's first obligation would be to their own pupils first and if space remains to take other students.

Charles Funk, Supt. #1 and U-1 - That is the reason to have a vote as soon as possible.

James Wiemers, #71 and U-9 - Majority of District No. 71 board would be in favor of the U-1 election.

Earl Drury, #67 and U-9 - Board has discussed this at length and if the Dexter-Zion area are allowed to vote by themselves it is a fair proposition.

Wm. Kidder, #71 - Had asked previously if Dexter-Zion could vote separately and was told "no".

Wm. Wilt - That was on a different question.

Richard McIntyre, Supt. #71 - Hate to see program go out of our school but I think the general feeling of the committee is that something has to be done. No doubt the proposal presented by the U-1 Board is the fairest method as it gives the Dexter-Zion area the right to vote alone.

Motion was made by Joe Swift, seconded by William Wilt, to approve the petition from the Board of Union High School District No. 1 to call an election in Union High No. 1 on extending the course of study downward to include Grades 1, according to ORS 335.490. Motion carried.

Ray Swanson called to the attention of the Committee the necessity of electing a vice-chairman.

Motion was made by Joe Swift, seconded by Paul Ehinger, to nominate William Wilt, vice-chairman of the Lane County Reorganization Committee. Motion carried.

Next regular meeting of the Lane County Reorganization Committee will be held on Tuesday, December 13th, at the County School Office.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION



Chairman

Secretary

October 24, 1960.

Following the Hearing at Crow High School, Earl Drury, Mitchell Fox and Robert Butler from the Fall Creek-Lowell area met with Ray Swanson, Edward Efteland, Clarence Jackson and Winifred Hult, to discuss problems in the Fall Creek-Lowell area.

It was proposed by the patrons present that Union High No. 9 vote their curriculum downward through Grade 1. It was suggested that this be held up due to the consolidation vote in Districts No. 67 and 71 and also the request already made from the board of Union High School District No. 1 to vote the curriculum downward through Grade 1. It was pointed out if the above was accomplished by local action it would automatically bring about the same result without a vote in Union High No. 9 to extend the curriculum downward through Grade 1.

No official action could be taken by the Committee since there was not a quorum present.

PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED PARTIAL PLAN R-5
Crow High School - October 24, 1960

A Public Hearing on proposed Partial Plan R-5 was held in the Crow High School with Committee Members Ray Swanson, Edward Efteland, Clarence Jackson, Winifred Hult, and Secretary Ruth Gould, present. Approximately 70 persons were in attendance for the hearing.

A Partial Plan of School District Reorganization calling for the formation of an Administrative School District comprising School District No. 66, Lane County, and School District No. 28J1, Lane and Douglas Counties, was presented by the chairman, Ray Swanson.

Edward Cooper, Superintendent, School District No. 66, explained the Crow High School program of studies in detail and called attention to their plan of rotating subjects.

Niles Williams, Superintendent, School District No. 28J1, explained the Elmira High School program of studies in detail.

Ray Swanson presented Table showing ranking of districts as to number of courses offered and cost per day, not including transportation.

Comments -

Mrs. Fullerton, #66 - If voted where will children go to High School - also, Grade School?

Ray Swanson - Committee does not have authority to set attendance units. This is up to the board of the Administrative School District.

Mrs. Riddle, #66 - How can we vote when there is nothing definite offered. We want to know what we are voting on before we vote. Mentioned what has happened in Florida and was afraid it might happen here. In Florida, land and enrolment soared and that is the reason we moved from there.

Paul Blander, #66 - Opposed to Plan. Pointed out the growth of the school program in Crow-Applegate and the good job the district has been doing. Favored forstalling proposal. We are working for a good school program in District No. 66. The larger the unit the smaller percentage of the people take an active part in school. We are going to have more population and will have a school comparable with what is recommended for a much larger school. We should stay the way we are.

Mr. Blazer, #66 - There is such a thing as quality and quantity.

Mrs. Bridges, #66 - Even though a school offers a reasonable amount of courses, a student can take only 20 in a period of four years. Children are going to get by with the least amount of study they can. Only about 3% would take more.

Mrs. Riddle, #66 - Would you promise 59 courses if we reorganized?

Ray Swanson - We cannot make any promises. This is up to the board of the Administrative District.

Mrs. Bridges, #66 - Is this school up to required State High School standards?

Ray Swanson - Yes, it is rated as standard by the State Department of Education. We have been criticized that we have not provided sufficient information. Some of this information we cannot supply.

Ernie Craig, #66 - School District No. 4, Eugene, offered 94 courses?

Ray Swanson - Yes, in 1958-59.

Ernie Craig, #66 - We had better simplify our courses instead of getting such a variety of courses. This information was suggested by college regulations for college entrance. The Conant report suggested the need for more basic courses and do away with frills.

Winifred Hult - From Conant report it stated that American youth should have education to develop talents.

Mrs. Wagner, #66 - The Conant report suggested terminal courses at High School level which would prepare them for college.

Ray Swanson - Reorganization is not tied to the Conant report. We are not following Dr. Conant specifically. Our desire is to make a district more effective.

Mr. Liles, #66 - Two problems are involved: 1. Cost, and 2. Size of schools. Cited problem that has been created with Attorney General's opinion in Cottage Grove case. After we vote this down the first time are we going to be faced with it again?

Ray Swanson - Explained Attorney General's opinion and the Cottage Grove outcome even tho five districts voted against. Over-ruled minority rights. Would not vote for a second election here until after the Legislature meets.

Mr. Liles, #66 - Could we get committment that we could vote a reorganized district comprising District No. 66? Suggested the Committee forget this until another law is passed by the Legislature.

Mr. Counts, #66 - Against Reorganization Plan as proposed. With Lorane and Applegate consolidated we got what we wanted here. Objected to zones and method of electing board members. As far as valuation is concerned, dollars count in this. Many problems in transportation, additional buildings, and no end when we get started. This is all right separately but would get out of control as a larger district. Objected to size of proposed Administrative School District.

Ray Swanson - This is the first plan. The plan at Cottage Grove was the second. It was on the second plan that the Attorney General's opinion applies.

Mr. Counts, #66 - It can look like it is being crammed down some peoples throats.

Noble Wheeler, #28J1 - In favor of proposed Plan. Satisfactory for educational purposes. Suggested that boundary change be made -- Range line between Ranges 6 and 7.

An unidentified lady from District No. 66 - Has there been a date set for a vote?

Ray Swanson - No. Reviewed procedure.

Stephen Ford, #66 - Questioned former statement --- if districts voted against they were automatically left out. Will things be changed again next week? We can't depend on statements.

Ray Swanson - Statement made was a provision for a district to reject on the first election.

Stephen Ford, #66 - How can we stay out of it?

Ray Swanson - Explained 60% negative vote provision -- under this they would have 30 days to present petition signed by 50% of number of voters, then a second election is proposed within the rejecting district. This vote takes only a 50% to reject.

Clinton Boehringer, #66 - Have no quarrel with Committee. Under the provisions of the law they probably came up with the only thing they could present to the people. As far as District #66, we will vote it down. Up to the time of the Attorney General's decision we were not worried for it to be put up to a vote, now we are afraid to put it up to a vote. I think the Committee should go back and consider proposal to let District #66 make an Administrative district. Suggested they allow an election outside of a Reorganization election so they could present evidence to the Reorganization Committee and then let each district set up a Reorganized district. This would give a chance to not turn down by election the first proposal. The Committee could then make an alternate proposal. This would give concrete evidence from the district. Do this before the first election is held.

Ed Utter, #28J1 - Should be a revision of boundary between Ranges 6 and 7. Proposed it be made mandatory that local committees be included in Plan.

Mrs. Blazer, #66 - Are there any specific provisions for election or appointment of local committees?

Ray Swanson - Cited ORS 330.533.

Mr. Liles, #66 - If boundary is changed, as proposed, it would have been OK before Attorney General's opinion, but not now. The problem is the threat of having it thrown back a second time and it would be carried without wanting to go. We would like assurance we won't get this crammed down our throats.

Ray Swanson - The proper place for this to be clarified and corrected is in the Legislature.

Mr. Scharen, #66 - After this has been digested is there anything to stop it?

Mr. Swanson - Cannot answer this. The Committee exists only until 1962. This Committee is not in favor of a County Unit.

Mr. Scharen, #66 - To what degree could this thing go? It looks like it is headed for centralized education and government.

Noble Wheeler, #28J1 - Clarified proposal. Did not believe there were any people living in the area that was proposed to be added to District No. 28J1.

Mary McIntyre, #28J1 - Asked for clarification of line between Ranges 6 and 7.

Clinton Boehringer, #66 - One (1) child lives west of Alma.

Gustaf Swanson, #28J1 - Would like to know if election is called and rejected, would Committee have the right to change the line?

Ray Swanson - Committee would have the right only to propose.

Gustaf Swanson, #28J1 - There is perhaps 200 acres in the Central area that is in the Eugene School District. What can we do to get that into our district. It would be ridiculous for the Eugene district to pick up children with the District 28J bus going within 1/4 mile. This land is located on the west side of Coyote Creek.

An Unidentified Lady from #28J - Is there any estimate of how long it would take high school children to get to their attendance units?

Ed Cooper, Supt. #66 - We have one child who is now on the bus for one hour. This includes riding in a private car before catching the bus.

Arvid Rothauge, #66 - Those in attendance are here because they are interested in education. We are beginning to see the light. We were interested in equalization previously but now with handwriting on the wall we should take notice where we are headed. We have two units that are pretty well organized. We do not need bigger schools to have a better education. Feel the Elmira High School and the Crow High School will have large ratio of college graduates. Questioned necessity of having more courses. Both Elmira and Crow have good High Schools. Know that the Reorganization Committee has a responsibility but feel the districts are now the way they should be. If we keep reorganizing we will lose local representation.

Edward Efteland - It would have been easier to suggest two plans but Committee proposed what they felt was the best Plan. We know where the dollars fit in. Read article from the August 15th issue of the Oregonian.

Edward Cooper, Supt. #66 - In behalf of the School Board, welcomed patrons and Committee back at any time.

Ray Swanson on behalf of the Committee, thanked District #66 for their courtesy and complimented District No. 66 on their interest in education.

Meeting adjourned.

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

October 19, 1960

Special meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in Harris Hall with the following members present:

Ray Swanson
Edgar Rickard
Marvin Hendrickson
Edward Efteland

Clarence Jackson
Winifred Hult
William Wilt
Ruth Gould, Secretary

Chairman Ray Swanson called the meeting to order and introduced Dennis Patch, State Director of School District Reorganization.

Seven (7) patrons were present at the meeting - five and the Superintendent from Union High School District No. 1, and the Superintendent from School District No. 45.

Secretary Ruth Gould informed the Committee that petitions had been received from School Districts No. 67 and 71, signed by a sufficient number of legal voters, requesting a consolidation election.

Ray Swanson asked for comments from patrons. No comments were offered and Mr. Swanson called on Ray Quick, a resident of the Dexter-Zion area.

Ray Quick - Was under the impression that legal procedure was for the School Boards in respective areas to do the circulating of petitions, not individuals.

Ray Swanson - Anyone can circulate petitions. The only provision is the required number of legal signers.

Ray Quick - Felt the consolidation of Districts No. 67 and 71 would conflict with the R-1 Plan. Suggested extending the curriculum down in Union High No. 1. If Districts No. 67 and 71 were consolidated it would mean a building project and the people in Dexter-Zion would be taxed for building which they would not use. If the consolidation was voted it would mean at least four (4) classrooms being built. Lowell Grade is up to capacity now, and also Fall Creek Grade. It would probably mean a bond issue of from \$125,000 to \$150,000 for a building program and it would be mainly for the benefit of the Fall Creek people.

Ray Swanson - Committee is faced with request from Union High No. 1 to extend the curriculum down through Grade 1 and the petitions from Districts No. 67 and 71 to consolidate. On October 18, 1960, Union High No. 1 passed a bond issue in the amount of \$315,000 to expand their present facilities. Their bonds will probably be sold in about January. This means there can be no election until after that time. Any bond proposal in School Districts No. 67 and 71 would take at least this long. We are faced with the problem of whether or not the consolidation of Districts No. 67 and 71 is desirable, and also whether or not it is desirable to hold an election in U-1 to vote down the curriculum.

Ray Quick - Is there a hurry to make a decision?

Charles Funk, Supt., Union High No. 1 - Have sent the Committee summary of the Pleasant Hill program. Still have the door open for School Districts No. 67 and 71. It would work a hardship on Union High No. 1 to lose the 75 students in the Dexter-Zion area. The Union High No. 1 directors are thinking only of the education of the students. Suggested that Pleasant Hill be given sufficient time to complete the selling of their bonds before Fall Creek and Lowell vote. Felt that the Dexter-Zion people favor going to Pleasant Hill.

Ray Swanson - Would the consolidation of Fall Creek and Lowell Grades be detrimental to the Pleasant Hill program?

Charles Funk, Supt. U-1 - No, it would probably be a push toward the R-1 Plan. Suggested that the consolidation petitions from School Districts No. 67 and 71 be held for a while.

Ray Quick - If Districts No. 67 and 71 were interested in academic benefit they would no doubt work this on a tuition basis.

Ray Swanson - This is a local issue and not of the Committee.

Charles Funk, Supt. U-1 - It seems that one of the vital points is, we will end up with two small high schools instead of one. Pleasant Hill's efforts are toward the R-1 Plan. Pleasant Hill has the site and plans for building a fine high school that would take care of the entire area.

Ray Swanson - The Committee has to decide on one of the following:

1. The R-1 Plan.
2. Two approximate equal districts in size.
3. One large district and one small district.

The Committee can propose but the decision is up to the people in the area.

William Wilt - We have had requests from both sides -- one side that it would hurt the R-1 Plan and the other side that it would help the R-1 Plan.

Charles Funk, Supt. U-1 - If Dexter-Zion is included in the District No. 67 and 71 consolidation they are still obligated to their share of the U-1 bonds. It is in the minutes of the U-1 Board that they wish to vote on extending the curriculum downward through Grade 1.

Ray Swanson - It would apply that if there is time to hold an election to vote down the District No. U-1 program and unifying District No. U-1, the Dexter-Zion area would be withdrawn from the District No. 71 area.

Charles Funk to Dennis Patch - Can Union High No. 1 do this immediately or must they wait on bonds?

Dennis Patch - Suggested they get clearance from Bond Attorney Schuler first.

Ed Seigmund - Asked for clarification on bonding.

Ray Swanson - It would seem that Lowell and Fall Creek might want to wait to see the outcome of U-1 voting down, as this would make difference to them due to the Dexter-Zion area. Felt it is still a local problem and should be accomplished by them instead of being resolved by the Committee. Bonding in both Pleasant Hill and the Lowell-Fall Creek area is a vital factor.

Ruth Gould, Acting County School Superintendent - Fall Creek is faced with a very overcrowded problem and it would be better educationally-wise to join a larger district.

Charles Funk, Supt. U-1 - District No. 1 hired a clerical aide to relieve their teachers.

Ray Swanson - Asked Committee if they see any reason denying Union High No. 1 to vote on extending their curriculum down, which would affect around 200 grade school students and around 75 high school students in the Dexter-Zion area?

Edgar Rickard - When can R-1 be put up again?

Ray Swanson - Committee would have to propose same Plan for two hearings. It is over a year since the first Plan was rejected.

Edgar Rickard - Are you considering what the result might be based on the Attorney General's opinion?

Dennis Patch - The Attorney General's opinion applies to the second election. ORS 330.600 (1), applies to the Committee submitting the same plan and the voting procedure on this would be the same as ORS 330.600, with the rejection provision.

Edgar Rickard - Feels Committee is committed on R-1.

Ray Swanson - What about these petitions from Districts No. 67 and 71?

Edgar Rickard - Propose R-1 again.

Ray Swanson - Announced that Edgar Rickard, Vice-Chairman, has accepted a part-time teaching position in Cottage Grove Union High School, and under the law cannot serve as a member of the Committee. Stated that Gordon Hale is the next alternate to become a member of the Committee.

Winifred Hult - If Districts No. 67 and 71 consolidate would it not have an affect on the R-1 Plan?

Ray Swanson - It would change description but not the legal boundaries.

Edward Efteland - What will they do with the Fall Creek students?

Ruth Gould, Acting County School Superintendent - They are at Fall Creek. They have hired a part-time special teacher but have not yet been able to make facilities available.

Charles Funk, Supt. U-1 - Would there be anything lost at all by postponing and Pleasant Hill could vote down to Grade 1 and it would give Dexter-Zion the opportunity to clear their status.

Ray Swanson - Only by improving the situation immediately if Districts No. 67 and 71 consolidated, could something be done for these children at Fall Creek without detracting from Pleasant Hill. We are concerned about the 75 high school students in the Dexter-Zion area and we are also concerned about these children in Fall Creek. This is a re-organization at the local level. We have to decide whether it is desirable or not desirable.

Edward Efteland - Has the school board at District No. 71 discussed any amount of bonding should this take place?

Ray Quick - No.

Marvin Hendrickson - What is the amount of bonding considered by the District No. 71 Board?

Ray Quick - Not decided. The School Board of District No. 71 has two members from the Dexter-Zion area and three from the Fall Creek-Lowell area.

Ray Swanson - Double taxation is the only possibility but the program needs to be improved at District No. 67.

Ray Quick - Some people in Fall Creek and Lowell would like to see the Dexter-Zion area indebted.

Edward Efteland - Based on previous information would their bond needs be very great if they consolidated?

Ray Quick - The Grade School within one year (as it is now) would need a building program.

Ray Swanson - Would like to get a conclusion on this and requested action.

Motion was made by Clarence Jackson and seconded by Marvin Hendrickson, that School Districts No. 67 and 71 be given approval as specified in ORS 330.645 to hold consolidation elections under the Act.

YES - 5

NO - 1 (Efteland)

Motion carried.

On September 30, 1960, a letter was submitted to the State Department of Education, requesting the opinion of the Attorney General on the following two questions:

"1. If a majority of votes cast in the new administrative school district are favorable is the new plan effective?"

"2. Does any common school district have recourse as provided by ORS 330.600-subsection 2-(b) paragraph (b)?"

The opinion received from the Attorney General was read by Edgar Rickard and the answers to the above two questions were summed up as follows: "* * * - - it is the opinion of this office that your first question must be answered in the affirmative, and your second question in the negative."

Ray Swanson - Introduced Senator Donald Husband, member of the Senate Education Committee, who appeared before the Committee and discussed phases of the Reorganization Law and the opinion of the Attorney General.

Dennis Patch - This decision came as a great surprise to me. Have not run into this before.

Jesse Fasold, Superintendent Dist. No. 45 - If this is reorganized and before a bond issue is voted I would want to have the case tested in court.

Edward Efteland - Under present law how long do we have to declare this a reorganized district under this opinion?

Dennis Patch - The only thing I can go by is the opinion of the Attorney General.

Edward Efteland - The law says the Committee shall meet and canvass the votes.

Jesse Fasold, Superintendent Dist. 45 - We would take this to court. An individual would have to have some assets to do this but the Administrative School District is legally affected in bonding, etc.

William Wilt - Who would sue who?

Senator Donald Husband - Probably everybody - School Board, Reorganization Committee, Etc.

Ray Swanson - Perhaps ORS 330.620 (4) would take care of this.

Edward Efteland to Senator Donald Husband - If other senators feel as you do as to what the law ought to be, what do you think will happen to the law at the next session?

Senator Donald Husband - Can't say. I think perhaps a lot of them may say as long as we have the Reorganization Law on the books they would be for taking out the 60/40 rejecting vote.

Dennis Patch - Interim Committee has already proposed the withdrawal of the 60/40 rejecting vote provision.

Dennis Patch - As to what constitutes a change in a Plan, any of the items in the Plan, such as zoning, number of directors, assets and liabilities, constitutes a change in Plan. This would be a new Plan.

William Wilt - What does a "more acceptable Plan" mean?

Dennis Patch - A Plan which is made in the Committee's best judgment.

Donald Husband - If the Legislature abolished this concept of the 60/40 reject, it would tend to solidify their position.

The votes were canvassed from the September 28, 1960 election, and were found to be as follows:

Dist. No. and Name	To Approve Proposed Administrative School District	To Reject Proposed Administrative School District
25J3- Latham	28	55
31 - Blue Mt.	0	26
40 - Creswell (Part)	20	7
45 - Cottage Grove	439	53
48 - Silk Creek	20	10
75 - London	25	23
80 - Lynx Hollow	14	1
84 - Culp Creek	54	20
93 - Dorena	7	24
128 - Mount View	55	3
177 - Disston	10	50
191 - Delight Valley	12	32
TOTALS	684	304

Motion was made by William Wilt and seconded by Marvin Hendrickson, to declare the election to form an Administrative School District comprising School Districts No. 31, 40 (part), 45, 48, 75, 80, 84, 93, 128, 177, 191, Lane County, and No. 25J3, Lane and Douglas Counties, carried -- to become effective on July 1, 1961 and to be known as Administrative School District No. 45J3. That the said election be declared carried in compliance with ORS 330.640 and based on the provisions of ORS 330.610 (2), (a), and the opinion of the Attorney General, No. 5063, dated October 14, 1960. Motion carried.

Ray Swanson reviewed the brochure on proposed R-5 Plan, to be distributed at the October 24th R-5 hearing at the Crow High School.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION


Chairman

Secretary

Robert Y. Thornton
Attorney General

STATE OF OREGON
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Salem

COPY

COPY

October 14, 1960

Honorable Rex Putnam
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Library Building

No. 5063

Attention: Mr. J. L. Turnbull
Deputy Superintendent

You have requested our opinion upon a problem relating to school district reorganization in Lane County. You state that the Lane County Reorganization Committee prepared and adopted a partial plan of district reorganization involving the formation of an administrative school district which would consist of 12 elementary school districts and two union high school districts. The proposal was submitted to the state board, a hearing was held and on May 18, 1959, the board approved the plan. On June 17, 1959, an election was held on the proposed formation which was rejected by the voters. Thereafter on June 21, 1960, the Lane County Reorganization Committee adopted a new plan of district reorganization which consisted of all the districts described in the first plan except the major part of School District No. 40 and Creswell Union High School District. The plan was submitted to the state board, a hearing was held thereon and subsequently on August 4, 1960, the state board approved the new proposal. An election was held in the area on September 28, 1960, and tentative reports indicate that an overall majority vote was in favor of the proposal, although five common school districts rejected the proposal by a majority vote. The questions submitted are as follows:

"1. If a majority of votes cast in the new administrative school district are favorable is the new plan effective?"

"2. Does any common school district have recourse as provided by ORS 330.600-subsection 2-(B) paragraph (b)?"

The Oregon Supreme Court has said:

"The formation, dissolution, and change in boundaries of school districts are legislative matters. School Districts may be abolished or dissolved at the will of the legislature, subject, of course to

constitutional limitations, if any. It is not necessary that the districts affected give their consent to such action, except as otherwise provided by statute. * * * " School District No. 68 et al. v. Hoskins et al., 194 Or. 301, 311.

Thus the question presented is merely one of statutory construction; that is to say, we must try to ascertain from the statutes involved the true legislative intent.

ORS 330.610 prescribes the procedure where the proposal for the formation of an administrative school district is rejected by the voters. Under subsection (1) the county committee may direct the submission of the same plan at a special election to be conducted in the same manner and to be held not earlier than one year from date of the election at which the plan was rejected. Subsection (2) thereof provides:

"The committee may devise a new plan of reorganization which the committee believes will be more acceptable to the legal school voters of the territory affected and submit the new plan to the State Board of Education for approval in the same manner as the original plan was submitted. If the new reorganization plan is approved by the State Board of Education, a special election shall be held as provided in ORS 330.585 to 330.595, and if the new plan is approved by the legal school voters at the election the new administrative school district shall be organized in the manner provided in ORS 330.650 to 330.780. Except as provided in ORS 330.720:

"(a) If the election is held between July 1 and April 30, inclusive, the new administrative school district shall come into existence effective on July 1 next following the election.

"(b) If the election is held between May 1 and June 30, inclusive, the new administrative school district shall come into existence effective on July 1 of the following year." (Emphasis supplied)

In our opinion a common school district which may be involved in the proposed formation of the new administrative school district does not have the recourse as a "rejecting school district" as provided by ORS 330.600 (2) (b) for the following reasons.

ORS 330.600 prescribes the procedure for voting upon an original plan for formation of an administrative school district and subsection (2) (b) requires the votes cast in each common school district to be counted separately and if 60 percent or more of the votes cast within any one or more of such common school districts are against the formation of the administrative school district, the organization of the new administrative school district is delayed for 30 days, and within the 30-day period petition against the formation may be filed in which event another election is held in rejecting

school district. If a majority of the votes cast in such election rejects the formation of the administrative school district the administrative school district is deemed to be rejected by the voters thereof.

Subsection (2) (c) of ORS 330.600 provides the further procedure where common school districts have rejected the formation of an administrative district, and authorizes a committee to submit a proposed plan within 30 days following the last election which would exclude any common school district which voted against the formation of the administrative school district under subsection (2) (b) of the said section. If the plan is approved by the state board an election is held and if a majority of the votes cast by the legal voters within the proposed district is favorable, the new administrative school district is organized, and if half or more of the votes cast are against formation, the committee is to proceed with a new comprehensive plan. Also, by a 1959 amendment (chapter 423, Oregon Laws 1959) the following provision is the concluding sentence in ORS 330.600 (2) (c):

" * * * If a proposed plan is not submitted to the State Board of Education within the 30-day period as authorized by this paragraph, the committee shall proceed with the preparation of a new comprehensive reorganization plan in the manner provided in ORS 330.610."

ORS 330.600 (3) provides the effective date of organization in part as follows:

"(a) If the last election on the formation of the district is held between July 1 and April 30, inclusive, the new administrative school district shall come into existence effective on July 1 next following the election.

"(b) If the last election on the formation of the district is held between May 1 and June 30, inclusive, the new administrative school district shall come into existence effective on July 1 of the following year." (Emphasis supplied)

As noticed from ORS 330.610, supra, the "new plan of reorganization" which the committee may devise is one which "will be more acceptable to the legal school voters" of the territory affected. If the new reorganization plan is approved by the state board, a special election is to be held as provided "in ORS 330.585 to 330.595." (Note that there is no reference or incorporation by reference, to the provisions of ORS 330.600.) The section further provides that if the new plan is "approved by the legal school voters" at the election the new administrative school district shall be organized

and "If the election is held between July 1 and April 30, inclusive, the new administrative school district shall come into existence effective on July 1 next following the election." Had the legislature intended the subsequent petition and election by "rejecting school district" on a revised plan for reorganization, it could have easily provided the same by specific reference to the provisions of ORS 330.600. On the contrary, however, it appears from the procedures outlined for a "new plan of reorganization" that the legislature intended but one election on the new plan and that is an election to be submitted to the voters residing within the territory of the proposed administrative school district. It further provided the effective date of the election (as distinguished from last election in ORS 330.600) when the administrative school district shall come into existence pursuant to the new plan of reorganization.

By chapter 423, Oregon Laws 1959, the legislature amended the School District Reorganization Law in several particulars, but no amendment or change was made with respect to the provisions of ORS 330.610, supra. To hold that the common school districts have the "recourse as provided by ORS 330.600 (2) (b)" following an election on a plan prescribed by ORS 330.610 (2) would be tantamount to supplying words and phrases omitted by the legislature, and this we are not authorized to do.

As stated by the Oregon Supreme Court in *Gouge v. David*, 185 Or. 437, 454:

"* * * All are familiar with the rule that the meaning of unambiguous language cannot be disturbed by judicial interpretation: * * * An administrative agency, no less than a court, is bound by the rule given to us in § 2-216 (ORS 174.010) which says:

"In the construction of a statute or instrument, the office of the judge is simply to ascertain and declare what is, in terms or in substance, contained therein, not to insert what has been omitted, or to omit what has been inserted; * * * ."

Accordingly, it is the opinion of this office that your first question must be answered in the affirmative, and your second question in the negative.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT Y. THORNTON
Attorney General

By

E. G. Foxley
Deputy

CHQ mm r

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

September 20, 1960

Regular meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County School Office with the following members present:

Ray Swanson
Joe Swift
Edward Efteland
Edgar Rickard
Paul Ehinger

Marvin Hendrickson
William Wilt
Winifred Hult
Ruth Gould, Acting Secretary

Motion was made by Mr. Hendrickson, seconded by Mr. Rickard and carried, that the minutes of the meeting of August 16th be approved.

The County School Office called to the attention of the Committee that the Superintendent of the Cottage Grove Elementary district had requested that an opinion of the Attorney General be secured relative to ORS 330.610 - Procedure where proposal for formation of administrative school district is rejected by voters.

Mr. Rickard, at the request of the Superintendent of the Cottage Grove High School, asked what the Committee would think, providing this plan is voted down, of voting the curriculum downward in the Union High? (Proposed ASD No. 45)

The Committee agreed they would have nothing to discuss regarding this until after the September 28th election, but would keep the matter in mind.

Request was made from the board of Union High School District No. 1 to vote on the question of extending the curriculum downward through Grade 1. A discussion of this followed and Mr. Swanson informed the Committee that some of the members had attended a meeting of the Pleasant Hill Grade and High School boards at which they requested an opinion on how this Committee might look to extend the Union High curriculum downward to include Grade 1. This was a general discussion meeting and no opinion was given. However, they did decide to go ahead and make plans for a high school on the site available.

Mr. Swanson - It was determined that if they do go ahead with proposed plan it will make it possible to handle the 150 elementary students. If made effective immediately it would mean they would be responsible immediately for the education of these children. If effective date was postponed until next July they would have no authority to call a bond election. They felt their people would be willing to accept this financial burden.

At this time the Committee adjourned to Harris Hall where a delegation of 17 persons were present from the Fall Creek-Lowell area -

Howard Convers, #67 - We have more students than our school will hold. We have come to request an election to consolidate Fall Creek and Lowell so that we may take immediate action to do something about our problem.

Ray Swanson - Pointed out that this would affect only the grade school students of Fall Creek and Lowell.

Charles Clark, Principal #67 - Fall Creek has four classrooms with an enrolment of 117 and this means each teacher has a double grade. This is over State standards. One of the answers through consolidation would be to make our school into a primary school, possibly next year, and we would give additional benefits by grouping the various grade children. Also, that we could have one teacher per grade. One of our teachers has 35 at present. We think we can give a better educational program all around by consolidating these two schools.

Richard McIntyre, Principal #71 - Have discussed this problem of possible consolidation or tuitioning the students. If consolidation goes through we could absorb some children and not hurt, and another possibility, we have another room or so that could be utilized. We will try to help the Fall Creek children to get a better education. How it is done is trivial but the thing to do is help the children. Lowell has sewers, etc. and if Fall Creek did build they would have a problem. It would no doubt be satisfactory to make Fall Creek a primary unit and move the larger children to Lowell.

Ray Swanson - Did the census figures indicate this problem would arise this year or was it unexpected?

Howard Convers, #67 - This was unexpected in Fall Creek. We have 18 or 20 more than when school closed last year. We knew this was coming sooner or later but were waiting to see the outcome of reorganization. We know we will have to build more rooms but feel we could do it cheaper and better as a unified district.

William Wilt - Could the Fall Creek children be taken to Lowell geographically?

Richard McIntyre, Principal #71 - We have two upper rooms and the first grades are such we hired another teacher last nite. If consolidation goes through we could take the first grade from this area to Fall Creek. The big thing is alleviating the problem in the classroom.

Charles Clark, Principal #67 - Transportation is not a big problem as schools are only 6 miles apart.

Jim Weimers, #71 - Feel the same as those who have spoken.

Howard Convers, #67 - Anxious to have consolidation to get a building program under way. Both boards have met and approved.

Ray Quick, #71 - Plan has not been approved by #71 board - only discussed.

Howard Convers, #67 - Public discussion was held in Fall Creek with around 40 people present. Discussed building program in Fall Creek, of tuition to another school, and consolidation. Group was unanimous to consolidate with Lowell. There will be people opposed but sure from conversations that a majority of people will be in favor.

Paul Ehinger - Is anyone present in opposition?

Ray Quick, #71 - Will speak in opposition since there has been no actual plan. Until we know how it will fit into the over-all plan, I am opposed.

Ray Swanson - For the Committee to give their approval for a vote on the consolidation of Fall Creek and Lowell, I think if this plan is as desirable as it seems to be to the people, you should pick up the petitions at the County Office, get them signed and make a formal request to the Committee. We have given our consent without formal petitions but with formal request.

Howard Convers, #67 - The Fall Creek board desire to either build or tuition some students. He summed up their problems and listed three possibilities:

1. Vote bonds and start building.
2. Vote money to tuition students to someother district.
3. Consolidate with Lowell - even then there would be a building program.

Richard McIntyre, Principal #71 - Do not wish to be interpreted. I do not think it is any of my business -- only looking at it for the good of the children. It is not that I am pushing consolidation or tuition, but only to help children get a better education. The voting public has to decide what is to be done.

Ray Swanson - requested Margaret Blanton to give the procedure on consolidation.

Margaret Blanton, County School Office - Following is the procedure on consolidation:

1. Petition filed from School District No. 67 signed by at least ten (10) legal voters.
2. Petition filed from School District No. 71 signed by at least fifty (50) legal voters.
3. Petitions to be presented to the County School Superintendent, who is Secretary of the District Boundary Board. The Boundary Board will call elections in both districts to vote on the question of consolidating School Districts No. 67 and 71. (Before they will authorize the election however, they must have the approval of the Reorganization Committee).
4. If there is a majority of votes cast in both districts the Boundary Board will declare the election carried.

Paul Ehinger - Get the two petitions signed and in. We could have a special meeting if necessary. Without petitions there is no action necessary.

Ray Swanson - Hearing no objection you can see the feeling of the Committee. This would be partial fulfillment of the R-1 Plan.

Edward Efteland - Are other members of #71 board present? Would like to hear from them.

George Crampton, #71 - We did not take action but majority of board feel it is OK. It is a step in the right direction.

Earl Drury, #67 - In behalf of U-9, School Districts No. 67 and 71 have worked together over a period of years and it did not create any problem.

Ray Swanson - Suggested they make formal petition.

George Crampton, #71 - Asked for a roll call vote of Committee.

Ray Swanson - There was no expressed opposition of the Committee. I am receptive to it. I can see no reason how it would conflict and would agree with the principals of Fall Creek and Lowell.

William Wilt - Have been very receptive to consolidation. In the absence of formal petition would not like to be put on the spot. If you get petitions in, signed by the proper number of people, I am sure there would be no opposition of Committee.

Charles Clark, Principal #67 - Would you call a special meeting on this?

Ray Swanson - We could call a meeting if necessary to discuss further and make decision.

Winifred Hult - On what basis might the opposition present arguments?

Ray Quick, #71 - On personal opinion - based on past election. If the consolidation of Fall Creek and Lowell was voted it would kill the R-1 Plan.

Robert Butler, Principal #U-9 - If Fall Creek and Lowell consolidation is rejected it would make unification further away in the future. This is a step in getting schools closer together. Felt it would be detrimental to reject the Fall Creek and Lowell consolidation. Stated he was speaking only as a person interested in better schools.

A poll of those present was taken and found that there were:

- 12 present from Dist. No. 67 - Fall Creek
- 4 present from Dist. No. 71 - Lowell
- 1 present from Dist. No. U-9 - Lowell Union High

Ray Swanson - Regarding leaving out Dist. #67 in the R-1 Plan, called attention that the State had rejected a Plan leaving out a district without a high school provision. We are not interested in any plan but a plan that would benefit all of the students in all of the county.

Mr. Swanson thanked patrons for comments and attendance.

The Committee resumed their meeting in the County School Office.

Motion was made by Mrs. Hult, seconded by Mr. Ehinger and carried, to set the hearing date for the Partial Plan R-5 on October 24th, 8:00 p.m., at the Crow High School.

A letter was read from Mr. Patch reminding the Committee that a request for a six-month extension of time covering the period October 1960 to April 1961, should be made prior to October 1st, 1960. Motion was made by Mr. Hendrickson, seconded by Mr. Wilt and carried, to make request for the six-month extension of time.

Ruth Gould called attention to the Committee on the need for withdrawing Sections 23 and 24, T19S R2W from Union High School District No. 12 and adding the same to Union High School District No. 1. This request was made for the approval of the Committee since these two sections will not be included in Administrative School District No. 40 when it takes effect July 1, 1961 and it is necessary that these two sections be included in a district for high school purposes. This territory is at present in School District No. 1.

Motion was made by Mr. Rickard, seconded by Mr. Wilt and carried, that the petitions be presented to the District Boundary Board with the approval of the Reorganization Committee.

Relative to the letter presented to the Committee from the Union High No. 1 board, excerpts from a letter from Dennis Patch on the legal procedure was read. Motion was made by Mr. Hendrickson, seconded by Mr. Efteland and carried, to table the U-1 request.

Edward Efteland commented on articles appearing recently in the Junction City Times and Register-Guard mailbag regarding reorganization.

Ray Swanson requested that Mr. Rickard read letter from Dennis Patch regarding substantial progress made in the reorganization program by the Committee, which represented tangible evidence of sound leadership, logical planning, and a great amount of effective and dedicated work on the part of the Committee.

It was agreed by the Committee that the next regular meeting (October 18th) be postponed until following the public hearing on proposed R-5 at Crow High School on October 24th -- unless special business requires a special meeting called by the chairman.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION

Ray C Swanson

 Chairman

 Secretary

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE
August 16, 1960

Regular meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County School Office with the following members present:

Edgar Rickard
Joe Swift
Marvin Hendrickson

Clarence Jackson
Mrs. Winifred Hult
William Wilt
Mrs. Ruth Gould, Acting
Secretary

In the absence of Mr. Ray Swanson, Mr. Edgar Rickard acted as chairman.

Mr. Rickard asked for a moment of silent prayer in memory of the late Mr. William Woodie, Lane County School Superintendent.

Motion was made by Mr. Jackson, seconded by Mr. Swift and carried, that the minutes of the meeting of July 19th be approved.

Mr. Rickard explained that the superintendents of the Cottage Grove districts had requested the election date for that area be held in October if possible. Mrs. Gould reported that the date must be set before October 6th. After some discussion, and due to deer season opening the first week in October, Mr. Swift moved that the election be held on Wednesday, September 28th. Mr. Hendrickson seconded the motion and it carried. Official notices will be sent by the County School Office.

The matter of zoning for R-5 was discussed and the following recommendation was presented: 2 zones in District 66 - 2 zones in Districts 28 and 44 - and 3 zones in Districts 139, 88, 118, 102J-1J. This would be the equivalent of one elementary unit for each zone and would meet the criteria of the law for approximately equal school census for each zone. Mr. Hendrickson made a motion that the recommendation as presented be adopted, seconded by Mr. Wilt and carried.

Mrs. Gould presented an opinion poll which had been brought in by Mrs. Josh Brown of the Dexter-Zion area. This is the second opinion poll from this area, each showing different findings.

At this time the Committee adjourned to Harris Hall where a delegation of about 50 from the Pleasant Hill, Dexter-Zion, Lowell, and Fall Creek areas was present. Mr. Rickard explained that in the absence of Mr. Swanson who is ill, he would be the acting chairman. Since the Pleasant Hill Boards had been invited to attend this meeting, Mr. Rickard called for the spokesman of the group. Mr. Funk, Superintendent of the Pleasant Hill schools introduced Mr. Josh Brown who explained the results of the opinion poll. The summary of this poll is as follows:

Total votes favoring Pleasant Hill (all 12 grades)	134 (68%)
Total votes favoring Lowell (all 12 grades)	51 (26%)
Total number of ballots taken	198
Total number stating no previous poll completed	101 (51%)
Total counted in previous poll	89 (45%)
Number of children in elementary school	154
Number of children in high school	74

(Several of the ballots taken were split, several were marked "undecided", and one ballot was not checked at all; hence the total number of ballots taken and the total votes for either one district or the other will not tally).

Dexter Area

Lost Creek Area

Favor Pleasant Hill . . . 66
Favor Lowell. 28

Favor Pleasant Hill . . . 68
Favor Lowell. 23

Mr. Brown said he wished to point out that at the time the R-1 Plan was presented that the advantages of a larger school were explained, and that they are not in favor of anything that would do just the opposite.

Charles Funk, Supt. 1 and U-1 - We have made progress and have put on extra teachers, new courses, and are interested in the best education for the least money.

John Kohl, Prin. U-1 - Presented to the Committee a Rebuttal to a plan for the division of districts. He explained that he had been interested in reorganization since 1950 when the Holy Report was made. He feels that R-1 is the only plan to date that has been presented which can adequately meet the needs of the district.

The rebuttal is as follows:

1. Does not meet the criteria set forth for reorganization by the reorganization law, especially its intent and purpose.
2. Any plan which jeopardizes the educational plan of a district to up-grade another district can neither be termed fair nor equal, especially when there is a plan in the offing which would benefit both districts.
3. Taking 75 students from the Pleasant Hill High School would have the following effects:
 - a. An increase in per pupil cost of education.
 - b. A curtailment of the curriculum.
 - (1) variety of offerings
 - (2) number of sections (important in scheduling)
 - c. A reduction in the teaching staff.
 - (1) number of courses possible
 - (2) increase teacher's subject area load
 - (3) decrease specialization
 - d. Curtailment of special programs
 - (1) college prep. sections
 - (2) special courses
 - (3) advanced college placement
 - (4) counselling and testing
 - e. Increase scheduling problems
 - (1) teachers
 - (2) students
 - (a) individual
 - (b) group
 - f. Increase class size in some subjects. (basics)
4. The proposed split would not only set education back a number of years in our district, it would also forestall programs which we are now considering for the future:
 - a. adult education classes
 - b. summer classes for students
 - (1) advanced classes
 - (2) make-up classes
 - (3) enrichment programs

5. Place an unnecessary tax burden on the patrons of our district. Under R-1, the building needs of the districts can be met with one major construction. This would be fair and equal and available to all districts without exception.
6. A possible proposal - That the Lane County Reorganization Committee set up a special study committee for R-1 composed of school board representatives, administrators, and especially patrons from all districts representing both pros and cons. This committee to be coordinated by a person from outside of the districts. Funds provided as necessary from the reorganization fund.

Charles Funk, Supt. 1 and U-1 - Report two things--first, at the last regular meeting of the Grade School and High School Boards, went on record as favoring the R-1 proposal and wouldn't wish to change the "status quo" at this time. Second--quoted from the August 16th editorial in the Oregonian which stated, "an unmistakable but slight tendency for students from large high schools, both young men and young women, to do better in their freshman college year than those from smaller high schools. The relationship is continuous and consistent, with those from smallest high schools doing most poorly, whether they are male or female, whether they have attended the University or Oregon State College." This is what we have been talking about, the larger the school, within reason, the better results. Mr. Funk introduced Mr. Grover Kelsay who has been on the elementary board for eight years, and is a partner in the Hills Creek Lumber Co.

Grover Kelsay, #1 - Very little can be said that hasn't already been covered. Can't understand why the R-1 Plan and the consolidation were defeated. Discussed the different reasons why the Plan may have been voted down; want to go forward, not backwards.

Charles Funk, Supt. 1 and U-1 - I feel that the Reorganization Committee was conscientious and did a good job on the R-1 Plan. I haven't personally changed my mind a bit. I feel very strongly that the "chickens will come home to roost" eventually. I believe in it 100%.

James Large-Dexter Zion - Was on Lowell Board for a number of years. The reason this poll was taken was because our group was pretty much aroused over the results of the other one. This poll was impartial and every house except two was contacted. We are for educating our children, definitely we don't want to take a step down, we want to get in one district or the other.

One of the patrons asked if the Committee would like to know how many in attendance were from the Dexter-Zion area. The Committee agreed that they would like the people from this area to stand. There were approximately 30.

Mr. Rickard - We need to hear from you people in order to know your feelings.

Mr. Wilt - Why is there a difference in this poll over the first one? Was every person counted, or just families?

James Large-Dexter Zion - 1 poll from each house.

Grover Kelsay, #1 - There were 89 in the first poll - 198 in the last one.

Charles Funk, Supt. #1 and U-1 - Made the suggestion that a paid survey of the area be made by the School of Education, University of Oregon.

Mr. Rickard - Might be a good suggestion.

Mr. Kidder, #71 - I can't sit by and not answer the insinuation that in the first poll we "brain-washed" the people. I'll admit we didn't get every house. The signatures are by the people that made them out.

James Large, Dexter-Zion - I didn't mean to get personal with anybody - we're neighbors. Something peculiar about the poll was that 51% stated no previous poll was completed.

Mr. Wilt - Was this poll taken in exactly the same area?

James Large, Dexter-Zion - Yes, those who go to Lowell Grade School, and Pleasant Hill High School, with the exception of two families.

George Crampton, #71 - Do you feel that you could get an accurate figure by this poll? I don't see where you get anywhere by two polls.

Mr. Rickard - Our experience with these polls hasn't been too satisfactory. Obviously this isn't the answer.

Dan Puckett, #1 - People object to much pressure - did they cross over the line any place - was the same name on two different polls?

Mr. Kidder, #71 - There was some discrepancy since there was only 161 in the first poll. I know the boundary line and no one was contacted outside the boundary.

Mr. Wilt - In talking to the people of the Lowell area they felt R-1 was the best plan if it could be put over. Our question is what do we do next about it.

Mr. Kidder, #71 - I believe the opinion poll was suggested because one had been taken in the Walker area.

Robert Butler, Prin., U-9 - Everybody knows that I have mixed feelings about this. Our board and the people in our district are wondering if we are faced with the "status quo", or what does the future hold. It is a factor at this time.

Mr. Rickard - We realize the urgency.

Mrs. Duncan, ^(U-9)~~Dexter-Zion~~ - If this was voted down a third time, would Dexter-Zion have to provide a 12 year program?

Mr. Rickard - I can't answer this.

Mrs. Duncan, ~~Dexter-Zion~~ - We will be the back-wash of Pleasant Hill - no possibility of the Lowell district getting much bigger - not big enough now.

George Kelsay, #1 - I would like to re-emphasize that Pleasant Hill didn't vote for it the first time but we tried to educate the people the second time. I feel that the R-1 Plan is best, but there is a need for more enlightenment in the districts.

Richard McIntyre - Prin., Lowell Grade - I have just been through this sort of thing. You can't have a good elementary program if it is cut in half. If there is interest in the R-1 Plan could it be put up to the people again - why accept an alternate. I speak as an educator - if every one backs it, it could be worked out.

Earl Drury, #U-9 - We are not going to argue with the democratic process of voting. R-1 failed in our area the second time more than it did the first. Were I living in the Pleasant Hill area I might feel differently. We are going to build--we have hired an architect. I don't care where or what part of Dexter - a common boundary with Pleasant Hill - choice should be theirs.

Ed Siegmund, #1 - When the Pleasant Hill, Lowell and Fall Creek Boards met together I was naive enough to think in talking things over that we were going to work together.

Robert Butler, Prin., U-9 - I was mostly responsible in trying to get the boards together -- not my school board.

Mr. Rickard - What is the school population in Lowell now and what was it two years ago?

Robert Butler, Prin., U-9 - 120 now - 105 two years ago.

Richard McIntyre, Prin., #71 - 400 now - 357 two years ago.

Mr. Wilt - On page 4 of the Plan we recommended that the reorganized district board consider using the present high school building at Lowell and the newer high school building at Pleasant Hill for elementary or junior high purposes, and construct a single high school building in the Dexter area before 1961.

George Crampton, #71 - It is hard to sell the Plan in Lowell - tax-wise and education-wise. In the Plan a definite place for the three year high school should be given.

Mr. Rickard - The Reorganization Committee feels they should not name definite sites - it should be up to the new board.

Mrs. Duncan, ^{U-9} ~~Dexter-Zion~~ I am not an accountant and don't know how the tax rates work, but I do know that we have a raise of 6 mills in our personal taxes.

John Kohl, Prin., U-1 - R-1 is still the Plan. There were 25 local people, Fall Creek had 5; Lowell, 10; and Pleasant Hill, 10; who met together to talk this over. The thinking then was that Dexter-Zion was not a major consideration. Agreed Pleasant Hill was the logical place, economically and geographically because land was easily available.

Mr. Bainbridge, U-9 - We did not feel we should try to sell anything to the people; felt we were there to represent them.

James Large, #71 - I disagree with Mr. Bainbridge. I was on the Board for five years and I felt it was my duty to represent the people and at the same time to inform them. I feel that if everyone had worked together it would have gone over.

Mrs. Walter, Lost Creek - Could we have some one from outside the area explain it, so that personalities would not enter in?

Ed Siegmund, #1 - People won't come out to meetings - our coffee hours in the different homes were better attended.

George Crampton, #71 - Would the Pleasant Hill Board be in favor of having a school in the Dexter-Zion area?

Mr. Rickard - I doubt if they would care to go on record at this time regarding this matter.

Norman Dick, Dexter - Could the people in the Dexter-Zion area vote by themselves?

Mr. Rickard - Must vote in the common school district.

Ed Siegmund, #1 - When the Pleasant Hill, Lowell and Fall Creek Boards met together I was naive enough to think in talking things over that we were going to work together.

Robert Butler, Prin., U-9 - I was mostly responsible in trying to get the boards together -- not my school board.

Mr. Rickard - What is the school population in Lowell now and what was it two years ago?

Robert Butler, Prin., U-9 - 120 now - 105 two years ago.

Richard McIntyre, Prin., #71 - 400 now - 357 two years ago.

Mr. Wilt - On page 4 of the Plan we recommended that the reorganized district board consider using the present high school building at Lowell and the newer high school building at Pleasant Hill for elementary or junior high purposes, and construct a single high school building in the Dexter area before 1961.

George Crampton, #71 - It is hard to sell the Plan in Lowell - tax-wise and education-wise. In the Plan a definite place for the three year high school should be given.

Mr. Rickard - The Reorganization Committee feels they should not name definite sites - it should be up to the new board.

Mrs. Duncan, ^{U-9} Dexter-Zion - I am not an accountant and don't know how the tax rates work, but I do know that we have a raise of 6 mills in our personal taxes.

John Kohl, Prin., U-1 - R-1 is still the Plan. There were 25 local people, Fall Creek had 5; Lowell, 10; and Pleasant Hill, 10; who met together to talk this over. The thinking then was that Dexter-Zion was not a major consideration. Agreed Pleasant Hill was the logical place, economically and geographically because land was easily available.

Mr. Bainbridge, U-9 - We did not feel we should try to sell anything to the people; felt we were there to represent them.

James Large, #71 - I disagree with Mr. Bainbridge. I was on the Board for five years and I felt it was my duty to represent the people and at the same time to inform them. I feel that if everyone had worked together it would have gone over.

Mrs. Walter, Lost Creek - Could we have some one from outside the area explain it, so that personalities would not enter in?

Ed Siegmund, #1 - People won't come out to meetings - our coffee hours in the different homes were better attended.

George Crampton, #71 - Would the Pleasant Hill Board be in favor of having a school in the Dexter-Zion area?

Mr. Rickard - I doubt if they would care to go on record at this time regarding this matter.

Norman Dick, Dexter - Could the people in the Dexter-Zion area vote by themselves?

Mr. Rickard - Must vote in the common school district.

Mr. Wilt - How far should the Reorganization Committee go - should we have the formality of public hearings? Would like to hear suggestions. Taking care of the Dexter-Zion area isn't simple to us, other than the R-1 Plan.

Josh Brown, #1 - It is the only one.

James Large, #71 - Let's get together on the Dexter-Zion area. It was only a recommendation. I feel we should do our own deciding. Don't split up our community.

Mr. Rickard - We are not going to make a decision at this time. We will talk about it some more among ourselves. We appreciate the fact that you people have come tonight.

A motion was made by Mr. Swift, seconded by Mr. Wilt to take no action until a full Committee is present. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION

Layne Swanson

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION PUBLIC HEARING ON
PARTIAL PLAN OF REORGANIZATION ASD No. 45
Cottage Grove Union High School
July 26, 1960

A public hearing was held in the Cottage Grove Union High School, 1000 Taylor Street, Cottage Grove, Oregon, on July 26, 1960 commencing at 8:00 o'clock P.M. for the purpose of discussing the Plan ASD No. 45 for Lane County. The hearing was attended by approximately 18 patrons.

Mr. Edward Efteland, Lane County Committee Member, opened the meeting and introduced: Mrs. Moore Hamilton, Member of the State Board of Education; Dennis Patch, State Director of School District Reorganization; Mrs. Ruth Gould, Assistant Lane County School Superintendent; Edgar Rickard, Lane County Committee Member; Clarence Jackson, Lane County Committee Member; and, Margaret Blanton, acting secretary. Mr. Efteland then reviewed the proposed Plan ASD No. 45, comprising component Lane County School Districts No. 25J-Latham, 31--Blue Mt., 45-Cottage Grove, 48-Silk Creek, 75-London, 80-Lynk Hollow, 84-Culp Creek, 93-Dorena, 128-Mount View, 177-Diston, 191-Delight Valley, 40-Creswell (part), and Douglas County School District No. 3J. The above districts comprise the bulk of Union High School District No. 14J.

Mr. Efteland then turned the meeting over to Dennis Patch, State Director of School District Reorganization.

Mr. Patch stated that this hearing was the 109th State Board hearing on a proposed plan of School District Reorganization as proposed by a County Committee. That it was a Plan that would provide an education Grades 1 thru 12 for School Districts No. 25J, 31, 45, 48, 75, 80, 84, 93, 128, 177, 191, and 40 (part), Lane County, and No. 3J, Douglas County. The above districts comprise the bulk of Union High School District No. 14J having territory mainly in Lane County, and 3J in Douglas County.

This Plan was submitted to the State Board on June 27th and the State Board set the date of July 26th as the hearing date on said Plan.

The State board has made the policy to have a member of the State Board present at each hearing. We are happy to have Mrs. Hamilton at this hearing.

Following this hearing the law provides that the State Board of Education must within 60 days meet and review the Plan and either approve or reject it. The State Board will meet on August 4th and this Plan will be reviewed at that time. The County Committee must be notified within 10 days after the State Board meets, providing the Plan is approved. If Plan is rejected the County Committee must be notified within 60 days and must be sent the reasons why the Plan was rejected. The County Committee must call the meeting within 30 days and the election must be held within 60 days from the date the Committee approves the Plan. The election must be held in each of the Common School Districts involved.

The law provides that the votes cast in each common school district shall be counted separately and if 60% or more of the votes cast within any one or more of such common school districts are against the Plan, the organization of the Plan shall be delayed for a period of 30 days. During the 30-day period a petition against the formation of the new administrative district may be filed with the County superintendent, and must be signed by a number equal to 50% or more of the legal voters who voted in the rejecting school district or districts, another election shall be held in such rejecting school district within 60 days after the date of the election on the formation of the administrative school district. If no such petition is filed within the

30-day period, the organization of the administrative district shall proceed. If petitions are filed by the legal school voters of more than one rejecting district, a separate election shall be held within each such rejecting school district. If half or more of the votes cast at the election in each rejecting district approving the formation of the administrative district the election is carried. If a majority of the votes cast at the election in any of the rejecting districts reject the formation of the administrative district it shall be deemed to be rejected.

If a Plan is voted between July 1 and April 30, inclusive, the new administrative district will become effective on July 1 next following the election. If the Plan is voted between May 1 and June 30, inclusive, the new administrative district will become effective on July 1 of the following year.

Mr. Patch declared the hearing officially opened, and informed those present that it was his intention to call for statements from each common school district starting with the lowest numbered district and rotating until all had had an opportunity to be heard. He requested that each person wishing to be heard should state their name and district number.

#25J - No one present.

#31 - No one present.

#45 - No question.

#48 - No question.

#75 - Marle Moore - Asked regarding statement on guarantee of transportation Grades 1-6 and what about transportation for Grades 7 and 8?

Mr. Efteland - Reread statement on Transportation contained in Plan. Would imply it would make no change in high school transportation and would be up to the board of the reorganized district.

Marle Moore - Can you give the voter population of this new district?

Mr. Efteland - Not available.

Marle Moore - Asked whether there might be so many more people living in Cottage Grove that they would dictate what goes on and individual district would have nothing to say.

Mr. Rickard - The Plan is proposed with 7 zones and Cottage Grove is set up with one director. Stated that the Union High #14 board had recommended this procedure be followed.

Marle Moore - Board will probably submit a vote and with such a large number of voters residing in Cottage Grove they could predominate and carry the election as a whole. The law says we must provide education in Grades 1 thru 12. We helped build the high school. If we would elect to stay out of the district can we be denied a right of this high school?

Mr. Patch - I think you refer to a district voting out. If County Committee would submit a Plan leaving out the rejecting district an administrative

school district could be voted. In the Plan an adjustment of equities would have to be made with the rejecting district.

#80 - No one present.

#84 - No one present.

#93 - No one present.

#128 - No one present.

#177 - Charles Wetzell - Districts No. 84, 93, and 177 will have one member on this board. Am I correct?

Mr. Eftaland - Stated their zone would be comprised of District No. 177, District No. 84, District No. 93, and the east 1/2 of District No. 128. One member would be elected from this area but would represent the entire district as a member of the board.

Mr. Patch - Called attention to an administrative district in Marion County including Salem, comprised of many districts with only one board member coming from Salem. I think good board members attempt to represent all of the people in the area and they render a tremendous service.

Charles Wetzell - In what way will this Plan affect the districts in Zone 5?

Mr. Patch - Some of the advantages as a result of a consolidation of this type would be the better utilization of the teachers that you have. Sometimes in an entire district you may have a teacher that has to teach out of her bracket. One of the advantages, can make for better use of personnel. The same with "specialties". Also, at the present time, you are involved in budgets for both your local district and Union High No. 14 and also the election of two school boards. Also, have laws that apply to one district but not to the other. Laws are quite complicated. As an administrative district you would have the status of a first-class district and one set of laws would apply. The cost to build one classroom is from \$25,000 to \$30,000. If you have those facilities and they are not used to a maximum it is better to use them and not have to build. You can make good utilization of existing buildings.

Charles Wetzell - Plans call for Grades 1 thru 6 - would Grades 7 and 8 go to Cottage Grove?

Mr. Patch - I think when the board of the new district found it desirable to have Grades 1 thru 6 in local buildings then they would provide for Grades 7 and 8. When voting on the Plan you will also vote on the adjustment of property, assets, debts and liabilities.

#191 - Roy Duerst - If Plan is defeated will they come up with a similar Plan? What if this area isn't reorganized -- where do we go from there?

Mr. Patch - Cannot answer this but when the entire county has been reorganized in the manner and using the procedure provided by Reorganization Law,

or on July 1, 1962, whichever is the earlier, the committee shall be dissolved and the function of the committee shall devolve upon the County School Superintendent. I can't tell what is going to happen.

Roy Dueret - Until some proposal comes up and passes we will still have the Union High School?

Mr. Patch - The Reorganization Law calls for districts with education in Grades 1-12 but it still says the Reorganization Committee is charged with Plans.

#40 (part) - No one present.

#45 - Lloyd Griggs (Board Member of Districts No. 45 and U-14J) - Submitted enrolment of districts by zones (the enrolment data was included with the Plan).

#48 - Ross Overholser - What happens to the Rural School Board when the County is completely reorganized?

Mr. Patch - There is nothing in the Reorganization Law that changes this. The only exception (one in the state), is where the entire county was reorganized into one district. The 1959 legislature passed legislation where by when all territory of the County is included in one district the office is discontinued and the administrative district takes over. There isn't any doubt the interim committee on education is looking at the Rural School Board. Whether the 1961 legislature will see fit to make any changes remains to be seen. Your guess is as good as mine on this. They are considering the matter of the Rural School District and also the equalization feature of the money that is coming from the state. There is a feeling on the part of some districts that are operating efficiently, that they are helping other districts that are not operating efficiently. Also, some districts cannot operate good schools with the wealth that they alone have.

Ross Overholser - Have been under false premise on this -- that Reorganization would put the districts on their own and the Rural School Board eliminated. Seems there has been a slip-up. Small districts would look very carefully at this Plan if all the expense was thrown back on our district.

Mr. Patch - The Non-High School District has gone out of existence as of July 1, 1960. In some cases this will make a hardship. The Union High School district has established a pattern for the education of their high school students and patterns are pretty hard to change. Also, component parts have equity in the high school building.

#75 - Merle Moore - Did I understand you to say if we reorganize there is a 7-man board? Am I correct? Do each of the component districts retain their board?

Mr. Patch - You do not retain your board. The 7-man board is the board for the entire new district.

#75 - Archie Powell - Considering equalization why didn't the board consider a County Plan?

Mr. Efteland - I am surprised at that question with the feeling of the people here. The Committee felt Lane County is a large area and school control.

should be kept as close to home as possible. In other words we didn't feel we wanted to propose a county unit plan as we felt it would make too large an area. Compared size of Portland with Eugene and felt Portland was too large a district. It could occur later if the people want it but at present the committee did not feel it advisable.

#75 - Archie Powell - I know in watching the districts we have been working competitively. Are we going to be represented if we join?

Mr. Efteland - The law requires that Plans be made by the Committee providing education in Grades 1 thru 12 that the people will approve.

#177 - Charles Wetzell - In your reasons for the educational program the Plan lists adjustment of teachers. We do not have a music teacher at District No. 177. Would this Plan provide a teacher to teach music at our school?

Mr. Patch - That involves a situation. People will have to approve the Plan and then the school board will have to set up the type of educational program they want in their district. There is nothing to prevent providing a teacher trained in Music, Art, and other of these specialties in all of these schools.

Charles Wetzell - There are several little children in Dieston who want to play the piano. My wife is giving lessons to children in her home. If the school had a piano teacher it would solve that to quite an extent.

Mr. Efteland - Implication is there were some of these things to be provided. You might share with another school who has such a teacher.

#75 - Wilma Olds - We are voting on a Plan including component districts. If voted down do we have five years with this law? If voted down until July 1962 is there a possibility Reorganization will be forced?

Mr. Patch - I do not know. The legislature could pass a law. I doubt very much if this would happen but there are a lot of things that could happen.

Wilma Olds - Could they do so if they desire? What does the law say about it?

Mr. Patch - Law provides for committees submitting plans and the people voting on them. That rests with the people.

#75 - Marle Moore - It seems hard for us to be for this reorganization Plan. Regarding utilization of equipment I do not see how we could do better than we are doing at present. I do not see where we are located other areas could conveniently attend. I can't see how we could have better utilization.

Mr. Efteland - Committee operated through sub-committees. Asked Mr. Rickard to give answer on this.

Mr. Rickard asked Ruth Gould, Assistant Superintendent, to speak on this.

Ruth Gould - The use of special services such as music, library, gifted children. Teachers would not have multiple class-rooms, depending on en-

rollment and transportation. You might not find the room but you might combine with another school for some time during the day or week.

#177 - Charles Wetzell - Called attention to Remedial Reading classes comprising Districts No. 84, 93, and 177. The teacher goes to all three schools each day.

#U-14J - Robert Dusenberry, Superintendent - If District No. 48 votes out on the second vote and if the Committee should put up the remaining districts and the districts are in favor, would it constitute a Plan? Then if a majority votes in favor of this Plan but one district has a 60% rejecting vote, can no district get out?

Mr. Patch - the second Plan is a new Plan if it involves different territory from the original Plan.

Mr. Simmons, U. of O. - Everytime a new Plan is proposed the law holds on each Plan.

Mr. Efteland - The first Plan was defeated. If second Plan comes to a vote and there is a rejecting district then that Plan is not a Plan anymore. If another Plan is put up it could be made without the rejecting district.

Robert Dusenberry - Quoted the following which was Superintendent Woodie's reply to a question submitted to him on March 3, 1960:

Question - " * * * - - - In the event that the South Lane passes a majority vote but one district has a 60% negative vote and through the due process votes out of the plan (and) a new plan excluding that district is proposed and passes, (and) a district has a 60% negative vote and by due process votes out of the plan, what is the status of the remaining districts?" - - -

Answer --- "The rejection procedure applies only to the first election. If a district or districts reject by a 60% negative vote, followed by petition, followed by a negative vote in the rejecting district, and if the Committee submits the plan to the State omitting a rejecting district, and this plan comes to an election, the ballots will be counted together to determine if the majority of all votes were cast in favor of the plan. There is no second chance to reject. - - - * * *"

Mr. Patch - Where you have a failure on the first vote the Committee has a right to submit the same Plan back not sooner than one year. They could then present a Plan taking out the rejecting district, thus making a new Plan, and going through the regular procedure. Wish to make it clear - the State Board has a very difficult time with Plans involving a Union High School District.

#48 - Ross Overholser - The Plan was rejected at the last election. No doubt the voters would vote against the Plan this time.

Mr. Patch - Either over-all vote is favorable or against.

#177 - Charles Wetzell - The first Plan was voted down. Suppose this Plan is voted down. This reminds me of a fisherman changing bait.

#75 - Merle Moore - We voted out on the last Plan. Are you trying to say when the next Plan comes up for vote we can't get out of it?

Mr. Patch - You sure can!

Merle Moore - Suppose after we vote out we want to get in. Can we do this?

Mr. Patch - Yes, boundaries of an administrative school district can be changed.

Mr. Patch thanked Union High School District No. 14 School Board and Superintendent for providing facilities, Mrs. Hamilton for attending. Also thanked the Lane County Committee for their work and the people for attending.

Hearing was declared closed.

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

July 19, 1960

Regular meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County School Office with the following members present:

Ray Swanson
Paul Ehinger
Winifred Hult
Joe Swift

Marvin Hendrickson
William Wilt
Edward Efteland
Ruth Gould, Acting Secretary

Motion was made by Mr. Swift, seconded by Mr. Wilt and carried, that the minutes of the meeting of June 21st be approved.

Mr. Swanson informed the Committee of the State Hearing on ASD 45 to be held in the Cottage Grove High School on Tuesday, July 26th.

Board Members, Clerks, and a Superintendent, were present from School Districts No. 28J and 66.

Mr. Swanson explained that due to the changes that had taken place in districts comprising the original R-5 Plan, and legislation, it was felt desirable to discuss with the boards their feeling on the original R-5 Plan and their feeling on a new proposal.

Edward Cooper, Supt. #66 - District No. 66 would like to know if you will submit R-5 as previously submitted?

Mr. Swanson - The Committee has made no decision yet whether to propose one (1) or two (2) Plans, or what type of Plan or Plans.

Mr. Swanson - Asked Mr. Cooper if he thought the fact that the Committee recommended the utilization of the buildings at Crow for a Junior High School was one of the main stumbling blocks or would it be acceptable.

Edward Cooper, Supt. #66 - It would be my guess it was probably not the major factor. Even though it was removed from the Plan it would not be acceptable. In looking back there was some resentment of this being done. I think there would still be opposition.

Mr. Efteland - What do you suggest this Committee consider?

Edward Cooper, Supt. #66 - If I were on the Committee I would probably do what I felt was right. I would probably have recommended the same thing as you did. However, being in the district I would probably take another view.

Mr. Efteland - Maybe we shouldn't waste the taxpayers money on an election even though there is merit in the Plan for the children in the area.

Mr. Wilt - Whatever we do now will set the pattern for the next few years. If there is any benefit we should save time in setting an election.

Mr. Swanson - Speaking as a citizen in District No. 28J, there is considerable sentiment for a Junior High School.

Edward Cooper, Supt. #66 - There is practically no sentiment for a Junior High School in District No. 66 - it has not come up for discussion.

Mr. Swanson - In District No. 28J if we go through with R-5 we will have to hold more than one election and at least two sets of hearings. In District No. 28J next year there

Page 2-Reorganization Minutes

will be a complete new board elected according to law. Time is a factor in whether one (1) or two (2) Plans are made.

Mr. Swanson - Speaking as a Committee member, the Committee is faced with two (2) problems. There are other districts in the county that are not compatible on Plans. If the Plan is split what position are we in relative to other areas in the county. We must maintain some kind of a policy. Since the unification of Districts No. 36 and 66 was accomplished we are faced with a different Plan that we were at the beginning.

Edward Cooper, Supt. #66 - If you did propose R-5 I think academic and transportation would be two of the matters you would have to spend some time on and it should appear in print. Also, whether or not Crow High would become a Junior High School. This was a big factor on Wolf Creek. Transportation and place of attendance in that area is of major interest.

Mr. Swanson - Committee has power only to recommend.

Edward Cooper, Supt. #66 - After you have made the proposal and found there are things you have forgotten to include, some kind of a guess is almost a requirement. Someone will demand that type of information and it must be provided -- such as "a possible Plan which will provide, etc."

Mr. Swanson - Perhaps we have made a mistake in suggesting a Junior High School at Crow, attendance units, and transportation routes. The information we do put out is not always the same when it comes back in print to us.

Edward Cooper, Supt. #66 - There is a general approach to the whole problem. Any estimate of a bond millage levy before voted on is about nil but we have found you must make some kind of a guess. On transportation it was his recommendation that it be given in detail. Should you stick to the minimum of information or go further into the other direction. This I think you should do. Whatever board is elected will take the blame for whatever happens.

Dennis Mitchell, Board Member #66 - I think District No. 66 is concerned about money, but looking at the fact first proposed I think those people lost sight of the money already spent in bonded debt. There is an absorption back and forth in values. I think there is no weight being placed on finances. Think it is on the education of the children.

Mr. Ehinger - Knowing the area, transportation is pretty much a front runner. This is attached to attendance units. They go hand in hand. Dollars and cents in the operating budget is one thing that goes up and up. The valuation is slightly higher than in District No. 28J. I am of the opinion there is no new light set on this. District No. 28J would no doubt go for it. District No. 66 would no doubt reject it. In the long run with the students they are going to have in the high school, one high school would be of a size that could give a well-rounded education. Transportation combined with the attendance units and valuation has the thing defeated.

Edward Cooper - Supt. #66 - If you live in District No. 66 and consider it from a millage standpoint, then they can afford a teacher for every five students.

Mr. Ehinger - Could offer a wider, better curriculum in the high school as a combined district than Westfir can offer.

Mr. Hendrickson - Due to state equalization I think the cream is going to be taken off the districts with the higher valuations.

Mr. Wilt - Would like to get comments from other board members present.

Noble Wheeler, Board Member, Dist. 28J - I think the answers are obvious. It seems that the R-5 Plan is not going to work and there is only one thing left to do -- split R-5 and make two Plans. I am still in favor of the original R-5 Plan but there is no chance of it passing. There is no reason to go ahead with it.

Dennis Mitchell, Board Member, Dist. #66 - I do not think the R-5 Plan will pass as it is. Two administrative districts would be the answer.

Mary McIntyre, Chairman, Dist. No. 28J - I was in favor of the first Plan but it does not look like it is going to work. Do not think it would be advisable to submit it to the people and have it voted down and then have to put up another Plan.

Mr. Swanson - Do not think the other members of the board would feel the same way?

Noble Wheeler, Board Member, Dist #28J - They have not been definite opinioned.

Mr. Swanson - Have discussed it with the Interim Committee on Legislation and they are considering leaving same board instead of electing a new one.

Mr. Swanson - Thanked them for their attendance.

Mr. Swift - Regarding the Dexter-Zion area - if Pleasant Hill High loses students it would definitely hurt curriculum in Pleasant Hill High. Questioned his former recommendation that the area go to District No. 71. It would lower curriculum in U-1. (There are 90 students in the area).

Mr. Efteland - Favors letting area go until the people do something or the legislature takes some action. Is also in favor of original R-4.

Representatives were present from Districts No. 67 and 71.

Mr. Swanson compiled an analysis of the Opinion Poll submitted previously by Mr. Kidder, which he presented.

William Kidder, Dist. #71 - Stated the Opinion Poll represented approximately 90% of those in the area.

Mr. Swanson - What effect would this area have on the Lowell High School?

Robert Butler, Prin. #U-9 - The effect of 75 students would require some building -- about 3 regular classrooms and it would be possible to broaden curriculum but no decision has been made on this. A new addition to the curriculum in 1960-61 will be Foreign Language. We have been adding at least one new subject each year for the past three years (Art, Speech and Drama, Basic Upper Grade Math.)

Earl Drury, #67 - We have consulted with an architect and we will be in the process of remodeling some classrooms, addition to Science facilities, library, a new shop, and additional classrooms at U-9. We are interested in how many classrooms we will need. We are going to put the others in. The shop will be separate from the high school building.

Mr. Swanson - Do you think the disposition of this request is critical to your remodeling program?

Robert Butler, Prin. #U-9 - Does not think the R-1 Plan is at all possible at this time. At the present time the situation in the area is insufficient and feels the public will not go along with a full consolidation effort. If something isn't done soon it will hold back the educational development. All three districts are handicapped.

N. F. Bainbridge, #U-9 - We have been holding off on much needed facilities trying to wait and see what is going on. We can't wait any longer.

Robert Butler, Prin, #U-9 - It is not critical as far as the shop is concerned as it will be built to handle increase. The problem is not the number of pupils in the classroom but having a sufficient number of teaching stations.

Mr. Swanson - Have you contacted U-1 as to what the decrease would do to them?

Robert Butler, Prin. #U-9 We are not here to promote a large number of students but to reach a settlement as to what is going to be the outcome in the area.

William Kidder, #71 - If Pleasant Hill High does not want to lose 50 high school students do they want to gain 200 grade school students?

Mr. Swanson - Position of the Committee is so far that R-1 is the Plan, so the solution up to this point rests with the people in that area.

William Kidder, #71 - Would rather not see it split but if Pleasant Hill still say they must have so many students from that area, let them have the Dexter area. Other than that we should go to Lowell. It would give Lowell a better High School, a better Curriculum, equal to Pleasant Hill. To take 50 students from Pleasant Hill High would be better than taking 200 grade school students from Lowell Grade School.

Robert Butler, Prin. #U-9 - As the vote came out in the past, does not feel negotiating would be the best thing to do. Feels it might be better to secure someone outside of the group to make recommendations.

Mr. Ehinger - You would like a settlement of this issue this year, am I correct?

Robert Butler, Prin. #U-9 - Yes.

Earl Drury, #67 - Due to the fact that R-1 has been proposed and repropoed and if voted again it would be less popular. Inasmuch as R-1 is not going to come about we have building we must do regardless of what the Committee does. Pleasant Hill also has a building program. If this decision waits until these buildings start we have Dexter to be carried from one way to the other. It would not be right to put them in that position. If we could get this settled before the beginning of the year we could take Grade 9 that will start to Pleasant Hill this fall into U-9 and we could take probably what Grade 10 students that would like to come -- the senior going on to Pleasant Hill and juniors be allowed to continue at Pleasant Hill without tuition if they desire. If it were possible to reach a decision in the near future the whole thing would work out a whole lot better.

William Kidder, #71 - Even Pleasant Hill is going to build and in the meantime if we vote and it carried, would the people in Dexter-Zion pay their share of bonds before unification?

Mr. Swift - The common procedure is to assume indebtedness of district into which you go.

William Kidder, #71 - Is it up to us to find out how the Pleasant Hill people feel?

Mr. Swanson - If we make a decision it cannot be done without consulting them.

William Kidder, #71 - Will you give us an answer at your next meeting?

Mr. Swanson - Depends on Committee's determination as to desire to split the district or propose the same Plan.

William Kidder, #71 - On what conditions are you working - consolidation or reorganization? Could 57 and 71 be put up as reorganization?

Mr. Swanson - Yes, also consolidation must be approved by the Committee.

Earl Drury, #67 - Is there any way to do away with a split district by district action?

Mr. Swanson - Yes, and if approved by the Committee.

Earl Drury, #67 - Everyone is tired of a split district.

Mr. Swanson - It creates a problem in both Districts No. 71 and U-1.

William Kidder, #71 - Feels a reorganization election would carry.

Robert Butler, Prin. #U-9 - Why is this one so much harder to handle than the split area at Creswell?

Mr. Swanson - It was a problem of double taxation there.

Robert Butler, Prin. #U-9 - If it is possible to have two reorganized districts in R-2 why isn't it possible in this area?

Mr. Ehinger - It was a much easier line to determine. In your area you cannot draw a line that isn't detrimental to both.

Robert Butler, Prin. #U-9 - If you want to develop something better for the children, something is going to have to be done.

William Kidder, #71 - Does Pleasant Hill wish to carry on as they are now?

Mr. Swift - Did not into that.

William Kidder, #71 - There is surely some way to split it. I think it should be settled one way or the other.

Mr. Swanson - From our information the Pleasant Hill board favor the original R-1. We have not had the consultation of the board on this.

Robert Butler, #U-9 - I am sure that most of this is not getting us very far but this group is after a decision, no matter what.

Earl Drury, #67 - Another proposal of R-1 will waste your time and ours. We want a division of the district any way so that we have a common boundary and we could get a better educational program.

Mr. Efteland - This is important and we are not going to make a decision in haste.

Robert Butler, Prin. #U-9 - It is apparent to me that people are not in favor of R-1. It is not going to go through. If we have to wait until another legislative session we will deprive the school children of a better school system.

Mr. Swanson - Don't you feel the removal of 50 students from U-1 might cause a problem. Is there any feasible boundary that would have no particular effect?

Robert Butler, Prin. #U-9 - From summary, people in the upper end of the district were in favor of going to District No. 71, where Dexter was not. If we build how do we know what we are building for.

Mr. Ehinger - Think we have all of the facts from the Lowell-Fall Creek area. Any further information should come from Pleasant Hill. On the basis of that I think the Committee should make their decision.

Earl Drury, #67 - Lowell and Fall Creek will agree to split but want a common boundary.

Mr. Swanson - We will try to get some opinion from Pleasant Hill board or boards.

Mr. Wilt - Feel people warrant consideration but we probably can't please everyone. Wants Pleasant Hill's opinion.

Mr. Swanson - Thanked the people for attending.

Mr. Ehinger - In the case of R-5 it should go the way it is now. They are far apart in their reasons. I do not see how you can get Districts 28J and 66 consolidated until something unforeseen happens. As far as R-1, I am of the opinion that R-1 is a dead issue. I think there should be 2 districts there. Do not wait until the legislature makes changes in the law. It is permissive legislation now. I do not favor the legislature making it mandatory law to force unification. There is a sizable group in any area that do not wish to go into their plans. We can offer a more acceptable Plan to the people. Lowell people are in their prerogative to have some decision. Any Plan is going to have to be answered on its own merit in a given area. We are not establishing a policy, we are making decisions.

Mr. Swanson - In regard to R-5 I called Mr. Patch and asked if it should be split. Mr. Patch did not give a conclusive answer. He thought State Board would accept the Plan either way it was proposed.

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger and seconded by Mr. Wilt, that R-5 be divided into two (2) districts as presently now established (Districts No. 28J and 66). The vote was polled as follows:

Efteland -----	NO
Hult -----	NO
Ehinger -----	YES
Swift -----	NO
Hendrickson -----	NO
Wilt -----	YES
Swanson -----	NO

Motion lost.

Motion was made by Mr. Hendrickson, seconded by Mrs. Hult and carried, to include in the Plan R-5, that the district be zoned into seven zones with seven directors elected at large.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION



Chairman

Secretary

Mr. Efteland - Census indicates growth and if this comes about, educational problems will no doubt face your area.

Earl Drury, #67 - You mention consolidation of Districts No. 67 and 71. I would not go for that. We have U-9 and the problem in the Dexter-Lost Creek area which needs to be taken care of.

Mr. Efteland - There will have to be a decision on a line in the Dexter-Lost Creek area, if a split is to be made.

Earl Drury, #67 - In the past three years I have talked to most of the legal voters and believe Fall Creek will go along with the Committee's decision.

Mr. Efteland - Did not feel he was prepared to vote with only five (5) members present.

Mr. Swanson - Thanked patrons for their attendance.

Mr. Robertson and one other representative from the Central area were present requesting transfer of territory from School District No. 28J to School District No. 66.

Petition was presented requesting transfer of territory from School District No. 28J to School District No. 66, as requested at the May 17th meeting.

Motion was made by Mr. Efteland, seconded by Mr. Wilt and carried, that should the Boundary Board approve the transfer of territory from School District No. 28J to School District No. 66, said transaction would be desirable and would not conflict with the plan of reorganization.

The hearing on proposed ASD No. 45 (R-2), which was held in Cottage Grove on February 18, 1960, was discussed.

Motion was made by William Wilt, seconded by Joe Swift and carried, to approve partial Plan ASD No. 45 and instruct the Secretary to forward the Plan to the State. Vote result:

Yes -----	5
No -----	0
Abstained ----	0
Absent -----	4

Rescheduling of R-1, R-3, R-4 and R-9 was discussed. It was suggested that Committee work as a whole on Plans and dispense with Sub-Committees.

Plan R-5 was discussed and tabled until the July 19th meeting.

It was agreed that an invitation be extended to the board members of School Districts No. 28J and 66 to attend the July 19th Committee meeting.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION

Chairman

Secretary

Page 2 - Reorganization Minutes

Earl Drury, #67 - Would like to know where we are as soon as possible, as a matter of building is involved.

William Kidder, #71 - Contacted everyone that he came in contact with. More than 90% are represented in the Poll.

Mr. Wilt - Thanked people for their work in securing the Opinion Poll.

William Kidder, #71 - As a Committee, would you be willing to accept this proposal or are you obligated to try the same Plan over again?

Mr. Swanson - The Committee will consider any feasible proposal that will meet the provisions of the Reorganization Law.

Mr. Wilt - It seems that a majority is not willing to go along with the original Plan and it has been given a good try by the three districts.

Mitchell Fox, #67 - What can we do to consolidate Fall Creek and Lowell?

Mr. Wilt - At the moment we are pretty much stymied on the original Plan. How do the people in Fall Creek feel about the consolidation of Fall Creek and Lowell?

Mitchell Fox, #67 - They are not in favor of being included with Pleasant Hill.

Mr. Swift - My opinion is that the first Plan is the logical Plan. However, if a line is drawn it would be best to give all of Dexter-Zion to Lowell, as it would bring U-9 up to Pleasant Hill High School population and would make a fair curriculum for their students and do so more economically.

Earl Drury, #67 - Facilities are planned in U-9 to handle 250 students.

Mr. Swift - Feels the children in too small schools are being penalized in our not providing the schools for them. Pleasant Hill will grow in the future but this will probably not be true in Lowell. To make a sensible line geographically to straighten out districts would be feasible. The line should be made that would facilitate good bus transportation.

Earl Drury, #67 - The Dexter-Lost Creek area would be willing to abide by Committee's decision.

Mrs. Hult - No comment to make at this time but to evaluate Poll presented.

Mr. Efteland - This area has been this way for many years. Am disappointed about the failure of R-1 and am very much interested in the activity in this Plan. Wish I had the answer of the apparent conflict. Does not feel U-9 plus the Dexter-Zion area would provide a practical education in the times in which we live. However, I will not forestall this and there is nothing to prevent this from becoming a complete reorganized district in the future.

Earl Drury, #67 - R-1 is opposed just as strongly in Fall Creek as it is in Lowell and too, there are as many votes in Dexter-Zion area as there are in Lowell proper.

Mr. Efteland - I am not in favor of forestalling Democratic progress.

William Kidder, #71 - There might be a possibility of the districts getting together later and making a senior high school.

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

June 21, 1960

Regular meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County School Office with the following members present:

Ray Swanson
Winifred Hult
William Wilt

Joe Swift
Edward Efteland
Ruth E. Gould, Acting Secretary

Motion was made by Mr. Wilt, seconded by Mr. Swift and carried, that the minutes of the meetings of May 17th and June 2nd be approved.

Representatives (5) were present from the Lowell-Fall Creek area relative to their request to consolidate Fall Creek and Lowell with emphasis on the Dexter-Lost Creek area.

William Kidder, #71 - Opinion Poll taken in the Dexter-Lost Creek area was presented. The poll was to secure the feeling of the people living in the area as to which grade school and which high school (Pleasant Hill or Lowell) they would prefer their children attend. The following summary by households was given:

	Preference		
	Lowell	Pleasant Hill	Mixed
Dexter Area -----	43	21	10
Lost Creek Area ---	68	14	6
TOTAL -----	111	35	16

William Kidder, #71 - Stated that the majority in the Dexter-Lost Creek area were in favor of having their children sent to Lowell through a consolidation program, and requested that the Committee give them an answer soon as to their decision.

Mr. Swanson - Stated the Committee wished to analyze Poll and original Plan before making any decision, and cited the Reorganization Law relative to rejection of original Plans.

William Kidder, #71 - What are you looking for in resistance to the program we have requested?

Mr. Swanson - The Committee is interested in a factual basis complying with the Reorganization law.

William Kidder, #71 - Cited the splitting of the Walker district and asked if this same situation did not apply to the Lowell-Pleasant Hill area. Did not feel there was too much opposition if Dexter area were included with Pleasant Hill (75 or 80 grade and high school students). Mr. Kidder felt a natural line would be North of the Railroad and West of Lost Creek Road from Highway 58.

Earl Drury, #67 - All in Lost Creek area excepting six or eight, indicated they would rather go to the Lowell High School. In Dexter proper about 1/3 indicated they would prefer to go to Pleasant Hill and 2/3 to Lowell.

Mr. Swanson - Could not give an opinion without some additional study.

William Kidder, #71 - Only families were included in the Opinion Poll who are located in the area in question.

Eugene, Oregon,
June 2, 1960.

Special meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County School Office at 4:30 P.M. with the following present:

Ray Swanson
William Wilt
Clarence Jackson
Marvin Hendrickson
Joe Swift
Margaret Blanton, Acting Secretary

The votes were canvassed from the May 24th Reorganization election held in School District No. 40, at the Creswell Grade School, on the question of forming an administrative school district comprising part of School District No. 40, and the results were found to be as follows:


For R-40 - Comprising part of School District No. 40:

YES - 212
NO - 21

According to the above results, a motion was made by Mr. Hendrickson, and seconded by Mr. Jackson, to declare the R-40 election CARRIED. Motion carried. (This will become effective on July 1, 1961).

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION



Chairman

Secretary

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE
May 17, 1960

Regular meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County School Office with the following members present:

Ray Swanson
Joe Swift
Winifred Hult
Paul Ehinger
William Wilt

Edward Efteland
Edgar Rickard
Clarence Jackson
Marvin Hendrickson
Wm. R. Woodie, Secretary

Motion was made by Mr. Hendrickson, seconded by Mr. Jackson, and carried, that the minutes of April 19th be approved.

Representatives were present from the Central-Crow area. Clinton Boehringer from District No. 66 acted as spokesman for the group, requesting transfer of an area from the southern part of Central to District 66, and presented a map with the requested change indicated. The area included in the transfer contains 8 families, 10 children, and approximately 1800 acres; from the center of the requested change it is approximately 2 miles to Crow and 7 miles to Elmira. The area includes only those persons who desire this change. The area proposed for change is the same area that was included in a former request, but it is the first time it has been submitted to the Committee. It was brought out that distance was no factor as far as the families were concerned in this proposed change.

Mr. Swanson called for comments from the patrons regarding the proposed Plan R-5.

The following statements were made:

1. Clinton Boehringer, #66 - Felt that the Crow district's expression, with respect to the R-5 Plan is in the hands of the State Board of Education and their feeling is still the same. Does not feel there is any possibility of this carrying. Is satisfied it will be voted down if it comes up.
2. Arvid Rothauge, #66 - Feels they have a good school system now without having to do any reorganizing - both in building and curriculum. Does not know of anyone in District 66 that would go into the original R-5. The only thing in question in District 66 is the point of the property line as proposed and some property out west involving transportation. Safe in saying they are satisfied as they are.
3. Mrs. Youngblood, Central - Has property in Central district and is satisfied to have her grandchildren attend there.

Mr. Efteland suggested that patrons present formal petition for action.

Clinton Boehringer, District 66 - There would have been a petition in today or before except that we were advised that it would be proper to present a proposal to the Committee and let them have some say-so as to where to petition the line.

Mrs. Robertson, Central - Has children in Grades 1 and 4 and property borders District 66. Favors going to District 66 as they have transportation and one teacher per grade, etc. Had asked previously if they could change boundaries and was told they could.

Mr. Ehinger asked if there was any possibility of other families adjacent to the area not included with this request that might wish to be included?

Mrs. Robertson, Central - All in proposal have been contacted and are in favor.

Clinton Boehringer, #66 - The lines were pushed as far north as they could be to include all who desired the change. It is about 3 miles from the Central school to the Crow-Applegate school. The proposed line is approximately in the middle. It would be close to Crow for High School and perhaps about the same distance to Applegate for Grade School. Does not believe distance makes any difference in this request.

Mr. Swanson - What percent of Non-High does this take?

Clinton Boehringer, #66 - About 50% of the Non-High.

Stephen Ford, #66 - This change has been desired for a long time.

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger that they submit petition to committee outlining boundary change and if adopted by committee to go to the Boundary Board. Motion was seconded by Mrs. Hult and carried.

Mr. and Mrs. Blundell appeared before the Committee and requested that they be transferred from School District No. 102J to School District No. 66. Mr. Blundell stated that it would be to their advantage to go into District 66. He did not request a specific amount to be transferred but felt it should be enough to take care of the cost of transportation and children going into District 66. Mr. Blundell was not certain just where his house was located but thought it was in Section 19, T19S R7W. His home is 2½ miles from District 66 boundary line; is nine miles from the next resident to the East; and, is within 9 miles from where the bus comes at the present time.

Mr. Swanson suggested that they secure a legal description of their property with home indicated and submit to the Committee.

Superintendent Woodie offered to help the Blundell's prepare the petition for presentation to the Committee.

Motion was made by Mr. Rickard and seconded by Mr. Hendrickson, that petition be presented to the committee for their favorable consideration. Motion carried.

Representatives were present from the Lowell-Fall Creek area. Mr. William Kidder from District No. 71 acted as spokesman for the group and requested that the Committee give their approval for a vote on the consolidation of Districts No. 67 and 71. Also, wanted to know if there would be a possibility of splitting the Dexter-Lost Creek Area, which is in Districts No. 71 and U-1. Felt there might be a majority of the people in that area who would be willing to go to District #1, which would entail splitting District #71. They wished to make a unified district of these two districts. From this area there are approximately 200 attending Lowell grade school and from 70-80 attending the Pleasant Hill Union High School. He did not know how all of the people in the Dexter-Lost Creek area feel about this and felt it would probably be necessary to take a poll.

Mr. Swanson asked if U-9 could accommodate these high school students?

Earl Drury, #67 - Lowell Union High has 120 students and can handle 150 at the present time. Some building is planned this year and if proposal receives approval by the Committee and voters they would probably go ahead and build

May 17, 1960

immediately. Suggested that they would be willing for part of Dexter to go either way but they are concerned about what Dexter would rather do. There is a geographical boundary which might be satisfactory: present boundary between #71 and #1 down the watershed divide down Lost Creek and Rattlesnake to the Railroad; East on Railroad to Dexter Road; then North and cross approximately at the Dexter Dam. This puts Lost Creek in the Lowell District. It was proposed to divide Dexter. This should be left up to Dexter. Whatever they desire will meet with the approval of the boards of District #67 and #71.

William Kidder, #71 - Does not know that majority would want to go this way and does not want anyone to come into a reorganized district if they are opposed. The proposal would provide a good bus schedule. The suggested division would take 73-75 grade school students from #71 to #1.

Earl Drury, #67 - If this area was divided it would allow Grades 7 and 8 to go to #71; U-9 should have additional building and the high school increase would not hurt. If District #1 was to take all of Dexter it would involve grade school building. If District #71 took Dexter area for all purposes it would involve high school building.

William Kidder, #71 - To take part of District #71 we do not know about that. If area was taken out would District #1 have some say on this?

Superintendent Woodie explained the following types of action:

1. Boundary Board - can change boundaries without a vote if it involves a part of a district.
2. Reorganization - Committee can encompass an area to be included. The people within the boundary will vote.

Mr. Efteland - asked what would be gained by joining District #67 and #71.

William Kidder, #71 - District #67 will be a part of a district that will have Grades 1-12; help to straighten out the split district in Dexter area where children attend in Grades 1-8 in Lowell and 9-12 in Pleasant Hill.

Mr. Efteland - are you interested in the children or in forestalling the Plan?

William Kidder, #71 - Feels R-1 Plan is a dead issue. The last consolidation vote was so opposed does not feel the same Plan would carry. Valuation-size the proposal would put them in good condition and it would not hurt District #71 or U-1.

Don Puckett, #71, Lost Creek area - Reorganization is not going to work. Does not know how everyone feels - is opposed to stringing this thing out so long. If we have to vote for a reorganization plan and it is voted down, the longer we wait the harder it is. Would like to see it solved. Has resided in area about 2 years.

Mr. Swanson - Do you think the line could be drawn through area so that people would be in favor?

William Kidder, #71 - There would no doubt be some unhappy people. To avoid any controversy if a majority of the whole district would vote in favor of a reorganization set up through consolidation, would think this better than to vote in their immediate area.

Mr. LaFont, #67 - Cited the following advantages to Fall Creek on the proposal:

1. Would increase curriculum in U-9.
2. Something that would be acceptable to the people in the district.

Mr. Fox, #67 - Would get more for their money on this proposal.

Mr. Wilt - Would it be possible for someone in the Dexter-Lost Creek area to secure the desire of the people on this suggested line?

Don Puckett, #71 - Felt this could be done.

William Kidder, #71 - What do you think would be best for the Committee as to proposal on the splitting of this area?

Mr. Wilt - Cited minutes on R-1 in December that they would submit the same Plan unless something more feasible is submitted to the Committee.

Mr. Swanson - The R-1 Plan would be the best to meet the objectives of the law.

William Kidder, #71 - What about the R-2 Plan? What was done to change that Plan?

Mr. Swanson - It has not yet been adopted by the Committee after the hearing. However, in dividing the original Plan into two Plans they did so as they felt it would be more acceptable.

William Kidder, #71 - The Committee can change a Plan then?

Mr. Swanson - Yes.

Mr. LaFont, #67 - Felt this proposal would provide a High School:

1. Large enough to provide a fair curriculum.
2. Would be acceptable to the area.
3. Did not believe if R-1 was put up again that it would be accepted.

Mr. Efteland - asked how many were present from the Lost Creek area?

William Kidder, #71 - Two.

Don Puckett, #71 - Asked if a poll would be helpful.

Mr. Swanson indicated he thought it would.

William Kidder, #71 - There has been some talk to take Dexter-Lost Creek area to District 1. If this would be brought to the Committee to consider it would be necessary to build a whole new school at District 1 for these extra pupils. They are figuring on a new gym and other building and if additional elementary facilities are required it would mean a big financial undertaking. Valuation from this area for the number of children to be accommodated, is small.

Mr. Efteland - Who would be the best person to take a poll in this area?

William Kidder, #71 - We could take that poll. Some people feel they have already built and paid for a grade school at Lowell. If they go to District #1

they would have to pay for that building also.

Petition was presented requesting the transfer of territory from School District No. 102J1, Lane and Douglas Counties, to School District No. 28.

Motion was made by Mr. Swift and seconded by Mr. Wilt, to approve the petition requesting transfer of territory from District No. 102J1, Lane and Douglas Counties, to the District Boundary Board. In Favor - 8; Opposed - 1.

Letter was read from J. L. Turnbull, Secretary of the State Board of Education, approving a six-months extension of time - to October 20, 1960.

Letter was read from Dennis Patch, State Director, School District Reorganization in answer to the Committee's question on the resubmission of partial plans, whether or not the inclusion of zones, term of office of first board, directors, etc., of a plan containing the same area constitutes the same plan or a new plan. The letter is quoted in part: " - - - * * * The amendments passed by the 1959 Legislature relating to zoning or not zoning apply to any plan submitted to the State Board of Education for a proposed administrative district of less than 40,000 population. Your Committee will definitely have to clearly indicate on any plan submitted the number of zones, the term of office of the first board, and the manner of electing directors; or, if they do not recommend zones, they should so state, in which case the board will consist of 7 members elected at large. Under either option the Committee should state as a part of its plan a provision for zoning or not zoning. Since the incorporation of the above provisions regarding zoning or not zoning the plans would be different from the original plans submitted a year ago, and the Committee would be obligated to hold public hearings before reviewing these plans. We are of the opinion that any change that is made in a plan by the County Committee necessitates a public hearing on the plan. The provisions of the law prior to the 1959 amendments are not now available in plans that are resubmitted by a County Committee. * * * - - -"

Superintendent Woodie reported on the election of board members for the new Administrative School Districts No. 52, 68, 69J, 97J, and 90.

Superintendent Woodie called attention to the A.S.D. 40 election on May 24th.

Superintendent Woodie reported on two legislative trends regarding School District Reorganization:

1. The S.O.S. Committee has expanded and will put before the people the proposal to repeal the Reorganization Law and all districts formed under reorganization revert to their former status.
2. Legislative action to force reorganization -- to either have all administrative school districts on plans submitted or no administrative school districts.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION


Chairman

Secretary

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

April 19, 1960

Regular meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County School Office with the following members present:

Ray Swanson	Edgar Rickard
Edward Efteland	Marvin Hendrickson
Paul Ehinger	William Wilt
Winifred Hult	Clarence Jackson
	Wm. R. Woodie, Secretary

Motion was made by Mr. Rickard, seconded by Mr. Hendrickson, and carried, that the minutes of March 15th be approved.

Mr. Swanson read a letter which he had received from Alfred Steinhauer regarding desired zoning in Administrative School District No. 90 and stated he would send a reply to Mr. Steinhauer.

The matter of zoning Administrative School District No. 90 was discussed and according to the minutes of the hearing on R-10, comprising School District No. 90, there was a strong desire for the district to remain as it was. It was pointed out that the committee was powerless to make any change in zoning at this time, but the board could rezone after one year.

Secretary Woodie reported that a petition had been received from patrons of the Stewart Road area requesting the transfer of territory from School District No. 4 to School District No. 52.

A review of School District Reorganization in Lane County was made, which follows -

R-1 - Consolidation election set for April 21, 1960.

R-2 - Proposed Administrative School District No. 45.

Suggested Time Schedule:

- a. Local hearing - February 18th
- b. State hearing - August 1st
 - (1). 1st Publication - July 15-18
 - (2). 2nd Publication - July 19-25
- c. State Approval - 3rd week in September
- d. Election - October 15th

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mrs. Hult and carried, to follow the above schedule for proposed A.S.D. No. 45 as nearly as possible.

A.S.D. No. 40 - State has not as yet returned Plan - Election was requested for 3rd week in May.

Motion was made by Mr. Rickard, seconded by Mr. Jackson, and carried, that authority be given Secretary Woodie to set the election for proposed A.S.D. No. 40 between May 15 and May 30.

R-3 - This Plan must come up again after June 16th.

R-5 - Plan has not been submitted to the State Board as consolidation elections are being held at the present time.

R-9 - This Plan must come up after August 25th.

R-4 - This Plan must come up after August 19th.

Superintendent Woodie was requested to submit the following question to the State: If the Committee submits the same Plan for the second time after one year with no change in boundaries but containing zoning and number of directors, is it considered a new Plan?

Motion was made by Mr. Hendrickson, seconded by Mr. Wilt, and carried, to request the State Board for an additional six-months extension of time in which to submit the comprehensive plan for Lane County.

It was proposed that a provision regarding the number of board members and their term of office be considered for legislative action. It was stated that the continuity of administration could be adversely affected when an entirely new board was elected in an administrative school district that had been formed with minor changes in its previous boundaries.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR
SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION


Chairman


Secretary

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

March 15, 1960

Regular meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County School Office with the following members present:

Ray Swanson
Edward Efteland
Clarence Jackson
William Wilt

Edgar Rickard
Joe Swift
Winifred Hult
Wm. R. Woodie, Secretary

Motion was made by Mr. Swift, seconded by Mr. Rickard and carried, that the minutes of February 18th be approved. The reading of the minutes was dispensed with since each member had previously received a copy.

Representatives were present from the Pleasant Hill, Lowell and Fall Creek area; the Crow-Applegate area; and the Central area.

Mr. Swift was requested by the representatives of Pleasant Hill, Fall Creek, and Lowell area, to act as spokesman for the group.

Mr. Swift presented a brochure on consolidation information composed of information gathered by board members and administrators of Fall Creek, Lowell and Pleasant Hill.

Superintendent Woodie cited the following means for accomplishing unification:

1. Reorganization election (as the first election).
2. Reorganization election with a new plan (calling for zoning).
3. Consolidation election (does not make a reorganized district).
4. Extension of the course of study in the Union High School.
5. Annexation (same effect as consolidation).

Superintendent Woodie called attention to the law on consolidation—should all three elementary districts vote in favor, Union High No. 1 and Union High No. 9 would cease to exist, and the Union High No. 1 board would take over until the next annual election—at which time a complete new board would be elected. (NOTE: After consulting with the State Department of Education, it was determined that the surviving board would be the two union high boards.)

Howard Convers, Fall Creek - asked how they would select directors for the consolidated district?

Superintendent Woodie stated that under consolidation the directors would be elected at large. Zones can be made only when a Reorganization occurs, providing the Plan contains this provision. Under Reorganization the Plan may call for from 5 to 9 zones with the directors elected at large or by zone. The school census is the basis for determining zone boundaries.

A Patron - asked how soon zoning could be brought about in the eyes of the law?

Superintendent Woodie stated that under consolidation it could be done immediately after resignation of the present board. Under reorganization a new board could be elected anytime after a reorganization election but they would not take office until the effective date of the reorganization, which would be July 1, 1961.

Howard Convers, Fall Creek - could building be done or would it be best to hold off any building until July, 1961?

Superintendent Woodie stated that under the law they would no doubt have the authority to vote bond issues prior to July 1, 1961, but all bond issues of any size in Oregon must be approved by a bond attorney before they can be sold, and this is sometimes a difficult procedure.

Earl Drury, Fall Creek - If we come up with a Reorganization plan it will go over like a lead balloon. Consolidation would be different because it is the result of local action.

Superintendent Woodie explained counting votes under consolidation and under reorganization:

Under Reorganization - A majority of the voters in the entire area must approve the plan before it is declared carried. Even if an over-all majority favors the plan a district that votes it down by 60 percent or more can eliminate themselves from the plan by filing a petition calling for a special election in their district alone. If a majority of the votes cast in this special election are against the plan this district cannot be included in it. The rest of the area, however, may go ahead and hold a second election to become an administrative school district without the rejecting school district. If this election carries the new administrative school district is formed without the rejecting district.

Under Consolidation - A majority of votes cast in each district is required to pass the measure. Any district failing to get a majority cannot be included.

Mr. Swanson quoted the law on the election of directors.

Charles Clark, Principal, Fall Creek School - Perhaps we had better contact Mr. Schuler, the bond attorney, to find if he would approve a bond issue if voted before the effective date of reorganization.

A Patron - asked if they could gain the approval of the committee for the consolidation of School Districts No. 1, 67, and 71?

Mr. Funk, Superintendent, Pleasant Hill - asked when would be the earliest date a vote could be taken under consolidation and under reorganization?

Superintendent Woodie replied:

Under Consolidation -

1. Petitions would be prepared by this office.
2. 50 signers would be required on the petitions from District No. 1 and 71; 10 signers would be required on the petition from District No. 67.
3. Upon receiving petitions (around the first of April), the Boundary Board would set election in approximately 17 days. Could become effective around April 28-29.
4. It would not be possible to elect a board on May 2nd, as nomination petitions must be filed 30 days prior to the election. The only possible way would be to elect a board by write-ins.

Under Reorganization -

1. A new plan calling for type of zoning.
2. Hearing held (this takes about 30 days).
3. State Hearing (this takes about 30 days).

March 15, 1960

(Would take a total of at least 90 days - then in June could hold director election and they would have until July 1, 1961 to begin operation.)

Superintendent Woodie also cited another possibility - and that of voting an extension of the Union High School program downward to include grade one. Procedure:

1. Petition presented from Union High School to extend the course of study down to the first grade.
 2. Majority vote in Union High School would carry.
- If this was voted in U-1 and U-9 it would leave two unified districts that would have to be joined by reorganization or consolidation.

Mr. Swanson - asked if they felt it was mandatory for the Committee to take action?

Before giving an answer they requested that they be permitted to leave the room and discuss the matter.

Mrs. Hiatt, Central (Non-High Portion) - presented a petition signed by 61 persons requesting the following: (She also presented a map of the area)

1. Transfer the non-high portion of School District No. 44, Central, Lane County, Oregon, to School District #66, Crow-Applegate, Lane County, Oregon.
2. Permit the union high school portion of School District #44, Central, Lane County, Oregon to make an independent decision concerning whether that area should remain a part of the Elmira Union High district and become a part of an adjacent elementary district that is also a part of the union high school district or become a part of School District #66, Crow-Applegate, Lane County, Oregon.
3. We request that the above action be taken by authority of the district boundary board because there are no applicable laws that give all residents of the Central district the same and equal rights.
4. We further request that the matter of disposition of assets and liabilities be settled by a board of arbitration selected by the boundary board.

Mrs. Hiatt, Central - stated that in submitting this petition they did not desire to deprive the rest of the district of a school, therefore, was asking the Committee's help.

Mr. Swanson made the following statements:

1. If granted, the portion of District No. 44 in Union High No. 4 would be left without facilities. Would be forced to join another district or withdraw from Union High No. 4.
2. Was informed that some of the people signing the petition signed but did so knowing it held no legal weight.
3. Cited remonstrances that were filed requiring an election in Districts No. 28, 44, 118 and 139, to consolidate (election March 29th).
4. Realize that something has to be done in District 44 soon due to the Non-High law going out of existence on June 30th.
5. Mentioned that even though the remonstrance election fails there is talk of filing of new consolidation petitions for Districts No. 28, 44, 88, 118, and 139.

Mrs. Hiatt, Central - If there is a "no" vote on March 29th and if another election is held on consolidation and it is again a "no" vote, what do we do?

Mrs. Thompson, Central - Could the U-4 portion of District No. 44 also go to Crow-Applegate?

March 15, 1960

Superintendent Woodie - Yes, it would require a boundary change in U-4 to withdraw this territory.

A Patron - If the U-4 portion would petition to go to Veneta could it go through the Boundary Board?

Mr. Swanson - Yes. Stated that he understands there is considerable opposition to going to Veneta. The Reorganization Committee has taken no action as it must consider the whole area. Stated that he would be very glad to disqualify himself since he is a resident of the area. The Reorganization Committee felt the entire area should go together, although the outcome might be two administrative school districts.

Mrs. Thompson, Central - Does the Committee look at it from a financial standpoint? Crow can take us without additional building.

Mr. Swanson - Committee has not as yet discussed this.

Mrs. Thompson, Central - Many feel building would be used for lower grades but not build on to it at present.

Mrs. Hiatt, Central - Questioned Mr. Swanson as to who it was that signed petition just to avoid argument.

Mr. Swanson - stated that he did not know.

Mr. Boehringer, Crow-Applegate - Stated that he grew up in the area and hasn't seen anyone yet try to avoid an argument.

Mr. Wilt - If another consolidation election is held and fails in one district would they have to go through same procedure if remonstrances were filed?

Superintendent Woodie - Yes.

Mr. Swanson - If proposal had included less territory and left the building there might be a possibility of acceptance by the committee.

A Patron from Central - Give them the school. Did not think signers of petition would object. We were made to believe if district had gone together that transfer of territory by Boundary Board action would be a simple matter.

Mrs. Thompson, Central - Felt many people living in the non-high part voted in favor of consolidation in order to help those in the U-4 part.

Mrs. Hiatt, Central - If consolidation is voted down on March 29th and another election is held, is there a way the ballot can be divided so that it could be determined what the two areas are in favor of?

Superintendent Woodie - Under the law it isn't possible.

Mr. Efteland - Felt that some think the committee instigated this R-5 proposal. The Committee suggested R-5 after they had considered it extensively. Called attention to the people from the Fall Creek, Pleasant Hill and Lowell area who voted down their proposed plan but are now requesting that it be tried again. Also cited the Cottage Grove-Creswell area, with one Plan proposed at first but now are being divided into two administrative school districts. We are not playing with this as a jig-saw puzzle. Maybe an election in R-5 will give us some facts that will be of help. There is no politics in the Committee.

March 15, 1960

Mr. Wilt - Will there be any different problem that hasn't existed previously?

Mrs. Hiatt, Central - Yes, the Non-High School District is going out of existence on June 30th.

The patrons from Fall Creek, Lowell and Pleasant Hill returned to Committee meeting.

Mr. Kelsay, Pleasant Hill - After considering the question of whether the Pleasant Hill, Lowell and Fall Creek area should go for consolidation or reorganization, it was the unanimous opinion of the group to proceed at the earliest possible date with consolidation and requested the Committee's approval.

Mr. Swanson - Have you resolved among yourselves regarding administration?

Mr. Kelsay, Pleasant Hill - Yes.

Motion was made by Mr. Rickard, seconded by Mr. Swift and carried, to give consent to consolidation elections comprising School Districts No. 1, 67 and 71.

Mrs. Thompson, Central - What can we do now, wait until the elections are over? I will have one high school student next year.

Superintendent Woodie - The best move now is for the Non-High portion of District No. 44 to be added to U-4 to take care of the interim period until reorganization.

Mrs. Thompson, Central - Have been told that if the non-high part of District No. 44 goes to U-4, Crow would not accept the 8th grade students.

Mr. Boehringer, Crow-Applegate - I think the answer to that statement is the 8th graders going to Crow and interested in going to Crow next year instead of Elmira. The majority of the Non-High students are attending Crow. These would have to leave Crow and go to Elmira. *Note: Majority of non-high students attend Elmira*

Superintendent Woodie - if the non-high portion of School District No. 44 was taken out it would abolish District No. 44.

Odyne Mathews, Central - There are 35 or 40 grade school students from the non-high section. I do not think the non-high section would want the district abolished. If the non-high portion goes to District No. 66 the U-4 part would have to be added to District No. 28 or withdrawn from U-4. He called attention to map presented by Mrs. Hiatt pointing out that much of the land is unoccupied farm land. One family in the area would like to go to Eugene.

Mr. Boehringer, Crow-Applegate - I live just over the fence from District No. 44. The whole thing has become very complicated.

Mrs. Hiatt, Central - In answer to Mr. Efteland we have no quarrel with the Committee and recognize the problem the Committee has. Mr. Swanson is held in very high regard in the entire district.

Mr. Swanson - I do not want to dodge my responsibility but I would be willing to disqualify myself and vote only in the case of a tie.

Mr. Wilt - have learned much more about this tonight. We are trying to help you and whatever is done we try to do it in the best interest of the people.

Mr. Efteland - Have you investigated the possibility of going to District No. 4, Eugene?

Mrs. Hiatt, Central - Yes, only one family is interested. There might be a possibility of splitting along Central road and please most of the people.

Mr. Swanson - No action can be taken until after the election. Please bear with us until one more meeting.

A Patron from Central - If Districts No. 28, 44, 118 and 139 vote "yes" at the March 29th election could we go ahead with the same proposal?

Mrs. Hiatt, Central - Felt there is nothing to do but wait.

Mr. Swanson - Aware that something should have been done previously.

A Patron from Central - As long as District No. 88 is not included in the consolidation and if the election would carry would there still be U-4?

Mr. Swanson - Yes, U-4 would not be abolished until all component elementary districts were consolidated.

Petition was presented requesting the transfer of that portion of School District No. 102J, including an area in Douglas County, which lies south of a line extended west from the point where district lines of School District #102J, Linslaw, District #118, Walton (Lyons), and District #66, Crow-Applegate meets to the point where it would intersect the western boundary of District #102J, Linslaw. This petition was signed by 6 persons and involves the Blundell family and property having one child in the seventh grade this year and one who will enter the 1st grade next year. (This property is located within a short distance of District No. 66's west boundary line in Section 20).

Mr. Boehringer, Crow-Applegate - stated that their bus run is not too far from the Blundell's home now.

Ed Cooper, Superintendent, Crow-Applegate - wanted to make clear they are presenting the Committee with a problem, not asking for one.

Mr. Efteland - What is the value of 102J and 1J, Douglas, not included in R-32?

Superintendent Woodie - Approximately \$800,000.

Mr. Efteland - What is a temporary expedience to take care of these children?

Superintendent Woodie - For the Blundell's to forget about school; request a boundary change for their property or move to another district.

Mr. Swanson - petition should not have included as large an area.

Mr. Efteland - how much value does Mr. Blundell's property have?

Mr. Boehringer, Crow-Applegate - Uncertain.

Mr. Swanson - if boundary change went no further than Township line I would look differently at it. If we have to split district, make Township line the Reorganized district line.

Mr. Efteland - if you take them at Crow will you transport them?

March 15, 1960

Mr. Boehringer, Crow-Applegate - When this problem came up we felt we were going to educate the kids, so when we found out they were out of the district it was not our intention to take all of that territory to District No. 66 but felt the Committee would whittle it down and make their recommendation.

Mr. Swanson - suggested that change not extend farther than Township line.

Mr. Efteland - feels this will take considerable soul searching.

Mr. Wilt - feels line as suggested by Mr. Swanson is fair.

Mr. Boehringer, Crow-Applegate - Most of the homesteads have already been bought up. There is probably no possibility of other children in this area.

Mr. Swanson - If no action is taken it is their problem until they present a request for a lesser transfer.

Mr. Cooper, Crow-Applegate - Since I typed up the petition perhaps we both feel it is a reasonable request - What then?

Mr. Efteland - I feel I could only approve a change if the petition contained a more reasonable amount of territory.

Motion was made by Mr. Wilt, seconded by Mr. Swift and carried, to reject petition. Mr. Swanson added, with personal advice, that they submit a revised request.

Mr. Boehringer, Crow-Applegate - How can we get pay for these children?

Superintendent Woodie - contact the Blundell's for payment.

Mr. Efteland - why isn't Mr. Blundell here making this request?

Secretary Woodie read letters from the following:

Letter from Dennis Patch, State Director of School District Reorganization, regarding the visit of certain Lane County patrons, to his office.

Letter from Dennis Patch regarding the State Hearing on proposed ASD 40 to be held at the Creswell High School on Thursday, March 24th.

Letter from Dennis Patch regarding the extension of the union high school program downward to include all grades including one.

Superintendent Woodie reported to the committee on an article appearing in the March, 1960, OEA Journal, entitled "4 POINTS FOR BETTER SCHOOLS" -- a study report of Committee for Economic Development. The CED is a research organization of 200 business executives and scholars who work together studying national and international economic problems in an effort to increase employment to promote stable economic growth. The CED policy statement pointed out that a large proportion of the 45,000 school districts in the United States "are much too small to provide good schools at all or to provide any kind of schools effectively." The Committee listed the following proposal as the first of four recommendations to assure continued progress for the nation's schools:

1. Immediate mandatory state programs of school district reorganization leading to larger unified districts.

March 15, 1960

The report stated that the minimum size for a school district to perform the best job of education was around 2,000 students enrolled and that educational benefits continue to accrue up to about 25,000 students.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR
SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION



Chairman



Secretary

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE
February 18, 1960

Special meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held following the proposed ASD No. 40 and ASD No. 45 hearings, at the home of Edgar Rickard in Cottage Grove.

The following members were present:

Edgar Rickard	Edward Efteland
Paul Ehinger	Joe Swift
William Wilt	Clarence Jackson
Winifred Hult	Wm. R. Woodie, Secretary

Secretary Woodie reported on the ASD No. 52 state hearing held at the Cascade Junior High School on February 15, 1960.

Regarding the hearing on proposed ASD No. 45, Mr. Rickard reported to the Committee that a request was made at the hearing, held in Cottage Grove just previous to this Committee meeting, that the election on proposed ASD No. 45 not be held until the fall of 1960.

Motion was made by Paul Ehinger, seconded by William Wilt, and carried, to comply with the request to not hold the ASD No. 45 election until after the beginning of school in September, 1960. No action was taken to approve or not to approve the ASD No. 45 plan.

The hearing on proposed ASD No. 40, which was held in Creswell just previous to this Committee meeting, was discussed.


Motion was made by Joe Swift, seconded by Paul Ehinger and carried, to approve the partial Plan ASD No. 40 and instruct the Secretary to forward the Plan to the State. Vote result:

YES -----	6
NO -----	0
ABSTAINED -----	1 (Edward Efteland)
ABSENT -----	2

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION


Chairman


Secretary

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION PUBLIC HEARING ON
PARTIAL PLAN OF REORGANIZATION ASD No. 40
Creswell High School
March 24, 1960

A public hearing was held in the Creswell High School, Creswell, Oregon, on March 24, 1960 at 8:00 o'clock p.m. for the purpose of discussing the Plan ASD No. 40 for Lane County. The hearing was attended by approximately 40 patrons.

Mr. Clarence Jackson, Lane County Committee Member, opened the meeting and introduced Mrs. Moore Hamilton, Member of the State Board of Education; Dennis Patch, State Director of School District Reorganization; Joe Swift, Lane County Committee Member; Wm. R. Woodie, Lane County School Superintendent; and, Margaret Blanton of the County School Office.

Mr. Jackson reviewed previous reorganization proceedings in the Creswell area, pointing out that a Plan was submitted about a year ago proposing the reorganization of School Districts No. 40 and 45 and adjacent districts in that end of the county. The Plan was rejected. County Committee then came up with a second Plan, which proposed one administrative school district comprising School District No. 40 and Union High No. 12 with the exception of the area immediately south of Creswell, known as the Walker area, which was divided - the northern portion included in District No. 40 and the southern portion to go to Cottage Grove under a proposed Plan that will be voted upon by the Cottage Grove area at a later date. Also, another exception is the two (2) sections known as Rattlesnake area. This will become a part of Pleasant Hill and will be voted upon at a later date. Mr. Jackson did not define the line but requested those wishing further information to call for it later.

Mr. Jackson then turned the hearing over to Dennis Patch, State Director of School District Reorganization.

Mr. Patch stated that this was the 94th State hearing conducted under the Reorganization Act. This Plan is a proposed plan for an Administrative School District to provide education Grades 1 through 12 in District No. 40 with the exception of the Walker area, which is divided. It includes all territory at present in Union High No. 12 and a part that is in Union High No. 14J.

The Plan was made and adopted by the County Committee and presented to the State Board of Education on February 25, 1960 and under provision of law, the State Board shall call a hearing within 30 days after receiving such a Plan. The State hearing is to provide an opportunity to those present to express themselves regarding the proposal. After the hearing to nite it provides that within sixty (60) days the State Board must review the Plan, which they will do when they meet on April 22nd, and they will approve or reject the Plan. If approved they must notify the County Committee within ten (10) days. If rejected, they must notify the County Committee and make a statement to the County Committee as to why the Plan was rejected. If the Plan was approved, an election must be held to vote on the proposal. Those voting will be only those residing in the area of the proposed Administrative School District. Those in District No. 40 not included will ballot in the proposed Cottage Grove Administrative School District.

If the election carries by a majority vote, the Administrative School District will be declared carried. In the event the proposal is rejected the County Committee is presented with:

1. May submit same Plan not sooner than one (1) year from the date of the election.

2. May submit new plan.

Elections - If the County Committee calls an election on this proposal between July 1st and April 30th of any year and it is approved, the administrative school district will become effective July 1st following. If the election is held between April 30th and July 1st, it will not come into existence until the following July 1st.

Mr. Patch stated that Mrs. Moore Hamilton was representing the State Board at this hearing.

Mr. Patch officially opened the hearing and called for statements or questions.

Mrs. Gatewood - If we vote on proposed Plan how long do we have to stay under it?

Mr. Patch - Legislation was passed by the 1959 session of the Legislature providing for boundary changes in administrative school districts. No doubt there will be further legislation for this provision at the 1961 legislative session.

Frances Quinn - If this would be a temporary plan for five or ten years and then consolidate with another district could they split District 40 or must they go in a block?

Mr. Patch - There are provisions for boundary changes at the present time.

Miles Wicks - We were told previously there could be no boundary changes.

Mr. Patch - The 1959 Legislature did make provision for boundary changes in administrative school district. Cited boundary changes made in Coos County under 1959 legislation. It was the Coos County Committee who requested the legislature to pass legislation allowing boundary changes in administrative school districts.

Superintendent Woodie - There must be some misunderstanding. Changes can be made after administrative school districts are formed. I am sorry there was a misunderstanding about this.

Mr. Patch - Should you vote on Plan and approve same, the new district would not come into effect until July 1, 1961. Between the time of vote and the time it becomes effective no change could be made, but after July 1, 1961, a change could be made.

Miles Wicks - All of Walker is in District No. 40. You state only part of the people in the Walker area can vote.

Mr. Patch - Only those can vote who are included in the proposed ASD 40 Plan. Those in Walker but included in proposed ASD 45 will vote on that Plan. All of District 40 is included in this Plan excepting a part of the Walker area, which part is included in the Cottage Grove Plan.

Cal Taylor - On boundary change how effective does that work?

Mr. Patch - A boundary change must be contiguous to the territory it is going into. There have been cases where consolidations are not coterminous.

Frances Quinn - Has there been a test case on a plan such as our proposed Plan and is it constitutional?

Mr. Patch - There has been one case in Multnomah County. It was contested on the procedure used in the election. Also, questioned the constitutionality of the Act. The case went to Circuit Court and the decision handed down was in favor of the newly formed district.

Mr. Patch - Pointed out that Wayne Morse has indicated to patrons in the Gresham area that there was no question on the constitutionality of the Reorganization Act.

Mildred Babcock - There are some of us who feel the plan isn't going to enlarge the district enough to improve our high school. What kind of an advantage can the committee give us with this Plan?

Joe Swift - Pointed out the result of the first election which was rejected by a large majority.

Mildred Babcock - Why is our tax levy higher than Eugene, Springfield and Cottage Grove, when we are not offering a comparable curriculum? Is there any possibility people would have been happier to go to Pleasant Hill, Eugene or Springfield? We wonder why the committee did not go north?

Mr. Patch - Wasn't the people contacted about this Plan?

Superintendent Woodie - Yes, and in the Committee's judgment it was felt best not to join Eugene or Springfield.

Mildred Babcock - What was the disadvantages of consolidation of Pleasant Hill, Lowell, Springfield and Creswell?

Superintendent Woodie - It was not felt the best Plan.

Mr. Patch - It is easy for us to say "put the districts together" but it has to be acceptable to the people.

Mildred Babcock - What you are taking here is a small step.

Superintendent Woodie - You will have to be patient. Sometimes we have to take a step at a time. The only thing certain is "change".

Frances Quinn - Someone requested that I ask if it would be feasible to suggest that you cut off part of District No. 1 and enlarge ASD 40?

Mr. Patch - No comment but I am sure the committee members heard it. There is nothing to prevent boundary changes after the formation of an administrative school district. Any changes at this time could not be made unless the committee wishes to withdraw the Plan and start over. The county committee must concur any change before the Boundary Board makes any change.

Isabelle Marple - What advantage is it to combine District No. 40 and U-12?

Mr. Patch - Grades 1 through 12 under one administration can provide a coordinated program. This school district will be just as good as you want to make it.

A Patron - Most of talk has been the rehashing of what was done before. I am sure the county committee has tried to satisfy the majority in this Plan. I am looking at it from all angles. The reason a part of Walker was cut out was by request of some

of the people in the area. Felt the Committee set the line where they felt was best.

Tom Wright - Wanted to know why this hearing and the election is being rushed in this part of the district and the Cottage Grove one is postponed?

Mr. Patch - Plan was submitted to the State Board on February 25th. Referred to time schedule previously stated.

Tom Wright - The fact that the elections are not going to be held simultaneously leaves some of my neighbors included in the Cottage Grove Plan without a chance to vote. The point I am coming to, if District 40 has a vote within 60 days and the election should carry, we are out of the district and do not know when there will be a vote in the south end into the Cottage Grove district.

Mr. Patch - Suggested that a boundary change could be instigated.

Tom Wright - The vote should be at the same time in Creswell and Cottage Grove. Asked who "they" were who promised legislation for boundary changes?

Mr. Patch - The Curry County Committee. The Legislature was in session and passed legislation at that session at the request of the Committee.

Miles Wicks - At the last meeting we asked why the hurry. Feel we should have more time to figure this out. The Committee put off the Cottage Grove Plan, why rush this?

Superintendent Woodie - At the Committee meeting held February 18th, the reason the Cottage Grove Plan was not sent in at the same time was due to a request that they have time to study problems that confronted them that does not confront you. They want time to take local action to study these problems. There was no reason to hold off here but there was in the Cottage Grove area.

Mr. Patch - Is there any building involved in the Cottage Grove area?

Superintendent Woodie - Yes.

Mr. Patch - If so and they vote it would hold up any building.

Tom Wright - In regard to Mr. Woodie's statement that it might require further time in Cottage Grove, do you consider any of these are more important than being taxed without representation?

Superintendent Woodie - I am in sympathy with your tax position.

Mr. Patch - Want to get this clear in my mind, Mr. Wright, is there any objection for a boundary change to put this in Cottage Grove? There is nothing in the event this proposal carried to prevent a request for a boundary change.

Larry Oslund - Cottage Grove has asked for an extension - won't they go into effect at the same time?

Superintendent Woodie - Yes, if it passes in both areas the effective date will be July 1, 1961.

Tom Wright - I am sure Cottage Grove would be willing to accept us.

Superintendent Woodie - The only complication I can see would be if it fails in Cottage Grove.

Mrs. Mathews - Why do people in the south portion of the district have a right to petition for a boundary change?

Mr. Patch - All the people in District 40 included in this proposal will vote as one district.

Mrs. Mathews - We are a part of District No. 40 but not U-12. 80% of the people were opposed.

Superintendent Woodie - Not 80% of the people said they wished to go to Cottage Grove. You cannot put all people just where they want to be. If you want a petition for a boundary change you may get it. The division line had to be drawn somewhere and the Committee set it where they did after conducting a survey of the entire Walker area.

Mr. Quinn - Have heard a lot of talk and haven't heard anyone say they want it. I am on the Creswell side of the line but I want to be on the other side of the line.

Cal Taylor - I think it's apparent most of these folks are from Walker. I think the people in Creswell will favor this plan. People who reject usually turn out.

A Patron requested a standing vote favoring the Plan - 22 or more people stood.

Tom Wright - It is where I want to go but I can't vote.

Mr. Patch - I do not like standing votes taken.

Mr. Griffith - We appreciate the efforts of the Committee and they have been reasonable. We have a good school here and want to keep it.

Isabelle Marple - What would be the proposed tax levy for the proposed ASD 40 with Grades 1-12?

Superintendent Woodie - Approximately 67.0 mills.

Miles Wicks - We are in Cottage Grove for high school with 9.0 mills. You would be taxing us more to come into Creswell.

Mrs. Gray - Is it possible through petition to change the boundary line to North of the Tate Road as the boundary line?

Mr. Patch - If the Plan is approved an election must be held within 60 days. If the people approve the Plan the Boundary Board could be petitioned with the permission of the Committee.

Clyde Holloman - I think you have done a wonderful job - ready to put it up to a vote. Perhaps it can be settled.

Mr. Quinn - What are we gaining? I can't see how we are gaining a thing.

March 24, 1960

Mr. Patch - Do not know what you think of your County Committee. They were elected by school board members at a Conference in 1957. I have had the opportunity of working with county committees in the state and would like you people to know that statewide these people have averaged a meeting a month. These are regular meetings but many committees have had other meetings. These committees do not get payment for this job. I do not know where you would find this type of dedication - especially your Committee in Lane County. They deserve a lot of credit. No Plan is the ultimate. All Plans can be improved. Schools will be as good as people will make them. The prime object of reorganization is for better schools.

Mr. Patch thanked the Creswell High School Board for the use of the building, Larry Oslund for making arrangements for this hearing, and Mrs. Hamilton for attending. Also, thanked Mr. Jackson for serving as chairman, Mr. Swift and Superintendent Woodie for attending, Margaret Blanton for acting as recorder, and the people for attending.

Hearing adjourned.

Babcock - In other words, we will have to leave the area in order to get a more comprehensive high school.

Mrs. Sly - Will there be any improvement in our assessable value?

The change in the assessable value is slight. The loss from the grade school district is offset by an addition to the unified district.

Mrs. Quinn - (question directed to Mrs. Babcock) What did you mean when you said "that we want to keep our schools at any cost".

Mrs. Babcock - I merely wished to point out that the district could have a better high school through a more comprehensive reorganization.

Mrs. Sly - If this proposition were to carry could some area remove itself, making the district even smaller?

Yes. The possibility of boundary changes through regular legal procedures would be open in the future to all taxpayers.

Mrs. Mathews - Why can't our districts remain just like they are?

Mr. Efteland - Because of a law passed by the legislature, which was an attempt to find a more effective arrangement for school district organization.

Tom Wright - The Committee did not accept a boundary proposal clearly defined on a map which was presented to them and which would have met the approval of more people than the boundary line for the Walker area finally adopted.

Miles Wicks - The Walker area would have become affiliated with Cottage Grove for grade and high many years ago if it had been possible.

Ed Efteland - I was not on the subcommittee that made the decision for the Walker boundary, but I think that the line was correctly drawn in the light of all the evidence handed to the Committee.

Tom Wright - I feel that the Committee drew the proper line from their point of view, however, to the people living in the area the line is of much more personal concern and does not suit them.

Miles Wicks - What is the hurry on this reorganization? Wouldn't it be better to wait instead of shoving it down someone's throat?

Clarence Jackson - Since this proposition has been before the area in one form or another for more than two years, in my opinion it probably would not make any difference in the understanding of the patrons in the area if they were to wait six months or a year longer.

Miles Wicks - There was much misunderstanding at the original election. I think that meetings of this type are helpful, since I have found things I didn't know before.

Mrs. Babcock - I do not believe the people will become interested in this matter until a vote is scheduled.

Mrs. Quinn - We in the Walker area supported this proposal at the first election, but we were outnumbered.

Mr. Wright - At the time this overlapping jurisdiction came into existence, it seemed the best thing for us all to do. We could not prevent the overlapping situation from developing according to the best information that was available to us at that time.

Mr. Wright stated that he was sympathetic to the Committee in the job that they had to do, and that he appreciated their efforts, and that even if he did not agree with the entire Plan of reorganization he thought that the Committee had operated honestly according to their own analysis of the school problems in Lane County.

Clarence Jackson - I would like to conduct an unofficial poll to see how the people here tonight feel about this proposal. Will all of those who feel that this proposal is equitable and fair please raise your hand? (17 responses). Will all of those who feel that it is not equitable and fair please raise your hands (5 responded).

Mrs. Babcock - I do not feel that an unofficial voice opinion at this/^{time}is fair.

Clyde Hollemon - We felt at the time of the first election that a favorable vote would have resulted in the loss of our high school.

Mr. Efteland - There was no such proposal made and if the high school had been changed it would have to have been done by the reorganized school district board. The original plan did not call for the abandonment of any school buildings.

Miles Quinn - I would like to have had the original plan passed with the transporting of teachers from the Cottage Grove area to the Creswell area in order that the present Creswell High School could be maintained, and we believe that if the people of Creswell had been assured that their high school would have remained that the original R-2 Plan would have carried. And, we think that if this could be explained, as well as other details, that the original plan might have a chance of success.

Clarence Jackson - I do not believe that interest in this matter would change substantially with the passage of time.

Mrs. Babcock - When will election take place?

Mr. Woodie - The day of the election has not been set and depends upon acceptance by the Committee, transmittal to the State Board, the results of a state hearing and action by the State Board of Education. The earliest the election can occur would be May, 1960.

Mrs. Mathews - When would this become effective?

Mr. Woodie - Not before July 1, 1961.

Mrs. Mathews - It looks as if we will have another year of lower taxes.

Mrs. Sly - I would like to know how many people present tonight live in the city. (About 8). I wonder what is the difference in thinking between the Creswell area and outside of Creswell.

At this point Mr. Jackson asked for further questions and hearing none, adjourned the meeting.

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE
February 18, 1960

Special meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held following the proposed ASD No. 40 and ASD No. 45 hearings, at the home of Edgar Rickard in Cottage Grove.

The following members were present:

Paul Ehinger	Edgar Rickard
William Wilt	Joe Swift
Winifred Hult	Clarence Jackson
Edward Efteland	Wm. R. Woodie, Secretary

Secretary Woodie reported on the ASD No. 52 State hearing held at the Cascade Junior High School on February 15, 1960.

Regarding the hearing on proposed ASD No. 45, Mr. Rickard reported to the Committee that a request was made at the hearing, held in Cottage Grove just previous to this Committee meeting, that the election on proposed ASD No. 45 not be held until the fall of 1960.

Motion was made by Paul Ehinger, seconded by William Wilt, and carried, to comply with the request to not hold the ASD No. 45 election until after the beginning of school in September, 1960. No action was taken to approve or not to approve the ASD No. 45 Plan.

The hearing on proposed ASD No. 40, which was held in Creswell just previous to this Committee meeting, was discussed.

Motion was made by Joe Swift, seconded by Paul Ehinger and carried, to approve the partial Plan ASD No. 40 and instruct the Secretary to forward the Plan to the State.
Vote result:

YES ----- 6
NO ----- 0
ABSTAINED --- 1 (Edward Efteland)
ABSENT ----- 2

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR THE
REORGANIZATION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS



Chairman



Secretary

MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING ON PARTIAL PLAN ASD No. 45
Cottage Grove Union High School
February 18, 1960

Public hearing on proposed partial Plan ASD No. 45 was held in the Cottage Grove Union High School on Thursday, February 18, 1960, commencing at 8 o'clock p.m., with approximately seventy (70) patrons in attendance.

Paul Ehinger, Committee Member, opened the meeting and introduced the following: Committee Members William Wilt and Edgar Rickard, and acting Secretary Margaret Blanton.

Paul Ehinger then summarized the Proposed Partial Plan ASD No. 45, South Lane, and explained the Reorganization Law.

Paul Ehinger asked that patrons present wishing to make a statement or ask a question, to stand and state their name and district number.

Jack Lively, a resident of the Walker area -

1. Under the Reorganization Plan where will I vote?
2. What will be the effect on my property if the Plan succeeds in Creswell and fails in Cottage Grove?

Mr. Lively also asked if the remaining members of the Committee would be present to hear the arguments. He objected to a hearing unless the remaining members were present. Felt he was denied the right to speak freely his objections because the hearings were held on the same evening.

Lloyd Griggs, U-14J - What is the date this will come up for election?

Paul Ehinger - This is a preliminary hearing. After this it must go to the State.

Edgar Rickard - It would be possible to have the State hearing within 30 days and have the election about May 15th. I do not think we are going to do this. If the election is held next fall and carries, the plan would not go into effect until July 1, 1961.

Larry Chapman, U-14J - Not clear on hearings - this preliminary hearing subject to another hearing at a later date. We would like to consider this at some length and if you have a schedule to meet we wish to have time to do some thinking on our own.

Paul Ehinger - Now is the time for you to ask questions. If Plan is approved by the Committee it will go to the next step which is to the State and a State hearing will be held.

Larry Chapman, U-14J - We would like time to think about the zoning.

Edgar Rickard - Next issue of the paper will contain a map showing the proposed zones.

Lloyd Griggs, U-14J - We wish a little more time to study zoning proposals. Suggested that Committee postpone sending to the State until sometime next fall.

Horace Wolfard, #45 - Agreed with the Union High School Board on the request.

Larry Chapman, U-14J - The High School Board proposed the zoning plan after receiving a request from Superintendent Woodie. The High School Board proposed the zoning boundaries and the Grade School Board accepted their proposal.

Lloyd Griggs, U-14J - Would like for the boards of the component districts to have an opportunity to consider zoning further.

Roy Duerst, #191 - Are the zones just a recommendation or a must. If the Reorganization goes through would it be mandatory their directors be elected from zones as proposed?

Jack Lively - Will the boundary and zones be in one issue?

Paul Ehinger - Yes, you accept or reject the Plan.

William Wilt - Explained the amendments providing that the Plan could be submitted with no zones and the directors being elected at large. Committee came up with the zoning proposal as was recommended.

Robert Dusenberry - U-14J Superintendent - Questioned Page 3 of the brochure as to the figure on valuation.

Committee was unable to answer.

Paul Ehinger - Read the new law regarding zoning.

Robert Dusenberry - Which law are you reading from?

Paul Ehinger - The new one received two weeks ago.

Jack Lively - Could not believe the Reorganization Committee could be right in both instances in their proposals of ASD No. 40 and ASD No. 45 -- if they felt the first Plan was the most feasible. If that was true then it is just as true today. Did not believe the Committee should sacrifice the best interest of the entire people of the district in attempting to get the vote in Creswell. Believed the best interest of the districts was the original Plan. If the Committee cannot go back to the first Plan and do a selling job then at least they should give the people sufficient time to face the facts. Put original Plan back on the ballot and explain it to the people or ask the people in the Walker area where they want to go.

Paul Ehinger - On the rejection last year it was overwhelming. The Committee came back and took a second look at the Plan. The Committee did then and does now still believe the best interest of the entire area would be the original Plan. Mr. Lively takes issue that we did not take into account the wishes of the people. It is an impossibility to satisfy everyone. It seemed the people in Cottage Grove had no desire to consolidate with Creswell. There were people in the middle that wanted to consolidate the area but, as you can see, there were some dissatisfied people so they had to compromise. We split Mr. Lively's and one other property in making the line. We have had to make a more acceptable Plan that would accomplish in part the objectives of the law. As far as a selling job I would make this comment. The Committee is made up of people who are volunteers. There is a limit how much time we can go out and sell. We expect the people within the district to sell the program. We can make the recommendations but without salesmanship in the area it is impossible for the Committee to go out and sell it. We try and get the best information and solicit attendance and have gone out into the districts at the request of the school boards. After this we try to formulate a Plan for a particular area. In dividing the area we had one objective -- to come up with a Plan that will be more acceptable to these districts. We have tried to evaluate the thinking of patrons in the individual districts.

William Wilt - We appreciate your position in this think. It is too bad we have to spend

so much time in this hearing as a consolation to Mr. Lively. If the people are entirely dissatisfied the boundary can be changed later on. We feel this is a good Plan and see it as a necessity. Plan provides for zoning. We would like to know if you criticize the proposal or zoning.

Jack Lively - I am not mad at anybody. I will help to get this through if you help me later on.

Paul Ehinger - If there are no further questions or comments we will call this meeting adjourned.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION PUBLIC HEARING ON
PARTIAL PLAN OF REORGANIZATION ASD NO. 52
Cascade Junior High School
February 15, 1960

A public hearing was held in the Cascade Junior High School, 1525 Echo Hollow Rd., Eugene, Oregon, on February 15, 1960 at 8:00 o'clock p.m. for the purpose of discussing the Plan ASD No. 52 for Lane County. The hearing was attended by approximately sixty patrons.

Mr. Edward Efteland, Lane County Committee Member, opened the meeting and introduced Ronald Jones, Member of the State Board of Education; Donnie Patch, State Director of School District Reorganization; Edgar Rickard, Lane County Committee Member; and, Margaret Blanton, acting secretary. Mr. Efteland then reviewed the proposed Plan ASD No. 52.

Mr. Efteland called on the secretary to read letters which were presented prior to the meeting. The following were read:

"To Whom It May Concern:

We would prefer to have the board members of School District #52 selected according to zones instead of the at large plan.

Because all of the areas would have a fairer chance of representation on the board. The Bethel District is composed of a large variety of communities and we feel our needs would be better represented by a member from our own community.

Ethel B. Ross
Deryl Ross
Leland C. Ross"

"To Whom It May Concern,

I would prefer to have the board members of School District #52 selected according to zones instead of the at large plan, because the area we live in, would have better representations on the school board. In zoning we can be assured of having a board member elected from our area while on the at large plan we would not stand a chance as the majority of the population being elsewhere would govern such an election. We would to see this plan followed.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Patry B. Fisher
Mr. Carl T. Fisher"

"To Whom It May Concern:

I am in favor of zoning our school district No. 52. By zoning, our outlying areas would have a chance of electing a board member to represent us. If board members were elected at large the more populated areas could elect the board members and we on the outlying areas would not have a chance of being represented.

Signed: Alice M. Widmaier
Albert F. Widmaier
4875 Barger Dr."

"To Whom It May Concern:

I am in favor of selecting board members according to zones in place of electing them at large. I think this is more fair to all parts of the district because all parts of the district are represented.

Dr. and Mrs. Charles Michel"

"To Whom It May Concern:

We prefer to have the board members of School District #52 selected by zones instead of at large so that representation would be assured from every area.

Bessie E. Alexander
Herbert P. Alexander"

" I would prefer to leave our school district just as it is. I don't think zoning will help me or my family so I am opposed to it.

Mrs. Harold Lambertz"

"Dear Sirs:

I am unable to be present at this hearing tonight. Therefore I am sending the statement of my feelings on the reorganization of our School District. I am very much opposed to having our district zoned. I feel very strongly that our schools are much better served by having our Board of Directors elected from our district at large.

Yours Sincerely,
Clyde M. Henager"

"To Whom it may concern:-

I have heard arguments and discussions on both sides of the question of whether or not Lane County School District #52 should be divided into zones for the purpose of electing school board directors. To me it seems that our entire school district is a pretty small area, we're all interested in the same thing, we should all vote together and let the best men win. I do not favor zoning of the district at this time.

Sincerely,
Bonnie E. Falk"

"TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

I am in favor of zoning our school district #52 because of the assurance it would provide that a small group or clique in one area of the district could not in effect control the school.

I feel that more people could make their wishes known to the board members if they were distributed evenly throughout the district. I think zoning is the

only way we can be sure of getting them evenly distributed.

Major Snyder
Mrs. Laura Snyder"

--

"To Whom it may concern:-

I have heard arguments and discussions on both sides of the question of whether or not Lane County School District #52 should be divided into zones for the purpose of electing school board directors. After considering both sides of the question and knowing the recommendations of the present board, I have decided that there is nothing to be gained by zoning the district.

I do feel that property tax is called upon to carry more than its share for school purposes, but any other tax source would have to come from the state level. I feel that the present and past board of this district and its administration has always done a good job to get the most in schools per dollar spent. That is all that can be done locally as state minimum standards for education and the school census in the district determines the job that has to be done.

Sincerely,
Julian B. Falk"

--

Mr. Efteland then turned the meeting over to Dennis Patch, State Director of School District Reorganization.

Dennis Patch stated that the hearing was being held for the benefit of the patrons of the area so that they may discuss viewpoints in regard to the Plan. He reviewed the provisions of the Act relating to the effective date of proposed reorganization and stated that if the State Board approves this Plan prior to April 30th, the new administrative school district would become effective July 1, 1960. If approved after April 30th it would not become effective until July 1, 1961. He pointed out that this Plan does not require a vote, since there is no change of boundary proposed. If the Plan is approved by the State Board at their February 19th meeting the County Superintendent will be notified to declare the plan effective on July 1, 1960.

Dennis Patch called for statements or questions.

Marvin Ringsdorf - Favors zoning, as he feels board members would be evenly divided among the school district. Feels that it is a democratic procedure.

Earl Ringsdorf - 3/4ths of District #52 is farming area. There are now four directors from the populated area. Feels that the farming area cannot stand a chance against the populated area without zoning.

Dennis Patch - Do you favor electing by zones or at large?

Earl Ringsdorf - Electing by zones. Feels the outlying area should have something to say.

Agnes Grant - Do other zoned districts in the State have the same problems as we have?

Dennis Patch - 36 ASDs have been established in the State - 9 will become effective July 1, 1960 and the balance on July 1, 1961.

Mrs. Jackson - Feels zoning is the most democratic way of electing board members.

Florence Ringsdorf - Stated she favored zoning.

Jack Ratcliff - Out of the plans that have come in are most of them for zoning?

Dennis Patch - Yes, most of them. Perhaps only 5 or 6 without zones and these came in after the amendment was passed allowing such.

Jack Ratcliff - Why did Committee make this Plan?

Edward Efteland - Explained that the legislature permitted a plan with no zones. The Plan was presented in this manner after the Committee contacted the board of former District No. 186, Alvadore, and District No. 52. No one was in attendance from Alvadore and the Committee took the stand that if District No. 52 was acting as the board of the district it must be the wishes of the people and their recommendations were accepted.

Dennis Patch - In establishing zones the law requires that the zones be established with equal census population.

An Unidentified Woman - Does zoning involve a great expense?

Mrs. Leonard Sharp - What is the involvement of people within a zone to elect a board member?

Dennis Patch - Boundary lines and people within the zone would elect a director, providing the provision was included in the Plan to elect by zone.

Marvin Ringsdorf - Regarding election costs, after the first election it would cost only 1/7th for an election since only 1/7th of the district would be voting.

Mrs. John Harris - Stated she has three children in Danebo school. Asked, do we have qualified members on the board? Feels that people should be electing on qualifications.

Jack Ratcliff - Favors zoning - feels they will have more equal representation by zones.

Mrs. Vernon Patton - Favors electing at large - no zones.

Earl Ringsdorf - We have competent men that could be elected by zones.

Tom Powers, Superintendent of Bethel Schools - Stated that he was speaking as a resident of District No. 52. Wished to go on record that he had never made a statement that the outside area never had a competent man. Stated that there was not a time a candidate was running from the Irving area that he was not elected. There are competent people, but none have run for the school board.

Emil Hansen - In the case of zoning where might zoning lines fall?

Dennis Patch - Plan has been presented to the State Board and the Committee's Plan indicated no zones with the election of directors at large. Based on this hearing the State Board would have to make their decision on this Plan - either approve or reject. Your question is irrelevant at this time.

Agnes Grant - Is there any chance of getting an election on this plan?

Mrs. Leonard Sharp - If people do not like the Plan how can we do something about it?

Dennis Patch - This is the purpose of the hearing. I have answered it several times already. Following the hearing the State Board will review the Plan.

Dennis Patch asked Mr. Ronald Jones of the State Board, if he wished to comment. Mr. Jones replied that he did not at this time.

Marvin Ringsdorf - If State Board rejects what is our next move?

Dennis Patch - The State Board would inform the County Committee the reason for rejection. Committee would then submit another plan.

Mrs. Arthur Louden - If you refuse Plan will we no longer be a part of District No. 52?

Dennis Patch - You are one district.

Mrs. Arthur Louden - Anxious to be a part of District No. 52. Stated that since the annexation they have had wonderful cooperation from District No. 52 of both transportation and curriculum.

Tom Powers - Stated the following regarding recommendations to the County Reorganization Committee. The School Board received a letter asking how they felt regarding this Plan. For many years the District No. 52 board has been elected at large. They felt this plan had worked satisfactorily in the past and would in the future. It is not right for a school board member to be elected as a political officer - but to encourage the best education of all children and represent all of the people. Feels it is desirable to have no zones and elect at large since director should be for all of the people and not just one area. School Board welcomes patrons at their official meetings.

Marvin Ringsdorf - With districts getting larger zoning should come in.

Mrs. Sandra Larson - Why so much heat to get a farmer on the school board. Are they not interested in the children?

Mrs. Earl Ringsdorf - We do not have any idea of putting politics in the school - we merely want representation.

Marvin Ringsdorf - We want representation locally that we can go and talk to. Would much rather go to a neighbor than a member living in another part of the district.

Mrs. Henager - It only takes the signature of 10 to put a man's name on the ballot for director.

Edgar Rickard - Unfortunate Committee did not have this kind of turnout at the County hearing. Only 4 patrons and 2 school administrators appeared at the County hearing.

Mrs. George Redick - How will we find out about meetings if we don't take the paper?

Mrs. Leonard Sharp - If you don't take the paper then listen to the radio.

Edward Efteland - Have found paper to be very cooperative in publishing various meeting announcements and news stories.

Dennis Patch - Not within the distates of the Reorganization Law.

Edward Efteland - Only two things that could change proposed Plan:

1. The Committee could recall plan before it goes to the State.
2. With preponderance on evidence State Board could turn down the plan.

Dennis Patch - No provision for recalling a plan at this stage.

Marvin Ringsdorf - If more publicity was given, other than in the legal column, there might be a larger turnout.

Mrs. Clyde Henager - Noticed two articles in the paper regarding hearing.

Mrs. Ammerman - If it isn't on the front page we don't read it. Put it on the front page and we will see it. Also, put it in the country edition.

Tom Fisher - If it takes zoning to give us some say, then I am in favor of zoning.

Elizabeth Neuswander - Being on the school board is a thankless job. Favors electing at large.

Mrs. Clyde Henager - Favors electing at large. Would like to vote for each one instead of those just in my zone.

M. Braxsted - What recourse do we have to change the Committee's opinion?

Dennis Patch - Plan is a hearing conducted by the State Board of Education. State Board will either approve or reject. If rejected it will be returned to the Committee with rejection indicated.

Mrs. Paul Albert - If zoned will there be enough school children in Alvadore to have a director?

Dennis Patch - Zones must contain equal school population as is feasible.

Marvin Ringsdorf - If we have seven zones no area will be left out.

Dennis Patch - Zones can be made in any way desirable as long as they comply with the requirement of equal school population. The Reorganization Law allows the board of the administrative school district to change the boundaries of zones not oftener than once a year.

Robert Neuswander - Favors no zones and electing at large. This would give the people an opportunity to vote on all candidates up for election. I am sure that in Alvadore there was a school board and I am sure they were competent and I would now like to see some of them run for the school board.

Glen Hankins, Principal of Clear Lake School - Has worked in the district for 10 years and always had a feeling the district has something many districts do not have and that is a "one-ness". Children from Clear Lake come from a large area of the district. Feels the people would have a lot more to say about it if the district voted as a whole. The district is trying to do the best possible for the boys and girls.

Mrs. John Harris - School Board meetings are open to the public.

Wm. R. Woodie - This has been the 5th hearing and publicity was given on all five.

Edward Efteland - This Committee had nothing to do with the law. We were elected to carry out the law. Read Section 31 of the Reorganization Act, which follows: "Immediately after the creation of an administrative school district, the committee shall divide the district into seven zones, as nearly equal in school census population as is feasible, except that in urban areas two or more zones may have a common boundary. Thereafter, the district school board may adjust the boundaries of the zones not more often than once each year." Committee has spent nearly 2½ years on this work now and we have tried to do the best we can. This plan was presented taking into account the amendment to the law and we were not aware the County Committee could recall a Plan at this stage. Will give summation of this meeting to the chairman of the Committee.

Dennis Patch - There is nothing in the law that this can be done.

Mrs. Amnerman - Why not let the entire populated area know as we are notified on other things.

Mrs. Lea Fisher - Favors zoning.

Dennis Patch - Law provides only that meeting notice be published in the newspaper and posted in the district.

Mrs. Sandra Larson - What is the school board doing wrong that these people want to get their man in?

Mr. Mickelsen - Will this fill their need?

Mr. Elmer Jensen - I do not have it in for the school board but feel they should give the outside a chance.

Mrs. Cook - Should have zones.

Dennis Patch thanked District No. 52 school board for providing facilities, Tom Powers for making arrangements for this meeting and Mr. Jones for attending. Also thanked the Lane County Committee for their work and the people for attending.

Hearing declared adjourned.

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

February 9, 1960

Regular meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County School Office with the following members present: (Regular meeting date moved ahead one week).

Edgar Rickard
Clarence Jackson
Paul Ehinger

William Wilt
Marvin Hendrickson
Joe Swift
Wm. R. Woodie, Secretary

In the absence of Ray Swanson, Edgar Rickard acted as chairman of the meeting.

Motion was made by Mr. Jackson, seconded by Mr. Wilt, and carried, that the minutes of January 19th be approved. The reading of the minutes was dispensed with since each member had previously received a copy.

Secretary Woodie reported on the R-12 hearing held at Cascade Junior High School on January 29th, and stated that Committee members were contacted following the meeting regarding their acceptance of the Plan in order that the Plan could be forwarded immediately to the State Board. Since it is desirable to include a record of this action he requested that action be taken and recorded in the minutes. Motion was made by Mr. Hendrickson, seconded by Mr. Jackson, and carried, to approve the Plan for Administrative School District 52 as presented at the hearing, and submit same to the State Board.

Mr. Swift reported considerable interest and work is being done on the part of patrons and school administrators on Plan R-1.

Secretary Woodie reported that the consolidation election in School Districts No. 28, 44, 88, 118, and 139, is scheduled for February 16th, and that meetings in these districts have been or will be held prior to the election regarding the implications of consolidation. He pointed out that School District No. 102J is not included in this consolidation but that a boundary change will be instigated following the election. Also, that should District No. 44 oppose the consolidation it will be necessary that the part of the district included in Union High No. 4 be withdrawn from U-4, or the Non-High portion of the district be included in a high school district - otherwise, School District No. 44 will have to include in their local budget a sufficient amount to pay the tuition and transportation of their high school students, residing outside of the union high boundary.

Mr. Rickard submitted the proposals of the School Boards of School District No. 45 and Union High School District No. 14J pertaining to zoning and local committees:

Zoning - Seven (7) Zones, approximately as follows:

- Zone 1 - Districts No. 25J3 and 75.
- Zone 2 - District No. 48, District No. 45 (outside City), and part of District No. 80.
- Zone 3 - District No. 191, the Saginaw part of District No. 45, the remainder of District No. 80.
- Zone 4 - District No. 31, the west half of District No. 128, and part of District No. 45 outside City to the East and South.
- Zone 5 - District No. 177, District No. 84, District No. 93, and the east 1/2 of District No. 128.

Zone 6 - City of Cottage Grove.

Zone 7 - Entire district.

(A description of the zone boundaries is contained in the Plan on file in the County Office.)

Local Committees: No local committees.

Motion was made by Mr. Swift, seconded by Mr. Jackson, and carried, to accept the recommendations of the School Boards of Districts No. 45 and U-14J pertaining to zoning and local committees, and to determine the term of office of the 7 directors as follows:

1. The candidate elected to the board who receives the highest number of votes shall serve for a term of 5 years.
2. The person elected to the board who receives the next highest number of votes shall serve for a term of 4 years.
3. The next two persons elected to the board, receiving the next highest number of votes, shall serve for a term of 3 years.
4. The person elected to the board receiving the next highest number of votes, shall serve for a term of 2 years.
5. The remaining two persons elected to the board receiving the next highest number of votes, shall serve for a term of 1 year.

Secretary Woodie presented the following recommendations received from the Creswell Union High School Board pertaining to the proposed Creswell School District (ASD No. 40):

1. No elected local committees.
2. No zones. All directors to be elected at large.

Motion was made by Ehinger, seconded by Hendrickson and carried, to adopt the recommendations of the Creswell Union High School Board pertaining to zoning and local committees, and to determine the term of office of the 7 directors as follows:

1. The candidate elected to the board who receives the highest number of votes shall serve for a term of 5 years.
2. The person elected to the board who receives the next highest number of votes shall serve for a term of 4 years.
3. The next two persons elected to the board receiving the next highest number of votes, shall serve for a term of 3 years.
4. The person elected to the board receiving the next highest number of votes, shall serve for a term of 2 years.
5. The remaining two persons elected to the board receiving the next highest number of votes, shall serve for a term of 1 year.

Motion was made by Mr. Hendrickson, seconded by Mr. Jackson and carried, that the partial Plan ASD No. 45 be accepted as proposed. (A copy of this plan is on file in the County Office.)

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Hendrickson and carried, that the partial Plan ASD No. 40 be accepted as proposed. (A copy of this plan is on file in the County Office.)

Secretary Woodie called the Committee's attention to the following hearings:

2/9/60


- February 15th - 8:00 p.m., Cascade Junior High School - State Hearing on proposed ASD No. 52.
- February 18th - 8:00 p.m., Cottage Grove Union High School - Hearing on proposed ASD No. 45.
- February 18th - 8:00 p.m., Creswell Union High School - Hearing on proposed ASD No. 40.

The next meeting of the Committee was scheduled to take place on February 18th at the Cottage Grove Union High School immediately following the hearing on ASD 45, South Lane.

The Secretary was directed to arrange for getting the Committee together at Cottage Grove immediately after the South Lane hearing. The members of the Committee attending the hearing at Creswell will drive to Cottage Grove after the Creswell hearing has adjourned.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION



Chairman



Secretary

MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED
ADMINISTRATIVE SCHOOL DIST. #52

January 29, 1960

Cascade Junior High School, 1525 Echo Hollow Road
Eugene, Oregon

Public hearing on proposed Administrative School District No. 52 (Comprising the present boundaries of School District No. 52) was held in the library of the Cascade Junior High School, 1525 Echo Hollow Road, Eugene, Oregon, on Friday, January 29, 1960, commencing at 3:00 o'clock p.m., with 6 present. (4 patrons, 2 school administrators).

The meeting was called to order by the chairman, Ray Swanson, who reviewed the Report of the Committee on proposed Administrative School District No. 52. He called special attention to the proposal of the Committee on zoning and local committees. The Committee recommended in their proposal that Administrative School District No. 52 be established with no zones and no local committees and that the board consist of seven (7) directors elected at large.

Mr. Swanson called on Superintendent Tom Powers to expand on the recommendations made by the school board of District No. 52. Superintendent Powers stated that previous to reorganization there had been no provision for zoning and they had found board representation satisfactory. He felt that if zoning was included it would demand a continual rezoning due to change in population. Also, that by having no zones a director would be representing the whole area and not a particular zone. He called attention to the fact that this year one person was appointed from the Alvadore district which was recently annexed to District No. 52. He also pointed out that if the Administrative School District Board should consist of 7 members it would increase the number on the budget committee to 14, instead of 10, as it is at present.

Chairman Swanson pointed out that previous to the January 19th meeting of the Committee, letters were sent to the Bethel School Board and to Mr. Tinkham, Alvadore, requesting that recommendations be presented to the Committee regarding zoning and local committees, but only District No. 52 made proposals.

The meeting was then opened to questions.

Earl Ringsdorf, a resident of west Irving, asked if a taxpayer has a say in this zoning? Also, that he favors local committees.

Mr. Swanson stated that the Committee had proposed no zoning and no local committees, but could change their plan if shown that a change was needed.

Superintendent Powers - explained that the proposal which they had made to the Committee is the same manner in which District No. 52 has operated in the past.

Mr. Swanson asked Mr. Ringsdorf how many people he represented.

Earl Ringsdorf - many, but would have to count them up.

Elmer Jensen - stated that he was in accord with Mr. Ringsdorf.

Superintendent Woodie asked that they look at zoning very closely. The Committee considered the matter and if the district was zoned would have 7 zones with equal school population. He cited that with no zones anyone could file and would have a good chance of being elected.

Mr. Swanson - zoning could lock the door and with no zoning the various areas would have a better chance of board representation. He pointed out that the choice had not been made and it remains in the hands of the Committee. If the Committee decides to send it on to the State, the State would then call another hearing at which they could be heard further. He explained that the provision for zoning and local committee was added in the 1959 legislature.

Hal McAbee - Assistant Superintendent, Bethel School District, stated that he had worked in County Unit Counties having local committees. Found in some areas they would grant use of buildings for almost any purpose, while another area would be very strict in this respect. Taxpayers of the County had to pay for outside use of buildings over the entire county. Also found considerable discrepancy in quality of teachers. One community would have good teachers while another would accept any type of teachers. Feels it would be much better to leave it to the local school board for the entire district.

Mr. Swanson explained that the functions of the local committees are:

1. To reject a teacher assigned to their building.
2. To determine use of school building for non-educational purposes.

Mr. Swanson read the proposal made on term of office for directors:

1. The person elected to the Board who receives the highest number of votes shall serve for a term of 5 years.
2. The next two persons elected to the Board receiving the next highest number of votes, shall serve for a term of 4 years.
3. The person elected to the Board receiving the next highest number of votes, shall serve for a term of 3 years.
4. The next two persons elected to the Board receiving the next highest number of votes, shall serve for a term of 2 years.
5. The remaining person elected to the Board shall serve for a term of 1 year.

Mr. Swanson - If Committee decides that the proposed Administrative District shall not be zoned you will have an opportunity to consider this again at the State hearing.

Earl Ringsdorf - what is going to happen ten to 12 years from now? We must find a remedy for our increasing taxes.

Hal McAbee suggested that people should go to the Legislature and request further State Aid.


Mr. Swanson urged that people follow Dr. McAbee's suggestion.

Earl Ringsdorf stated that he did not notice a news story of time of meeting and that it would be better to hold hearings in the evening. Urged that good publicity be given.

Mr. Swanson stated that the Committee was willing to hold hearings at time most satisfactory to patrons.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION


Chairman

Secretary

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

January 19, 1960

Regular meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County School Office with the following members present:

Ray Swanson
Winifred Hult
William Wilt

Edgar Rickard
Joe Swift
Edward Efteland
Wm. R. Woodie, Secretary

The Secretary stated that an error was noted in the December 15, 1959 minutes on Page 3, last line in the last paragraph. The word "election" should be changed to "hearing". Motion was made by Mr. Rickard, seconded by Mr. Swift and carried, that the minutes of December 15th be approved with the above correction. The reading of the minutes was dispensed with since each member had previously received a copy.

Superintendent Tom Powers, School District No. 52, Bethel, appeared before the Committee and presented the following recommendations:

"I would suggest that the members of the School Board first elected to serve the reorganized School District Number 52 for terms as follows:

1. A person elected to the Board who receives the highest number of votes shall serve for a term of 5 years.
2. The next two persons elected to the Board, receiving the next highest number of votes, shall serve for a term of 4 years.
3. The person elected to the Board, receiving the next highest number of votes, shall serve for a term of 3 years.
4. The next two persons elected to the Board, receiving the next highest number of votes, shall serve for a term of 2 years.
5. The remaining person elected to the Board shall serve for a term of 1 year.

I would further suggest that the chairman of the School Board for the first year shall be elected by the members of the School Board or shall be that person receiving the highest number of votes.

I would further suggest that the Lane County Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts request that the Lane County Boundary Board not make any changes in the existing boundaries of Bethel School District Number 52 until after said school district is declared to be a Reorganized Administrative School District."

Secretary Woodie cited from a decision handed down by the State Department of Education relative to selecting a chairman. The decision stated that a district would have the right to establish rules to select a chairman for the first year and would continue on that basis until changed by law.

Superintendent Powers informed the Committee that they would like to have the effective date of their Administrative School District to be on July 1, 1960, if at all possible. He further stated that it was the recommendation of the Board of School District No. 52 that the new Plan avail them of the amendments to the law and state

that the district not be divided into zones and the board of directors be made up of seven members elected at large.

Motion was made by Mr. Rickard, seconded by Mrs. Hult, and carried, to adopt the recommendations of the District No. 52 School Board with respect to the amendments and that the hearing on forming an Administrative School District of the present School District No. 52 be held on January 29th, 3:30 p.m., at Cascade Junior High School, 1525 Echo Hollow Road, Eugene.

A letter was read from Superintendent Wm. H. Dolmyer, Linn County Superintendent and Secretary of the Linn County Reorganization Committee, requesting a meeting of the Lane and Linn County Committees at the Harrisburg High School on Tuesday evening, January 19th, 7:30 p.m. to discuss various problems concerning the two committees.

Superintendent Woodie informed the committee that he had notified Mr. Dolmyer that it would be impossible for the committee to meet with them at that time, since it was the regular meeting date of the Lane County Committee, and suggested another date be sought.

The Secretary was directed to further define issues with Linn County and arrange a suitable time at which a representative, or representatives, of the Lane County Committee could meet with them.

A letter was read from Superintendent Dusenberry, Union High No. 14J, informing the Committee that they had received a request for the annexation by U-14J of the Curtin district of Douglas County. No action was taken by the U-14J Board and those interested were referred to the Douglas County Superintendent and Reorganization Committee.

A letter was presented from Walter A. Commons, Clerk of School District No. 19, approving the following statement for transmittal to the Reorganization Committee (which was made at a regular board meeting on December 14, 1959):

"The Board of Directors of School District No. 19 opposes the option of zoning for Board members and also opposes the formation of local school committees for each attendance unit. The opposition to zoning and local committees applies whether or not additional territory is annexed to the present district. Since practically every objective of the present school district reorganization law has been accomplished and has been in full effect within School District No. 19 for the past ten years, we feel that continuance of the present method of electing board members and the present method of determining local attendance area needs is a system far superior to the alternate plan proposed, which is optional under the present law."

After some discussion the Committee instructed the Secretary to notify School District No. 19 that they will be contacted before any new Plan is made.

The Committee discussed the R-11 Reorganization Plan. Motion was made by Mr. Swift, seconded by Mr. Rickard and carried, that R-11 be declared an urban area and be zoned in accordance with the recommendation of the Junction City School Board so that they will have seven (7) zones, with the School District boundaries.

Mr. Swanson informed the Committee that petitions were being circulated and filed requesting the consolidation of School Districts No. 28, 44, 88, 118, and 139. *the boundaries of each coinciding*

Motion was made by Mr. Wilt, seconded by Mr. Rickard and carried, that school districts 28, 44, 88, 118, 139 be given approval as specified in ORS 330.645 to hold consolidation elections under the Act.

Secretary Woodie informed the Committee that the Yates petition had been received and that the Boundary Board hearing had been set for February 15th at 10:00 a.m.

Time schedule was discussed for the new Cottage Grove Plan (R-2) and the new Plan for Creswell (R-13).

Motion was made by Mr. Rickard, seconded by Mr. Wilt and carried, that local hearings on the Cottage Grove (R-2) and Creswell (R-13) Plans be held as follows:

Thursday, February 18th


Cottage Grove (R-2)-----Cottage Grove Union High School
Creswell (R-13) -----Creswell Union High School

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION



Chairman



Secretary

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

December 15, 1959

Regular meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County School Office with the following members present:

Ray Swanson
Marvin Hendrickson
Edgar Rickard
William Wilt

Edward Efteland
Joe Swift
Paul Ehinger
Wm. R. Woodie, Secretary

The Secretary stated that several errors in the November 17th minutes on page 3, had been brought to his attention by the Superintendent of Cottage Grove Union High School. The description of the dividing line between the proposed Creswell and Cottage Grove administrative school districts was corrected as follows:

Beginning at the Northwest corner of the Southwest 1/4 of the Southwest 1/4 of Section 33, T19S R3W, WM; thence East 1/2 mile; thence South 1/4 mile; thence East 1/2 mile to the Easterly right-of-way line of the Southern Pacific Railroad; thence northeasterly along said easterly right-of-way line to the South line of the North half of Section 34, T19S R3W; thence East along said center line to the East line of Section 36, T19S R3W.

Motion was made, seconded and carried, that the minutes of the meeting of November 17th be approved with the above corrections.

A letter was read from Cecil Safley, Clerk of Union High School District No. 14J, sending official protest on the boundary as established at the November 17th Reorganization meeting. The letter noted an error in Township (which was corrected above); and stated that the boundary appears illogical for the practical operation of bus route for the reorganized district; and, proposed the following as a logical boundary:

"Beginning at the Northwest corner of the George W. Harper Donation Land Claim No. 65 in Section 33, T19S R3W, W.M.; thence East to the West boundary of the Claus Arp Donation Land Claim; thence South to the North boundary (sic) of said donation land claim (Tate Road) and thence East to the Coast Fork of the Willamette River; thence south along said river to the center-line of Section 34 (sic) said Township and range; thence East along said center line to the East line of Section 36, T19S R3W."

Attorney John Luvaas, representing the School Boards of School Districts No. 40 and U-12, summarized the position of the two boards regarding the Committee's division of the Walker area. He expressed the belief that the line should be left at the present southern boundary of Walker; that the valuation of the Walker area is needed to maintain Creswell Schools; that Cottage Grove would not feel the loss of the area valuation-wise or pupil-wise; that it would benefit the entire area to leave the southern boundary as is, since Creswell is at present furnishing transportation for the entire area and could continue to do so.

Jack Lively, Attorney, living in the Walker area, spoke to the Committee relative to the Committee's line dividing his property and that of Tom Wright. He stated that he was not opposing Creswell but spoke only in the interest of the Walker area; that he desired to be included in the Cottage Grove district, but was opposed to the boundary line dividing his property and also that of Tom Wright's. He suggested that the line be changed to follow Donation Land Claim lines and presented a map showing his proposal. He stated that with his proposed line no children would be affected and valuation-wise it would help Creswell.

Mr. Ehinger stated as far as transportation is concerned the Committee could find no serious difficulty with the line as proposed. Since the first Plan, R-2, did not pass, the Committee must now make a more acceptable plan. In the Walker area Creswell was getting area only for grade school purposes. By dividing it as they did it would not result in significant differences in total taxable value for either district.

Mr. Luvaas presented a map showing the southern boundary of Township 19S R3W as a dividing line that might be equitable both student and valuation-wise, that might be a compromise line, if the Committee felt the line should be moved at all. He pointed out that boundaries should be set for the welfare of children.

Mr. Clyde Hollemon, Mayor of Creswell, asked what the time limit would be on this line?

Mr. Swanson stated that as far as the Committee is concerned it is permanent. Later, of course, petitions could be presented requesting boundary changes.

Mr. Efteland asked Mr. Hollemon if he thought the first vote in Creswell was the result of a fear of losing their high school.

Mr. Hollemon felt that it was, perhaps due to misunderstanding and lack of correct information on the part of the voters.

Mr. Swanson stated he felt the Committee had submitted the best Plan and since it was not accepted that it is now looking for a plan that will be acceptable.

Mayor Hollemon stated that the general feeling, if Creswell area has to go, that it go North instead of South, or to Pleasant Hill. Does not know why there is a feeling between Creswell and Cottage Grove.

Mr. Lively - the law provides that when a Plan is not accepted another more acceptable Plan shall be submitted -- acceptable by whom?

Mr. Luvaas - accepted by the voters.

Mr. William Land, Board Member, School District No. 40 - Mr. Lively is talking entirely about a few mills. The thing we people are interested is in a good school system and we are willing to pay more in taxes for a good system. If the Walker area is taken it will make a small district smaller and a large district larger, and this would make Creswell very weak.

Mr. Luvaas stated that Creswell is barely able to be a district and if the Walker or a part of Walker is taken, the district could not stand to lose. It would make Creswell a poorer district in students, size and valuation.

Mr. Ehinger - it might be well to re-submit the same Plan again to take care of these problems. The Committee has certain obligations to consider the wishes of persons living in the Walker area.

Mr. Efteland - the State Board of Education did approve the first Plan. It is not certain what they will do on a second Plan, or how the vote will turn out.

Mr. Swanson informed the Committee that at the Arbitration Hearing on December 14th, School District No. 1J, Douglas County, was given to Lane County to become a part of their Comprehensive Plan.

Secretary Woodie informed the Committee of the outcome of the Boundary Board hearings on December 14th:

Petition to transfer territory from School District No. 117 to School District No. 76 (Crispin) ----- Granted

Petition to add the Non-High portion of School District No. 28 to Union High No. 4 ----- Granted

Petition to add the Non-High portion of School District No. 139 to Union High No. 4 ----- Granted

Petition to add the Non-High portion of School District No. 44 to Union High No. 4 ----- Denied

Secretary Woodie informed the Committee that the Linn County Committee desires to hold a joint meeting with the Lane County Committee to discuss the Coburg-Harrisburg situation.

Mr. Swanson directed the Secretary to request an agenda from the Linn County Committee listing the various things to be discussed, in order to determine whether the entire Committee or a representative should attend.

Secretary Woodie was directed to secure a certified copy of the petition from the Crow-Applegate area filed with the State Director of School District Reorganization, protesting the inclusion of School District No. 66 in the Proposed R-5.

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Hendrickson and carried, to submit R-5 to the State Board.

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Hendrickson and carried, that the R-12 Plan, consisting of the present boundaries of School District No. 52, be prepared and the ~~election~~ date set. The secretary was so instructed.

Meeting adjourned. *hearing*

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION

Ray C Swanson

Chairman
W. R. Woodie

Secretary

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

November 17, 1959

Regular meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County School Office with the following members present:

Ray Swanson
Edgar Rickard
Marvin Hendrickson
Edward Efteland

Paul Ehinger
Clarence Jackson
Winifred Hult
William Wilt
Wm. R. Woodie, Secretary

Motion was made, seconded and carried, that the minutes of the meeting of October 20th be approved. The reading of the minutes was dispensed with since each member had previously received a copy.

A letter was read from Kenneth Barneburg, Douglas County, confirming the appointment of Glen Hawkins to the Arbitration Committee for the Linslaw District, and nominating Mr. Marsh Dunkin, Route 1, Box 269, Troutdale, Oregon as the second member of the Arbitration Committee. The Lane County Committee was requested to take action on Mr. Dunkin's nomination.

Letters were read from Tom Powers, Superintendent, Bethel District, recommending that the Committee not include "Local School Committees" or "zoning" in its plan of Reorganization for District No. 52. The letters also raised an objection to the proposed transfer of territory from District 52 to District 4. The Board was opposed to the stated "West line" being the center of the Southern Pacific Railroad and should it be desirable to make this change, recommended that it be the easterly boundary of the Southern Pacific right-of-way. They further suggested that no action be taken on this petition until after a joint meeting is held of the Eugene, Springfield and Bethel School Boards, which will be held on December 2nd.

A petition from District 52, signed by 15 persons, addressed to the Lane County Boundary Board, stating that they did not, at this time, wish to be annexed into School District No. 4, was presented.

A letter was read from Joy Hills Gubser, Secretary of the State Board of Education, notifying the Lane County Committee that at a special meeting held November 4, 1959, the request submitted by the Lane County Committee for a six-month extension of time for completing a final plan of reorganization was approved. (Extended to April 20, 1960).

A letter was read from Elmer W. Grimes of Eugene, Rt. 5, Box 18, requesting the Committee to consider the proposed property change located on Stewart Road, from School District No. 4 to School District No. 52.

Motion was made, seconded and carried, to approve the appointment of Marsh Dunkin to the Arbitration Committee. (With the approval of Marsh Dunkin, he and Glen Hawkins will appoint a third member to serve on the Committee. The Secretary and Chairman of the Douglas County Committee and the Secretary and Chairman of the Lane County Committee will meet soon to set up a time, place, and other provisions for the Arbitration meeting.)

A letter was read, to the Superintendent of District No. 43, Coburg, citing the law on arbitration, which provides for an Arbitration Committee only in the disposition of territory of joint districts.

Page 2 - Reorganization Minutes

The following persons were present from the area requesting transfer of territory from School District No. 52 to School District No. 4: Mrs. Yates, Mr. and Mrs. Adams, and Mrs. Friesen. They appeared in the interest of the transfer.

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Rickard, and carried, that should the Boundary Board approve the transfer of said territory from School District No. 52 to School District No. 4, said transaction would be desirable and would not conflict with the plan of reorganization.

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Wilt and carried, that the west line be moved to the easterly line of the Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way on the above.

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Rickard and carried that should the Boundary Board approve the transfer of territory on Stewart Road, from School District No. 4 to School District No. 52, said transaction would be desirable and would not conflict with the plan of reorganization.

The matter of a plan of reorganization for School District No. 52 was directed to the Sub-Committee, who will submit their proposal to the Committee.

Secretary Woodie reported on the following petitions - which were approved by the Committee on October 20th:

Crispin petition - To transfer territory from School District No. 117 to School District No. 76. District Boundary Board Hearing set for December 14, 1959.

Lowell petition - To add the non-high portion of District No. 71 to U-9. District Boundary Board hearing set for December 1st at 10:00 a.m.

Secretary Woodie presented the following petitions and requested that the Committee take action on same:

Petition to add the Non-High portion of School District No. 44 to U-4.
Petition to add the Non-High portion of School District No. 28 to U-4.
Petition to add the Non-High portion of School District No. 139 to U-4.
(Boundary Board set the tentative date of hearing on these petitions for December 14, 1959, pending approval of the Reorganization Committee).

Motion was made by Mr. Rickard, seconded by Mr. Hendrickson, and carried, that should the District Boundary Board approve the addition of the Non-High portion of School District No. 44 to Union High School District No. 4, said transaction would be desirable and would not conflict with the plan of reorganization.

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Jackson, and carried, that should the District Boundary Board approve the addition of the Non-High portion of School District No. 139 to Union High School District No. 4, said transaction would be desirable and would not conflict with the plan of reorganization.

Motion was made by Mr. Hendrickson, seconded by Mr. Ehinger, and carried, that should the District Boundary Board approve the addition of the Non-High portion of School District No. 28 to Union High School District No. 4, said transaction would be desirable and would not conflict with the plan of reorganization.

Report of Group II Sub-Committee was made on the following:

- R-1 - That Plan be resubmitted in substantially the same form, unless something more desirable is presented.
- R-4 - That Plan be resubmitted in substantially the same form, unless something more desirable is presented.
- R-9 - That Plan be resubmitted in substantially the same form, unless something more desirable is presented.

The Sub-Committee would welcome any reasonable proposals for consideration.

The Group II, Sub-Committee, recommended the following on R-2: That one Plan be formulated that encompasses U-14J with a split in the Walker area and another Plan be formulated to include U-12 and a part of the Walker area.


Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Hendrickson, and carried, to divide R-2 into two Administrative School Districts -- one to be centered at Creswell and one to be centered at Cottage Grove.

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Rickard, and carried, to establish dividing boundaries between the two districts as follows:

Beginning at the Northwest corner of the Southwest $\frac{1}{4}$ of the Southwest $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 33, T20S R3W, WM; thence East $\frac{1}{2}$ mile; thence South $\frac{1}{2}$ mile; thence East $\frac{1}{2}$ mile to the Northeast corner of Section 4, T20S R3W; thence East to the Easterly line of the Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way; thence northeasterly along said right-of-way to the centerline of Section 34, said Township and Range; thence East along said center line to the East line of Section 36, T20S R3W.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION



Chairman



Secretary

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

October 20, 1959

Regular meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County School Office with the following members present:

Ray Swanson
Edward Efteland
Marvin Hendrickson
Clarence Jackson
Winifred Hult

Paul Ehinger
Edgar Rickard
Joe Swift
William Wilt
Wm. R. Woodie, Secretary

Motion was made, seconded and carried, that the minutes of the meeting of September 15th be approved. The reading of the minutes was dispensed with since each member had previously received a copy.

The following persons were present from Cottage Grove, District No. 45; Jesse Fasold, Superintendent; Dwight Near, Warren Hansen, and Horace Wolfard, board members; Mr. Fasold acted as spokesman for the group and presented schedules relative to buildings, present and prior enrolments, population, class load, etc. in School District No. 45. He requested the Committee to redefine R-2 to be made up of all elementary districts in Union High School District No. 14J and part of the Walker area. By proposing R-2 in this manner it was felt that if said Administrative District was established they could utilize the classrooms in the elementary districts comprising the Administrative District and save further building for Grades 1-6 and build a junior high school for Grades 7-9 in Cottage Grove, thus eliminating building additional facilities for students in Grades 1-6. The high school would then be established for Grades 10-12. Mr. Fasold urged that the Committee propose an administrative school district for the Cottage Grove area prior to January 30, 1960.

Mr Fasold presented a map showing the proposal from the Board of Union High School District No. 14J on the division of the Walker area. The proposal called for a common boundary running on a straight line east and west through the middle of sections 25 and 26 T.S. 19S, R3W.

The Committee thanked the patrons from Cottage Grove for their proposals and stated that they will be taken under consideration.

The following persons were present from Lowell: Robert Butler, Superintendent; James R. Wimers and Geo. W. Crampton, Board Members, District No. 71; and Earl Drury, Board Member, U-9. Mr. Drury acted as spokesman for the group, making the following proposal: That an Administrative District be formed of School Districts No. 67-Fall Creek; No. 71-Lowell; and U-9 - Lowell Union High. He stated that they wished to have a common boundary worked out and do away with the split district in the Dexter-Lost Creek area. After some discussion on the Dexter-Lost Creek area Mr. Drury agreed that possibly the area should be divided - part going to Pleasant Hill and part going to Lowell for Grades 1-12. He felt if all of the Dexter-Lost Creek area were put into Lowell the Dexter-Trent or lower western half would object. Also, if the entire area was included it would mean additional building for Union High No. 9. Mr. Drury also stated that the Fall Creek people would support this proposal.

Mr. Swanson thanked the patrons from Lowell for their proposals and stated that the Committee will take them under consideration.

Mr. Woodie explained the cancellation of the R-12 election set for October 20th, due to irregularities in posting and publishing, and the Boundary Board's action in setting an annexation election for November 5th pending the approval of the Committee.

Legal petitions were presented to the District Boundary Board from Districts No. 52 and 186 requesting the annexation with the sharing of outstanding indebtedness.

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Wilt and carried, to approve holding an annexation election in School Districts No. 52 and 186 on November 5, 1959. Mr. Woodie informed the Committee that should the annexation election carry in both districts it could become effective immediately, and that the patrons of both areas would then be able to participate in the plans for next year. For the remainder of 1959-60 the attendance units would remain unchanged.

Pending boundary changes were reviewed by the Committee.

Yates petition - To transfer territory from District No. 52 to Dist. No. 4. Will come to the attention of the Committee as soon as the Bethel-Alvadore election is held on November 5th.

Stewart Road petition - To transfer from District No. 4 to District No. 52. Letter was read from Elmer Grimes concerning the transfer and requesting that the committee reconsider. (Committee took no action at this time)

Crispin petition - To transfer territory from School District No. 117 to School District No. 76. This request contains 19.92 acres with a valuation of \$855.

Motion was made by Mr. Rickard, seconded by Mr. Ehinger, and carried, that should the District Boundary Board approve the transfer of this territory from School District No. 117 to School District No. 76, said transaction would not conflict with the plan of reorganization.

Lowell petition - To add the non-high school portion of School District No. 71 to Union High School District No. 9.

Motion was made by Mr. Wilt, seconded by Mr. Rickard and carried, that should the District Boundary Board approve the addition of this territory to Union High School District No. 9, said transaction would not conflict with the plan of reorganization.

Letter was read from the Lincoln County Committee stating that the election to annex School Districts No. 143 and 165, Lane County, to the Lincoln County School District, has been set for November 18, 1959.

Letter was read from Mr. Charles Funk, Superintendent, Pleasant Hill Schools, stating that the Pleasant Hill Districts favored R-1 as first submitted, consisting of School Districts No. 1, 67, 71, U-1 and U-9.

The Committee authorized and directed Secretary Woodie to send affidavits to Linn and Benton Counties relative to Lane County Committee's action on Joint Districts Nos. 55J, 114J, 154J and 155J.

Secretary Woodie presented maps to members of the Committee with the Walker area marked and indicating the residents of the area who replied to the poll recently conducted, listing their choice of Cottage Grove or Creswell. The Committee took no action on this matter but referred it to the Sub-Committee for study.

Motion was made by Mr. Hendrickson, seconded by Mr. Ehinger and carried, to authorize Mr. Woodie to set up the election dates in R-6 and R-7 for election of directors.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION



Chairman



Secretary

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

September 15, 1959

Regular meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County School Office with the following members present:

Edgar Rickard
Edward Efteland
Marvin Hendrickson

Joe Swift
Paul Ehinger
Clarence Jackson
Wm. R. Woodie, Secretary

Since the Chairman, Ray Swanson, was not present, Edgar Rickard, Vice-Chairman, presided.

Motion was made by Mr. Jackson, seconded by Mr. Hendrickson, and carried, that the minutes of the meeting of August 25th, be approved. The reading of the minutes was dispensed with since each member had previously received a copy.

Secretary Woodie presented a copy of the Lane County map as revised by the State Department. Also, new forms for making Plans. He called attention to a new requirement in making Plans, that a legal description of the proposed Administrative School District must be included. Also, a new form is required from Counties having joint districts -- which requires that each County Committee must file an affidavit regarding their disposition of joint districts.

Secretary Woodie informed the Committee that Mr. Patch had requested a Committee Progress Report.

Proposed zoning of Administrative School District R-6 was discussed, and the Committee was informed that Ray Swanson had checked with patrons of the area and they favored the proposal as submitted to the Committee by the Mapleton School Board. Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Hendrickson, and carried, to approve the seven zones as proposed.

The following persons were present from the Marcola district: Richard Eymann, Willard Gibbs, and Ernest Conley.

Mr. Eymann acted as spokesman for the group, who stated that two attempts had been made to reorganize School Districts No. 19 and 79, one by consolidation election and one by reorganization election, and both had failed. Now their alternative to accomplish part of their objective is by a boundary change for a part of the district.

Three proposals were submitted to the Committee:

Proposal No. 1 - To transfer to District No. 19 an area located in Parsons Creek Drainage and Lower Mohawk Drainage at an assessed value of \$90,690.
Children affected: 6 - High School
 44 - Grade School
 50 - Total

Proposal No. 2 - To transfer to District No. 19 an area located in Lower Mohawk Drainage at an assessed value of \$48,120.
Children affected: 2 - High School
 19 - Grade School
 21 - Total

Proposal No. 3 - To transfer to District No. 19 an area located on the Mohawk River Bank at an assessed value of \$30,435.
 Children affected: 1 - High School
 11 - Grade School
 12 - Total

Mr. Ehinger stated that he felt that the Proposals should be reduced to one, instead of three.

Mr. Eymann stated that he was more favorable to Proposal No. 1 - however, it was felt if three proposals were submitted to the Committee it would give an opportunity to approve one that would be satisfactory.

Mr. Conley stated that nearly every resident of the area had been contacted -- a few strongly opposed but he found many who were strongly in favor.

Mr. Eymann stated that should a petition be presented to the Boundary Board on any one of these proposals, there would probably be opposition from the rest of the district.

Mr. Conley stated that the enrolment in the Marcola Grade school is the largest it has ever been and that in the high school, of the six students affected in Proposal No. 1, three are seniors this year.

The Committee advised the patrons from Marcola that they will consider their proposals but no action will be taken until a full Committee is present and a policy is made regarding boundary changes.

The following persons were present from the Lowell-Dexter area: Norman Dick, Jim Large, Roy Quick, and Simeon Davis. They appeared before the Committee to request a change in the boundary of School District No. 1 to coincide with the boundary of Union High School District No. 1. The territory at present is in District No. 71, located in the Dexter-Lost Creek Area with a valuation of approximately \$882,000, and with approximately 200 grade school students and 60 to 70 high school students. The patrons present from this area felt strongly that Pleasant Hill is their logical school center, if their area is changed. Social activities of the area are centered around Dexter and Trent.

Mr. Efteland suggested that it might be a good thing to have some outside persons, or the University of Oregon, make a complete survey for them. He also asked if they would be willing to wait 60 days or so in order that the Committee may arrive at some policy regarding Plans.

Mr. Large stated they would, however, they did not want to wait too long, as they wished to have it taken care of by next school year.

Secretary Woodie informed the Committee that R-2, R-3, and R-9, were yet to be discussed.

Secretary Woodie reviewed the survey returns received to date from the Walker area, relative to their desire to be included in the Cottage Grove or Creswell districts for education Grades 1 through 12. Since the returns were incomplete, action was withheld until a future meeting.

The matter of the Committee formulating a policy regarding boundary changes was withheld until all Committee members were present.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
 DISTRICT REORGANIZATION
Ray C. Swanson, Chm.
J. R. Hardy, Sec.

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

August 25, 1959

Regular meeting of the Reorganization Committee meeting was held in the County School Office with the following members present: (This meeting was postponed one week from regular meeting date.)

Ray Swanson
Marvin Hendrickson
Edgar Rickard
Clarence Jackson
Winifred Hult

Edward Efteland
William Wilt
Joe Swift
Paul Ehinger
Wm. R. Woodie, Secretary

Motion was made, seconded and carried, that the minutes of the meeting of July 21st, be approved. The reading of the minutes was dispensed with since each member had previously received a copy.

Secretary Woodie read the following letters, received prior to the meeting:

1. Letter from W. A. Crispin, Star Rt., Box 409, Oakridge - requesting transfer of territory from School District No. 117 to School District No. 76.

Mr. Ehinger informed the Committee that the territory in question contained no children and said territory is logically in the Oakridge district.

After some discussion the matter was tabled until the next meeting and Mr. Woodie was instructed to check on Mr. Crispin's property.

2. Letter from Kenneth Barneburg, Douglas County Superintendent, informing the Committee that due to the recent explosion in Roseburg and illness, he found it necessary to ask the Lane County Committee to bear with them a little longer in the matter of the Lane-Douglas Arbitration Board.
3. Letter from Jim Turnbull, State Department of Education - relative to Non-High for 1960-61. The letter included information regarding the responsibility of districts in the Non-High School District to include in their 1960-61 budget an amount for tuition and transportation of their high school students for the school year beginning July 1, 1960, or to join a high school district. The letter also stated that in the case of school districts which are now partially in the non-high and partially in a union high school district, if nothing is done to bring the entire district within the union high school district or to exclude it entirely, the tax required to meet the needs of tuition and transportation will be spread over the district and that portion which is within the union high school district will in effect have a double tax.
4. Letter from Cecil Safley, Clerk of U-14J - relative to the Walker area. The board recommended that when a decision on the boundary is needed, that a plebiscite of the residents of the area be conducted by the reorganization committee. They suggested that the preference, or lack of preference, of the residents of this area could then be plotted on a map of the area and a reasonable and practical boundary could thus be determined; then as many people as possible to be placed in the district of their choice and those with no preference could be placed as to best serve a practical boundary.

5. Letter from Richard Shollenberger, Superintendent of Florence Schools - relative to zoning of their Administrative District R-7.

Secretary Woodie read letter of reply he had sent to Mr. Shollenberger.

Chairman Swanson called for report of Sub-Committee regarding the Walker area.

Mr. Rickard, member of the Sub-Committee, stated that there is a possibility of a request for a boundary change. Mr. Jackson, also a member of the Sub-Committee, stated that he had informed the Walker patrons that should a petition for transfer of territory be presented, it would have to be approved by the Reorganization Committee. He also stated that he had checked distances of families in the area and found that the distance from the center of Creswell to the Wick's residence was 2.3 miles, and to the Wright's residence 3.2 miles.

Secretary Woodie reviewed minutes of July 21st meeting regarding action taken relative to the Walker area.

The following persons were present from the Creswell district: Mrs. Verna Kerr, William Land, J. G. Griffith, Calvin Taylor, and W. B. Markley. Their main concern in appearing before the Committee was the possibility of double taxation in the Creswell District should the two sections in the Creswell Union High School District should be transferred to the Pleasant Hill Union High School District. Should this occur, the Creswell District would become a unified district.

Mr. Griffith asked if there was a way to get away from double taxation?

Mr. Woodie replied that there was. He cited three ways to change boundaries:

1. Petition to the District Boundary Board (requires no vote).
2. Consolidation.
3. Reorganization Act.

Mr. Griffith asked that if this comes to a boundary change could the Creswell District oppose at the Boundary Board hearing?

Mr. Woodie replied that they could.

Chairman Swanson stated that the Committee will have to submit a new Plan or re-submit the original Plan.

Mr. Woodie stated that for the Walker area to withdraw from Union High No. 14J, a petition signed by 10 legal voters within U-14J must be submitted to the District Boundary Board. This must also have the approval of the Reorganization Committee.

Three ways were given by Secretary Woodie whereby Creswell could become a unified district:

1. Two sections be transferred to U-1.
2. Petition to withdraw the old Walker district from Dist. No. 40.
3. Petition to withdraw the old Walker district from U-14J.

Mr. Efteland stated that he felt both Cottage Grove and Creswell should be consulted before the Committee arrives at any decision.

After considerable discussion the matter of the Creswell-Cottage Grove area was left to the Sub-Committee for recommendation to the Committee.

Mr. Wilt submitted and explained a chart he had prepared on voting procedures (a copy of this chart is included with Committee's minute book).

The votes were canvassed from the reorganization elections (R-9), held August 24th, 1959, and the results were as follows:

For the Proposed Plan of Reorganization, R-9

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>VOID</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
School Dist. No. 19 -----	195	124	0	319
School Dist. No. 79 -----	80	194	0	274

According to the above results, a motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Rickard, to declare the R-9 election LOST. Motion carried.

Possible zoning of Administrative School Districts R-6, R-7, R-8, R-10, and R-11, was discussed. It was pointed out that unless the Plans for R-5, R-11, and R-12, were revised to include zoning procedures, with new hearings being held, these administrative school districts would be dedicated to seven zones with one director from each zone, elected at large. The consensus of opinion was that the intent of the 1959 amendments to the reorganization law was to liberalize the procedure in the election of directors and the zoning of administrative school districts and that most of this same flexibility could be obtained in the Plans that were made under the original law by declaring certain areas to be urban areas, so that two or more zones could have the same boundaries.

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Hendrickson, and carried, that R-8 and R-10 be declared urban areas and be zones so that all seven zones will have the same boundaries, being the boundaries of the pre-existing districts.


No action was taken on Administrative School District R-11.

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Efteland, and carried, to accept the proposal of the Florence School Board for the zoning of R-7,


Motion was made by Mr. Rickard, seconded by Mr. Hendrickson, and carried, to refer back to the sub-committees, future Plans on R-1, R-2, R-3, R-4, and R-9.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION




Chairman



Secretary


VOTING PROCEDURE OF THE OREGON SCHOOL REORGANIZATION LAW

First Advertised GENERAL ELECTION for Proposed District



VOTING PROCEDURE OF THE OREGON SCHOOL REORGANIZATION LAW

First Advertised GENERAL ELECTION for Proposed District



MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

July 21, 1959

Regular meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County School Office with the following members present:

Ray Swanson
Marvin Hendrickson
Edward Efteland
Edgar Rickard

Clarence Jackson
William Wilt
Winifred Hult
Paul Ehinger
Wm. R. Woodie, Secretary

Minutes of the special meeting held June 25th, and the State Hearing held July 13th were read and approved.

Mr. Woodie reported that the allocation for the coming year for expenses of the Committee has been approved for \$1750.00, which is greater than last year. Mr. Patch, State Director of School District Reorganization, has sent the new rates for travel expense as follows: 10¢ a mile, \$5.00 for meals, and \$6.50 for lodging. Mr. Woodie gave each Committee member a blank on which to keep a record of their expenses in connection with the work of this Committee.

A visitor, Mr. William Land of Creswell, stated that he had heard there was a possibility of a petition from residents of the Walker area, but since no one was present from that area, he would make no comment at this time.

The matter of the selection of a member for the Arbitration Board was brought up and discussed. Mr. Woodie summarized the replies received from the various persons contacted to act on the Board, and reviewed the criteria for selecting such a person.

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger and seconded by Mr. Wilt to choose Mr. Glen Hawkins of Vernonia, and as an alternate, Mr. Gerald Gray of Beaverton. Motion carried.

Six (6) persons from the Walker area arrived and Mr. Tom Wright acted as spokesman for the group. He stated that they represented a group who were not satisfied with the Plan as presented by the Reorganization Committee, since they would like to remain in the Cottage Grove Union High School. They requested that the Reorganization Committee consider their recommendation for changing their boundaries. Mr. Land said he represented those who did not wish the district divided, and offered a counter-proposal to make the district unified. After much discussion, Mr. Swanson requested that the group work with Mr. Edgar Rickard and Mr. Clarence Jackson in submitting a map with the area involved blocked out as they wished the changes made. This map would be presented to the next meeting of the Committee.

Mr. Woodie reviewed the present status of the Lane County Comprehensive Plan which is as follows:

R-1, R-2, R-3 and R-4 - rejected
R-5 - State Hearing has not been held
R-6 - Approved - Effective date, July 1, 1960
R-7, R-8, R-10, R-11 - Effective date, July 1, 1960
R-9 - Election date to be set
R-12- State Hearing held July 13, 1959

Motion by Mr. Ehinger and seconded by Mr. Rickard, to set the R-9 election (Springfield and Marcola) for August 24, 1959. Motion carried.

A letter was read from M. C. Huff, Superintendent of Lincoln County concerning the annexation of Districts 143 and 165, to Lincoln County.

Mr. Wm. Dolmyer, Superintendent of Linn County, sent concurrence of Linn County for that portion of 69J, Junction City, in Linn County to be included in 69J, Lane County.

The State Board of Education informed us that Districts 68, McKenzie, 90, Blachly, and 97J, Florence have been approved as administrative districts and would become effective July 1, 1960.


A letter from Mr. Claude Martin, Superintendent of Mapleton Schools, contained the following zoning proposal - 3 zones, Mapleton, Tiernan, and Point Terrace, which includes 278 children; 1 zone, Indian Creek, containing 82 students; 1 zone, Deadwood district including the Deadwood Junction on Highway 36; 2 zones, that part of 102J, Linslaw affected, Swisshome, and down the highway to Rainrock. The zoning procedure was discussed.

Motion by Mr. Ehinger and seconded by Mr. Efteland to refer this zoning proposal to the sub-committee for further study. Motion carried.


Motion by Mr. Ehinger and seconded by Mr. Hendrickson to request the Secretary to write letters to School Districts 97J, 68 and 90 requesting their recommendations as to zone boundaries for R-7, R-8 and R-10. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION



Chairman



Secretary

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION PUBLIC HEARING ON
PARTIAL PLAN OF REORGANIZATION R-11 & R-12
Willamette High School
July 13, 1959

Public hearing was held at the Willamette High School on July 13th, 1959, with the following persons present: Ray Swanson, Marvin Hendrickson, Clarence Jackson, Ed Efteland, Edgar Rickard, Secretary Wm. R. Woodie, Mrs. Moore Hamilton, State Board Member, and Dennis Patch, State Director of School District Reorganization.

Chairman Swanson called the meeting to order and stated the purpose of the meeting was to hear questions and statements from those present relative to the formation of two proposed Administrative School Districts: R-11, comprising the present boundaries of School District No. 69J, Lane County, and District No. 69J, Linn County, being the present Junction City District; R-12, comprising component District No. 52, Bethel, and District No. 186, Alvadore.

Chairman Swanson introduced members of the Committee and asked Marvin Hendrickson to explain the proposed Plan R-12, including Districts No. 52, Bethel, and 186, Alvadore.

Mr. Hendrickson reviewed Items 1 through 7 in the Plan R-12, as adopted by the Committee and submitted to the State Board of Education.

Chairman Swanson reviewed the action taken by the Committee previous to combining Districts No. 52 and 186 into an Administrative School District. The first thought of the Committee was to include District No. 186, Alvadore, with Junction City. However, a poll was taken in the Alvadore District and it was found that the majority of persons residing in the Alvadore District preferred being included with the Bethel District. Since all other factors were comparable, the Committee decided to include District No. 186 with Bethel.

Chairman Swanson stated that since R-11 indicates no change, no review would be made unless requested.

Chairman Swanson introduced Mrs. Moore Hamilton, member of the State Board of Education, and Dennis Patch, State Director of School District Reorganization.

Mr. Patch stated that the purpose of this hearing was to consider two partial Plans: R-11, comprising the present boundaries of School District No. 69J, Junction City, Lane and Linn Counties; and, R-12, comprising School District No. 52, Bethel, and School District No. 186, Alvadore.

Mr. Patch briefly explained that the meeting was called according to law as a result of Plans being submitted by the Lane County Committee to the State Board. He stated that following this meeting the State Board would review the Plans and would approve or reject. In the case of R-11, present Junction City District, if the Plan is approved, no election is required, since this district is at present providing education Grades 1 through 12 and no change in existing boundaries is proposed. If Plan R-12 is approved, it would be returned to Lane County and an election date would be set within thirty (30) days from the date the Plan was received. He stated that the Plan would become effective on July 1st following the favorable election unless the election takes place after April 30th, in which case it would become effective one year from the following July 1st. He asked that persons wishing to speak on the proposed Plan R-12 should state their name and school district after being recognized by the Chairman.

Following are statements and questions submitted by patrons present:

Mr. O. H. Michael, Alvadore - Would disposition of the Alvadore building wait until this is voted upon?

Mr. Patch - Any disposition of buildings will be left to the new board.

Mr. Michael, Alvadore - If this election carries, would Bethel take over or would the Alvadore Board have a voice?

Mr. Patch - Following the election, if favorable, the new district would be divided into seven zones as nearly equal in population as possible. One member would be elected from each zone - however, all voters would vote on the candidates in all seven zones.

Ray Swanson - It is the responsibility of the Committee to zone the district. In the one Administrative District voted, the Committee has requested the boards to make zoning recommendations.

Mr. Michael, Alvadore - Would it be advisable for the two boards to meet?

Mr. Swanson - Yes, the Committee feels that the patrons are most familiar with their own area.

Mr. T. R. Powers, Supt., Bethel - District No. 52 could supply the Committee with a listing of the children in their district with their actual residence -- as of October, 1958.

Mr. Patch - It is permissible for more than one zone to have common boundaries.

Mr. Vernon Patton, Alvadore - In the explanation of the proposed Plans, it was stated we could approve or reject going to Junction City.

Mr. Patch - If District No. 186 had been included in R-11 instead of R-12 that would have been true, but since they are now included in R-12 they would vote to approve or reject being included in that proposal.

Mrs. Vernon Patton, Alvadore - Will you please give the qualifications of voters:

- Mr. Patch:
1. Must be a resident of the district for at least six (6) months.
 2. Must be a registered voter in the district at least thirty (30) days prior to the election.

Mr. Patch then called for statements and questions regarding proposed R-11, including the present boundaries of School District No. 69J, Lane County, and School District No. 69J, Linn County (a small portion of land).

Mr. Efteland - Did not believe any children resided in the Linn County area.

Mr. Patch - If the State Board approves R-11, the County Committee will zone the Administrative District into seven (7) zones and seven (7) directors, one from each zone, will be elected at large.

Mr. Patch - Asked the Committee if they had received written approval from the Linn County Committee to include their District No. 69J in the R-11 Plan.

Mr. ~~W~~ Linn County had been contacted and has ~~approved~~ the inclusion of ~~the~~ District
No. ~~999~~, Linn County, in the Lane County Plan. However, he ~~is~~ not certain whether
the ~~request~~ received in writing. (Note: Written confirmation received on
July 14th).

Eddie Buck, Supt., Junction City - At what time during the year should the election of Board Members be held for the new Administrative District. Should it be the annual meeting next May?

Mr. Patch - It would cause less confusion if held at the regular time unless it would interfere with the budget.

Mr. Swanson - Committee would agree to holding the election at a time which would be in the best interest of the district.

Mrs. Vernon Patton, Alvadore - Stated she preferred reorganization with the Bethel District due to that direction being their natural outlet, the roads were paved, good bus service, etc. Also, the curriculum offered was excellent. Stated "we are not agin it!"

Mr. Patch - Glad you said what you did. In about two (2) years I have heard only about two (2) such expressions.

Meeting adjourned.

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE
June 25, 1959

Special meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County School Office with the following members present:

Ray Swanson	Clarence Jackson
William Wilt	Winifred Hult
Edgar Rickard	Wm. R. Woodie, Secretary

The votes were canvassed from the reorganization elections held on June 16th, 1959, and the results were as follows:

R-1 - Comprising the following School Districts:

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>VOID</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1 -----	60	92	1	153
67 -----	9	108		117
71 -----	120	158		278
<u>Total -</u>	<u>189</u>	<u>358</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>548</u>

R-2 - Comprising the following School districts:

25J -----	14	42		56
31 -----	1	21		22
40 -----	35	512	1	548
45 -----	50	41		91
48 -----	6	15		21
75 -----	10	47		57
80 -----	19	3		22
84 -----	7	12	2	21
93 -----	2	23		25
128 -----	42	5		47
177 -----	2	26		28
191 -----	3	45		48
<u>Total -</u>	<u>191</u>	<u>792</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>986</u>

R-3 - Comprising the following School districts:

76 -----	57	180		237
117 -----	38	88		126
<u>Total -</u>	<u>95</u>	<u>268</u>		<u>363</u>

R-6 - Comprising the following School districts:

32 -----	58	0		58
102J -----	14	10		24
112 -----	24	2		26
<u>Total -</u>	<u>96</u>	<u>12</u>		<u>108</u>

According to the above results, a motion was made by Mr. Rickard and seconded by Mr. Wilt, to declare the R-1, R-2, and R-3 elections LOST. Motion carried.

According to the above results, a motion was made by Mr. Rickard and seconded by Mr. Wilt, to declare the R-6 election CARRIED. Motion carried. (This will become effective on July 1, 1960).

Mr. Swanson requested the Secretary to write letters to School Districts No. 32, 102J and 112, requesting their recommendations as to zone boundaries for R-6. The five committee members present made the following suggestion: Five (5) zones for present District 32; 1 zone for present District No. 102J; and, 1 zone for present District No. 112.

The members present discussed the most feasible time for electing board members for new administrative districts. After some discussion they arrived at the following:

1. Districts where no change of boundaries is involved -- 1st Monday in May.
2. Districts comprised of two or more component districts -- prior to 1st Monday in May so as to allow ample time for budget procedures for the new administrative school district.

Mr. Woodie informed the Committee that he had discussed the matter of Administrative districts, including parts of component districts, as in R-6, with Mr. Patch, and he advised that all territory included in an administrative district is automatically removed from any other district, except the rural school district.

Mr. Woodie presented a list of Reorganization Committee members from other Counties, who were submitted to him by Mr. Patch, relative to the selection of one member by the Committee to serve on the Arbitration Board. The Committee reviewed the names included on the list and instructed Mr. Woodie to contact persons listed to ascertain their views on the following:

1. Willingness to serve on the Arbitration Board if appointed.
2. Position on joint districts.
3. Type of joint problems existing in their county.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION



Chairman



Secretary

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

June 16, 1959

Regular meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County School Office with the following members present:

Ray Swanson	William Wilt
Clarence Jackson	Edgar Rickard
Winifred Hult	Marvin Hendrickson
Joe Swift	Edward Efteland
Paul Ehinger	Wm. R. Woodie, Secretary

Minutes of the meetings of May 19th and 25th, 1959, were read and approved.

Eight (8) persons were present from School District No. 52, Bethel, requesting the Committee to approve their request for transfer of territory from School District No. 52 to School District No. 4. Mrs. R. E. Yates, resident of the area, acted as spokesman for the group. She reported that they were representing twenty-five (25) families with children of school age residing in the area, and were interested in accomplishing this boundary change for the reasons specified in their original letter. She asked the Committee for permission to circulate a petition requesting a boundary change.

Mrs. Frank, a resident of the area, informed the Committee that she resides within three (3) blocks of Colin Kelly and that the line between School District No. 4 and 52 is the center of the street. She is very anxious to complete the transfer prior to the beginning of the 1959-60 school year.

Mr. Swanson suggested they go ahead and circulate petition but withhold presentation until after R-12 election in Bethel and Alvadore.

Five (5) persons were present from School District No. 43, Coburg, representing a group from Coburg who favored Reorganization. Mr. Harry Harbert of Coburg, acted as spokesman for the group. He stated that a meeting was held recently in Coburg, attended by approximately fifty (50) patrons who desire to bring about Reorganization, and the five (5) persons appearing before the Committee had been appointed by the group to offer their assistance to help bring about Reorganization.

Mr. Hendrickson explained the law regarding the Committee submitting the same or a new Plan and the time limits involved.

The following report of a meeting of the Douglas County Chairman and Secretary and the Lane County Chairman and Secretary, held at noon on June 16th, was submitted by Mr. Woodie:

"It was agreed that the following proposals would be presented to each Committee for their approval:

1. The Secretary from each Committee and the State Director of School District Reorganization will prepare a list of 12 persons presently serving on Reorganization Committees in Oregon not resident in Lane or Douglas Counties and having

no financial interest in either County. This list of twelve persons will be submitted to each Committee who shall have the option of rejecting any persons on the list.

2. From this list each Committee shall select one member, with each Committee having the right to reject any appointee. The two members mutually agreed upon will appoint a third member who is also not a resident of Lane or Douglas Counties and has no financial interest in either County.
3. Each County Committee will provide one-half of the expenses incurred by the three-man Arbitration Board. The expenses of presenting testimony to the Arbitration Board will be borne separately by each Committee and will not be shared.
4. Each County Committee will select one of their members to prepare and present arguments to the Arbitration Board. This member may call such witnesses as he feels is necessary to testify in behalf of the County Committee.
5. The Arbitration Board shall be requested to reach a conclusion that is compatible with the objectives and criteria of the Reorganization Act.
6. The Arbitration Board shall meet for the purpose of hearing arguments at a mutually acceptable time and place outside of Lane or Douglas Counties
7. The Chairman and the Secretary of each County Committee shall meet with the Arbitration Board for their initial meeting to orient them with this agreement and to set a time and place for the presentation of arguments and to make such other recommendations as the two Committees deem desirable."

After discussion of the proposals submitted, a motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Swift and carried, to accept the proposals in their entirety.

Motion was made by Mr. Wilt, seconded by Mr. Hendrickson, and carried, to reconsider the appointment of Chairman Ray Swanson as a member of the Arbitration Board.

Copies of House Bill 40, House Bill 41, and other materials on Reorganization for use by County Committees from the State Department of Education, were presented to the Committee and discussed at length.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION

MEETING WITH THE DOUGLAS COUNTY REORGANIZATION
COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN AND SECRETARY

Eugene, Oregon
June 16, 1969

A meeting was held at the Lynwood Cafe on June 16th with the following persons present: Ray Swanson, Chairman, Lane County Committee
Harold Glover, Chairman, Douglas County Committee
Kenneth Barneburg, Secretary, Douglas County Committee
Wm. R. Woodie, Secretary, Lane County Committee

It was agreed that the following proposals would be presented to each Committee for their approval:

1. The Secretary from each Committee and the State Director of School District Reorganization will prepare a list of 12 persons presently serving on Reorganization Committees in Oregon not resident in Lane or Douglas Counties and having no financial interest in either County. This list of twelve persons will be submitted to each Committee who shall have the option of rejecting any persons on the list.
2. From this list each Committee shall select one member, with each Committee having the right to reject any appointee. The two members mutually agreed upon will appoint a third member who is also not a resident of Lane or Douglas Counties and has no financial interest in either County.
3. Each County Committee will provide one-half of the expenses incurred by the three-man Arbitration Board. The expenses of presenting testimony to the Arbitration Board will be borne separately by each Committee and will not be shared.
4. Each County Committee will select one of their members to prepare and present arguments to the Arbitration Board. This member may call such witnesses as he feels is necessary to testify in behalf of the County Committee.
5. The Arbitration Board shall be requested to reach a conclusion that is compatible with the objectives and criteria of the Reorganization Act.
6. The Arbitration Board shall meet for the purpose of hearing arguments at a mutually acceptable time and place outside of Lane or Douglas Counties.
7. The Chairman and the Secretary of each County Committee shall meet with the Arbitration Board for their initial meeting to orient them with this agreement and to set a time and place for the presentation of arguments and to make such other recommendations as the two County Committees deem desirable.

Eugene, Oregon,
May 25, 1959.

Special meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County School Office with the following members present:

Edgar Rickard
Marvin Hendrickson
Joe Swift

Clarence Jackson
William Wilt

The ballots cast in the R-4 election held in School Districts No. 4 and 43 on May 19th were canvassed by the Committee and the results were found to be as follows:

<u>To Approve R-4</u>	<u>#4</u>	<u>#43</u>	<u>Total</u>
Yes	365	160	525
No	296	239	535
Void	1	0	1

% Rejecting in #43-59.899

Since a majority of the votes cast were against the formation of R-4 the election was declared NOT CARRIED.

Secretary Woodie informed the Committee that partial Plans R-1, R-2, R-3, R-6, R-7, R-8, and R-10, had been approved by the State Board of Education on May 19, 1959, and were received at this office on May 20th. Therefore, since partial Plans R-1, R-2, R-3, and R-6 require elections within sixty days (July 19th), the following motions were made: Motion was made by Mr. Hendrickson, seconded by Mr. Jackson and carried, to set the date of June 16th as the election date for R-1, R-2, and R-3; Motion was made by Mr. Swift seconded by Mr. Hendrickson, and carried, to set the date of June 16th as the election date for R-6, providing Secretary can prepare notices for this date-otherwise, to authorize and direct Secretary to set a satisfactory date.

Letter of resignation was read from John Brewer. Motion was made by Mr. Hendrickson, seconded by Mr. Wilt, and carried, to accept Mr. Brewer's resignation. The second alternate being Mr. Charles Foster, the Secretary was authorized and directed to contact Mr. Foster to find if he would be willing to serve as a member of the Committee.

Next regular meeting of the Committee will be held on June 16th.

Meeting adjourned.


Chairman


Secretary

Eugene, Oregon,
May 19, 1959.

Regular meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County School Office with the following members present:

Ray Swanson	Edward Efteland
Marvin Hendrickson	William Wilt
Clarence Jackson	

Secretary Woodie reported to the Committee that Mr. Garoutte had informed him of his desire to resign as a member of the Reorganization Committee. Since Clarence Jackson was elected first alternate Mr. Swanson asked Mr. Jackson if he would be willing to serve as a member of the Committee. Mr. Jackson accepted and was declared a member of the Lane County Committee.

Minutes of the Public Hearing on R-11 held at the Laurel Elementary School, Junction City, on April 28th were read and approved.

Minutes of Public Hearing on R-12 held at the Willamette High School, 1801 Echo Hollow Road., Eugene, on April 28th, were read and approved.

Secretary Woodie reviewed the minutes of the State Hearing on R-8 and R-9 held at the Springfield Junior High School on May 13, 1959, and the State Hearing on R-6, R-7, and R-10 held at the Mapleton High School on May 14th, 1959.

Chairman Swanson requested Mr. Woodie to read letter which was written to Mr. Clyde Holleman of Creswell in answer to his telephone request for information.

Discussion was held on the possibility of R-2 passing. Mr. Jackson felt that the Creswell district was very much opposed being included in R-2 and stated that some felt they would prefer to go with Pleasant Hill, Eugene or Springfield.

Progress Report was presented to members and reviewed by Mr. Woodie. Request was made that members keep report up to date.

The amendments to the Reorganization Act were reviewed. Mr. Woodie called attention to the members that certain parts of the amendments would not apply to Plans already made and approved, but would apply only to Plans submitted and adopted after H.B. 40 becomes law.

Motion was made by Mr. Wilt and seconded by Mr. Jackson, to adopt and submit ASDR-11 and ASDR-12 to State in proposed form. The vote was as follows:

YES - 5
NO - 0
ABSENT - 4

Secretary Woodie read a letter from Kenneth Barneburg, Secretary of the Douglas County Committee, informing the Lane County Committee that they were withdrawing District 1J, Douglas County, from the Douglas County Plan, and requested that said district be included with

the Lane County Plan. Concurrence was requested of the Lane County Committee regarding this matter.

The Secretary was authorized and directed to notify the Douglas County Committee that the Lane County Committee did not wish to take formal action on including 1J, Douglas County with the Lane County Plan, but to accomplish it by a boundary change, providing the Lane County R-2 election carries.

Relative to Lane County proposed Partial Plan R-5, motion was made by Mr. Hendrickson, seconded by Mr. Wilt, and carried, to appoint Ray Swanson as the Committee's member on the Arbitration Board as specified in H.B. 40. The Chairman instructed the Secretary to notify the Douglas County Committee of the appointment of Ray Swanson as Lane County's member on the Arbitration Board -- this to be done after House Bill 40 becomes law.

The Committee requested Mr. Woodie to secure an answer to the following question:

1. If financial data changes and the districts included in a proposed Plan remain the same, does this constitute a New Plan or does it remain the same Plan?

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION
COMMITTEE


Chairman


Secretary

R-6
R-7
R-10

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION HEARING ON PARTIAL PLANS OF REORGANIZATION
R-10, R-7 and R-6
Mapleton High School - 8:00 o'clock
May 14, 1959

The following members and guests were present: Dennis Patch, State Department of Education, Mr. Ralph Stullar, member of the State Board of Education, Mr. Edward Efteland, representing the Lane County Committee for Reorganization and Tom Newton of the Lane County School Office, representing Wm. R. Woodie, County School Superintendent.

Twenty-five persons were in attendance. Introductions of guests and committee members were made by Mr. Edward Efteland. Mr. Efteland also explained the procedure of the hearing. He further explained very briefly the Plans R-10, R-7 and R-6. He then turned the meeting over to Mr. Dennis Patch for the State Board hearings. Mr. Patch first explained that the Plan R-10, and R-7 involved no changes, or very slight changes in the case of R-7, and there were no changes recommended by the County Committee, if approved by the State, no elections on these plans would be necessary. As for Plan R-6, Mr. Patch explained procedures of hearings, elections, and other procedure required by the Reorganization Law. He also explained the procedure of the State Board Hearing now in progress.

In the question period, no one had registered to speak officially. There were several comments and questions from the floor. First to speak Mrs. Margery Welding, District 112. She asked if the election concerning R-6 was not held in time to consolidate this coming school year, who would take care of the high school students from District No. 112? Mr. Patch explained that the Non-High District will not go out of existence until 1960. Up until that time they would take care of tuition of the Deadwood high school students. He also explained that the election could be held this summer, but not in time for consolidation this fall. Mrs. Welding also asked if budgets of School Districts 112 and 32 could be merged this coming year. Mr. Patch said "no", not until the reorganized district is officially formed could the budgets be merged.

Mr. Claude Martin, District 32 asked when the seven new directors would be elected if the reorganization was passed on favorably. Mr. Patch answered as soon as the vote is favorable, the County Committee would divide the new district in 7 zones. Elections would then be held.

Mr. Ralph Wheeler, District 32 asked about how the balloting would be conducted. Would there be separate polling places in each district or would they vote all in the same poll? He also asked if one district could reject the Plan, if others favored it. Mr. Patch answered that elections and balloting would be held separately with a polling place in each district, and that one district could reject the plan.

Mr. Ira Larson, District 102J asked what was the part of 102J that is involved in the proposed Plan R-6. Mr. Patch answered that all the non-high section of 102J and 3 sections now in the U-4 district would be the portions of 102J that would be in R-6.

Mrs. Welding, District 112 asked if the Plan was rejected by all districts what then happens. Mr. Patch then explained the alternatives involved in re-submitting plans and the course the County Committee would take as prescribed by the Reorganization Law.

Mr. A. L. Steinhauer, District 112 asked what portion of state funds would be available for the Deadwood district when the non-high district goes out of existence. Mr. Patch explained that this amount would depend on the legislature as to how much money would be appropriated, but further explained that elementary districts would have to foot the bill for their high school students after the non-high districts are dissolved.

Mr. Charles Casey, District 112 asked what effect the reorganization would have on consolidation of the Deadwood district. Mr. Patch answered that consolidation could be effected any time if the districts involved so desired and the County Committee on Reorganization okehed the plan. Mr. Efteland concurred.

Mr. A. L. Steinhauer, District 112 asked if there was anything in the state law about Deadwood buying a new school bus. Mr. Patch said that he didn't feel that this was related to any discussion of the proposed reorganization plan.

Mr. Phil Franklin, District 32, in relation to Mr. Steinhauer's remark, said that he thought Mr. Steinhauer had a point, and that the bus problem did relate to reorganization because District 112 might be reluctant to invest in a new bus while the reorganization plan is "hanging fire". In answer to this, Mr. Patch offered the help of the State Department to District 112 in advising on transportation and suggested that it might not be a good time for District 112 to invest in a new bus.

Mr. Claude Martin, District 32 asked if District 112 might in his words "jump the gun" this fall if reorganization doesn't take effect officially until 1960. Mr. Patch answered that something along this line might possibly be worked out by the two districts involved, even though the new reorganized administrative unit would not be in effect until the fall of 1960.

Mrs. Welding, District 112 asked if anyone on the Committee had any idea or would hazard a guess when the election would take place. Mr. Efteland answered that it could be as early as July or August, 1959 if all went well, but that the Lane County Committee felt that summer elections were not too favorable. Mrs. Welding further asked if requests from districts would have any effect on setting the date of elections. Mr. Efteland answered that it very probably would have an effect.

Mrs. A. L. Steinhauer, District 112 asked if Deadwood could get into the Mapleton school district this fall. Mr. Patch answered, not by law. Legally the new reorganized district could not go into effect until the fall of 1960, but he repeated the answer that he gave Mr. Martin that some arrangement could probably be worked out if both districts were desirous.

Mr. Harry Wilson, District 112 asked how the new board members would be picked, would they be appointed or elected. Mr. Patch answered that they would be elected.

Being no other comments, questions or discussion, Mr. Patch thanked all in attendance and adjourned the meeting.

R-8
R-9

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION PUBLIC HEARING ON
PARTIAL PLAN OF REORGANIZATION R-8 & R-9
Springfield Junior High School
May 13, 1959

Public hearing was held at the Springfield Junior High School on May 13th, 1959, with the following persons present: William Wilt, Edward Efteland, Ray Swanson, Secretary Wm. R. Woodie, Ralph Stullar, State Board Member, and Dennis Patch, State Director of School District Reorganization.

Chairman Swanson introduced members of the Committee and the representatives of the State Board. He asked Edward Efteland to explain the Plan R-9.

Mr. Efteland reviewed Items 1 through 7 in the Plan as adopted by the Committee and submitted to the State Board of Education. He referred to the estimated tax levies for all twelve proposed reorganizations and pointed out the relative position of R-9. The schedules accompanying and supporting the Plan were explained by Mr. Efteland.

Chairman Swanson stated that it was the purpose of the meeting to hear persons wishing to make statements relative to R-8 or R-9.

He introduced Mr. Dennis Patch who briefly explained that the meeting was called according to law as a result of a Plan being submitted by the Lane County Committee to the State Board. He stated that following this meeting the State Board would review the Plan and would approve or reject it. If the Plan was approved it would be returned to Lane County and an election date would be set within thirty days from the date the Plan was received; such election to take place within sixty days after the Plan was received. He stated that the Plan would become effective on the July 1st following the favorable election unless the election takes place after April 30th, in which case it would become effective one year from the following July 1st. He asked that persons wishing to speak should state their name and school district after being recognized by the chairman.

Following are statements and questions submitted by patrons present:

Frank Heesacker, District No. 79. Do teachers have to undergo a probationary status under a reorganized district?

Mr. Patch referred the question to Harold Beall, who stated that a probationary period would be required of Marcola's teachers if the reorganization were approved.

Mr. Heesacker asked, how about Springfield's teachers?

Mr. Beall replied they would not be required to fill a probationary period if they were presently on tenure in Springfield.

Mr. Heesacker asked, who would issue the contracts for the 1960-61 year?

Mr. Patch replied that the new school board would issue the contracts.

Mr. Heesacker again asked, would the new board actually hire the teachers.

Mr. Wilt asked, how could the new board hire teachers if they were not yet elected?

Mr. Patch replied that the existing school board would elect teachers until the new board came into existence.

Richard Eymen, District No. 79 - Why are the teachers in District No. 79 not subject to the same tenure protection as the Springfield teachers?

Harold Beall answered, that the Marcola teachers do not now come under any of the three existing tenure provision but would come under it for the first time under the proposed reorganization while the Springfield teachers are presently under tenure.

Leo Paschelke, Marcola - What will happen to the High School building if the reorganization is approved?

Mr. Wilt replied that this would be a matter to be decided by the new board and it is not known at this time how they will decide.

Mr. Patch added that it was very hard to predict the actions of a body not yet elected in a school district not yet in existence.

Harold Beall, District No. 19- Stated that a change had occurred since the previous hearing held on this reorganization in that the Springfield district had authorized and approved a bond issue in an amount of \$1,400,000 for the construction of a high school to house 970 students in the Thurston area.

Frank Heesacker, Marcola - When will this High School be open?

Harold Beall, replied, the tentative opening date was September, 1960.

William Wilt, Reorganization Committee member from Marcola stated that he felt that this opening date meant that the Marcola students would have ample high school facilities by the earliest date that they could come in under the law and that the capacity of the existing Springfield High School could not be an issue in the coming election. Mr. Wilt also asked if Mr. Beall would state what the approximate levy would be for bonds.

Mr. Beall answered, that on a 20-year issue the estimated millage for the first year would be 4.5 mills.

Wm. R. Woodie asked if an approximate date of issue for the bonds could be made at this time?

Gordon Hale, District No. 19 - stated by September 1, 1960, the district would require the money that would be derived from the sale of bonds and therefore he felt the bonds would be issued and sold prior to that date. He stated that the school board felt they should not issue the bonds until they needed the money because of the interest they would be paying.

Mr. Patch called for a discussion of the proposed Administrative School District R-8, where no changes in the boundary were proposed. He stated that the combined hearings were held only where areas have no proposed

boundary changes. Since there was no one present from the McKenzie School District Mr. Patch asked if other patrons had questions regarding R-8.

Berry Mauney, Marcola - If the proposal is rejected can an area withdraw from the rejecting district?

Mr. Patch - Yes, minor changes can be allowed in a reorganized district due to an amendment passed in the last session of the legislature which makes it possible to change the boundaries of Administrative School Districts. Mr. Patch pointed out that the present laws in regard to boundary changes are geared to common school districts and do not affect Administrative School Districts.

Mrs. Conley, Marcola - Do you have to have a vote on a boundary change?

Mr. Patch - A petition to the District Boundary Board can be instigated if the boundary change does not involve an administrative school district, but in any case approval of the Reorganization Committee is necessary before any action can become effective.

Berry Mauney, Marcola - What if the reorganization election fails?

Mr. Patch replied that the Committee may resubmit the same Plan or revise the Plan but that the Committee's authority did not continue beyond July 1st, 1962, because at that date the County Superintendent assumed the duties of the Committee.

John Nelson, District No. 19 - Does the County School Superintendent have any means at his disposal that may implement reorganization easier than the powers now possessed by the Lane County Committee.

Dennis Patch replied that "No, the County Superintendent's power and duties would be the same as the present powers and duties of the Committee".

William Wilt, Reorganization Committee Member from Marcola, asked Mr. Patch to clarify his statement in regard to the amendments to the Reorganization Act.

Mr. Patch stated that the amendment pertains only to Administrative School Districts and that existing law in regard to boundary changes, consolidations, and annexations, takes care of existing school districts.

Meeting adjourned.

PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED R-12
Willamette High School
April 28, 1959
8:00 P.M.

Public hearing on proposed R-12 was held in the Willamette High School, April 28, 1959. Members present were Pat Rickard, Vice Chairman, Ed Efteland, William Wilt, Marvin Hendrickson, and William Woodie, Secretary.

Vice Chairman Rickard opened the meeting and introduced Ed Efteland who reviewed the Reorganization brochure and called attention to the major provisions of the law contained therein. He cited the four criteria for administrative school districts and the procedure that is followed from the local hearing to the election. In reviewing the plan Mr. Efteland read aloud from items referring to Existing School Buildings, Proposed Boundaries, Adjustments of Assets and Liabilities, Transportation, and Purposes of Recommending this Reorganization. He explained the schedules 1 through 4, also contained in the Plan.

Vice Chairman Rickard asked if the patrons had questions or statements to make.

Mr. Hansen, District 186 asked if their school presently met standards. The answer was that they had a standard school according to the standards at the time the evaluation was made. Mr. Efteland pointed out that the district did not meet the criteria of the Reorganization Act as it did not provide education in grades 9 through 12.

Mrs. Ammerman, District 186 - What will happen after this meeting? Mr. Rickard stated that this is one of two hearings on the Plan and that after this hearing the Committee would adopt or change the Plan, but if they adopted it, it would be submitted to the State Board of Education who would hold a second hearing on the Plan and then either adopt or reject. If they adopted it, the Plan would be returned to the County and placed to a vote in the Proposed Administrative School District. Mrs. Ammerman, District 186, asked what would happen to the 12 high school children who are now in high school in Junction City. Mr. Rickard answered that this would be up to the Board of the reorganized school district. Mr. Rickard called for a show of hands from the persons present as to who favored the plan and who did not. The results were as follows: Favoring the plan - 15; not favoring the plan - 1.

Mrs. Michael, District 186-asked for a review of the predicted tax levies in Junction City as opposed to Bethel and Alvadore. Mr. Efteland stated that the Junction City proposed levy will be 50.2 mills and the Bethel proposed levy would be 57.8 mills and stated that these rates were very close and were reasonable when compared with the predicted millage rates in the other ten reorganizations. He also emphasized that they were merely predictions based on current expenses, current bond retirement schedules, and current assessed valuations.

Mr. Michael, District 186 asked if a new bond issue in the city of Junction City had been included in the millage rates quoted. Mr. Woodie answered that they had.

Mrs. Ammerman, District 186 asked what additional buildings would be needed in this reorganization. Mr. Efteland answered the Committee felt that the Bethel district would be able to absorb the number of children presently in school in Alvadore, and Mr. Powers explained that the building program at Bethel would probably not be affected by consolidation with Alvadore, but wanted to point out that there would be a building program in Bethel in future years whether or not the reorganization was approved by the voters.

There being no further questions the meeting was adjourned.



Chairman

Secretary

PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED R-11
Laurel Elementary School
April 28, 1959
3:00 P.M.

Public hearing on proposed R-11 was held in the Laurel Elementary School, Junction City, April 28, 1959. Members present were Ray Swanson, Ed Efteland, Joe Swift, Pat Rickard, William Wilt and Secretary William Woodie.

The Chairman opened the meeting and introduced the members of the Committee present. Mr. Swanson presented the data contained in the preliminary partial plan R-11. The Chairman asked for questions or statements from the patrons present.

Mr. Payne, Harrisburg elementary district, stated that he lived on a fringe area of District 69J and would like to petition to have his property transferred to the Junction City district. The Chairman referred this question to the Secretary. The Secretary stated that the property in question is presently in the Harrisburg Union High School due to a recent consolidation of Noraton with Harrisburg and would probably be subject to indebtedness to Harrisburg Union High School if property were transferred. After unification of Harrisburg Union High a transfer could be made by petitioning the Lane County District Boundary Board.

Chairman Swanson stated that the original proposal for the Junction City area had called for the Alvadore district to be incorporated with Junction City into one Administrative School District. A preference poll circulated in the Alvadore area and presented to the Committee before the plan was adopted indicated that the persons in Alvadore considered the Bethel area their natural social, economic community, and the Committee subsequently changed their proposal.

Ed Buck, Junction City, District 69J stated that there had been some question about the southern boundary between Junction City school district, Eugene school district, and Bethel school district, and that his Board had previously suggested that if any changes were made in this area they be made with the idea of simplifying the boundaries.

Meeting adjourned.



Chairman



Secretary

P-3

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION PUBLIC HEARING ON
PARTIAL PLAN OF REORGANIZATION R-3
Oakridge High School
April 20, 1959

Members present: Dennis Patch, State Director of Reorganization; Ralph Stuller, State Board of Education member, and; Paul Ehinger, Ray Swanson, Secretary Wm. R. Woodie of the Lane County Committee.

Chairman Ray Swanson called the meeting to order and asked the secretary for a brief explanation of the Plan.

Mr. Woodie stated that the preliminary hearing had been held on this Plan of Reorganization on January 26, 1959, at the Oakridge High School, and that subsequently the Lane County Committee had adopted the Plan and submitted it to the State Board of Education, and that the State Board had scheduled this hearing prior to approving or rejecting the Plan.

The Chairman introduced Dennis Patch, State Director of Reorganization, who opened the public hearing on R-3. Mr. Patch introduced Mr. Ralph Stuller, State Board Member from Coquille.

Mr. Patch explained that on March 16th the Board had considered the Plan and authorized the hearing. He stated that after the hearing had been held the State Board would either approve or reject the Plan and if rejected the County Committee would be required to prepare a new Plan and if accepted it would come to a vote within the boundaries of the Proposed Administrative School District. If the election was held after April 30th the effective date would be one year from the next July 1st. Mr. Patch explained the procedure for the conduct of the hearing as outlined on the agenda. Mr. Patch called for statements from patrons of the school districts.

Mr. George Pokorny, District No. 117 - What would be the effect on taxes if the Reorganization were approved?

Mr. Paul Ehinger - Tax predictions cannot accurately be made but only a trend can be established. Would appear from the preliminary data, as explained in the preliminary plan, that the total tax load would be some 55.6 mills based on current expenditures and current valuations. Stated that the people were somewhat concerned with bond retirement and noted that the indebtedness in each district is not in direct proportion to the valuation. He also noted that in the long run the bonded indebtedness in each district would equalize since the Oakridge debt runs longer and the patrons would be retiring the Oakridge bonds beyond the time the Westfir bonds would be retired. Stated again that certain unpredictable changes, for instance in assessed value, could change the tax picture in the future.

Mr. Pokorny, District No. 117 - Wanted to know if District No. 76 would have to build recreation or physical education facilities soon if they did not consolidate. The question was referred to Paul Elliott.

Mr. Paul Elliott, District No. 76 - explained that by about 1963 the High School would be better than 400 but that he was not in a position to definitely say how soon added facilities would be needed, but that he was sure that within six years, on the basis of present enrolments, the Oakridge High School would have in excess of 400 youngsters. He noted that in 1953 a prediction was made for 350 students in the High School in Oakridge and 105 in District No. 117 for the present time.

Actual enrolments however, indicates 280 students in Oakridge High School and 69 in the Westfir High School. Stated that what the community decided was needed would determine when the needs were met. Stated that a need for a swimming pool would probably be considered, since many high schools at present had swimming pools and recreational facilities.

Mr. Neil Griffith, District No. 117 - What would happen if the vote was unfavorable? What would happen if the vote was favorable?

Mr. Patch explained that if the vote was favorable the change would become effective as previously noted. If the vote was unfavorable the Committee's job would be to prepare another Plan of Reorganization or to submit the same Plan of Reorganization for another election, and that the Committee would operate until the entire County was reorganized or until July of 1962.

Mr. Neil Griffith, District No. 117 - Can the Committee approve a district as it presently exists without change?

Dennis Patch answered that if a district meets the criteria and standards of the law, some of which are mandatory and some of which are suggested and are interpreted by local Committees, that the district may exist as it is presently constituted with the exception of the change in the number of board members and the zoning of the district. Mr. Patch pointed out that transportation requirements are suggestions only and are not mandatory.

Mr. Paul Elliott, District No. 76 - What are the three standards contained in the law?

Mr. Patch stated that the three standards are:

1. Each district must provide a 12-year program.
2. Each district must be a natural, social, and economic community.
3. Each district must meet the standards of the State Board of Education for elementary and secondary schools and the standards as adopted by the State Board at the completion of Reorganization Act.

He pointed out that these standards (No. 3 above) were flexible and not firm.

Mr. Vern Laswell, District No. 117 - Asked how are the districts zoned and how are the directors elected?

Dennis Patch replied that the districts are zoned by school population into seven zones with one director being elected from each zone by a vote at large. He explained that two or more could have the same boundaries.

Mr. Paul Elliott, District No. 76 - asked, how can zones be changed?

Dennis Patch replied that the zones may be changed not oftener than once each year.

Mr. Fred Baxter, District No. 76 - asked, do both existing districts meet all standards at the present time?

Dennis Patch replied that he did not know.

Mr. Fred Baxter, District No. 76 - asked, what would be the effect on taxes taking into consideration equalization?

Paul Ehinger answered that predictions he had referred to earlier considered the Rural School District law and Equalization.

Mr. Fred Baxter - asked, will it do away with equalization if we have this Re-organization?

Mr. Ehinger answered - there is no provision for doing away with equalization in this Plan.

Mr. George Pokorny asked - Are the teachers out of their training field, either their major or their minor, in either district?

Mr. Ehinger replied that this question should be answered by the Superintendent.

Mr. Paul Elliott, District No. 76, stated - that according to the Northwest Association Standardization Report, there was one teacher in the field of mathematics who was teaching outside of his field. Indicated that consolidation would probably bring no change in this condition.

Mr. Alfred Johnson, District No. 117 - Indicated that his school offered forty-one subjects last year and that among his teachers only two were out of their major or their minor and these were not academic subjects.

Ray Swanson stated that the questions he had heard were, in his opinion, good questions, and this was the first time he had heard questions asked about teacher qualifications.

Mr. Paul Elliott, District No. 76 - Stated that the largest taxpayers in the two districts were tied closely to the National forests. Said that he had been told by these taxpayers that the type of employees that they hire depends upon the type of schools that they maintain. Stated that they have been willing to go along with what has been needed in the past and that a combination at this time would not result in better individual attention for students. Pointed out that District No. 117 was practically tutoring their students now and in District No. 76 they had a very favorable teacher-pupil ratio. If the districts combine this ratio would be approximately 19 to 1. He stated that he is wondering why there should be a change at this time and wondered if we had to wait for an election to determine the results.

Ray Swanson - Committee had looked at all Lane County and had considered a number of factors in preparing the Plans. These factors included the number of courses per teacher where there was great variation. It also included the cost per pupil per day, the number of courses per teacher in the high school, and stated that they had found that unequal reorganization had resulted in unequal wealth and other inequalities that the Committee felt could best be corrected through Reorganization. He stated that it was now up to the people to determine whether the Committee's Plan was feasible or not, pending approval of the Plan by the State Board of Education.

Mr. George Pokorny, District No. 117 - stated that the personal attention received by his daughter in High School had been very advantageous in English and that his son has enjoyed the low pupil-teacher ratio and his conclusions are that the smaller informal groupings would appear to be superior.

Mr. Cecil Wiley, District No. 76 - Indicated an interest in the zoning amendments and stated that he is opposed to zoning by population and likened it to the ward system of government. Stated that the zoning provision does not provide the highest caliber of individual for board members.

Dennis Patch stated that amendments pending, provide for complete zoning from five to nine zones with one director per zone or for no zoning and for a choice of electing at large or by zones.

Meeting adjourned.

2

**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION PUBLIC HEARING ON
PARTIAL PLAN OF REORGANIZATION R-2
Cottage Grove Union High School
April 16, 1959**

State Board of Education Hearing on the Lane County partial Plan of Reorganization R-2.

A public hearing was held in the Cottage Grove Union High School on April 16th at 8:00 p.m. for the purpose of discussing the Plan R-2. Members present were: Dennis Patch, Director of State School District Reorganization; Mrs. Moore Hamilton, State Board of Education; Edgar Rickard, Earl Garoutte, William Wilt, Ray Swanson, Ed Efteland, and Secretary Wm. R. Woodie.

Chairman Swanson opened the meeting and introduced the Reorganization Committee members and guests and called upon William Wilt to review the Plan. Mr. Wilt reviewed the Plan pointing out the overlapping situations in Walker and in upper Rattlesnake Creek. He explained the computation of the estimated millage rates and reviewed the purposes recommending this reorganization.

Chairman Swanson introduced Mrs. Moore Hamilton, member, State Board of Education, and Mr. Patch, Director of School District Reorganization.

Dennis Patch stated that the hearing was being held for the benefit of the patrons of the area so that they may discuss viewpoints in regard to the Plan. He reviewed the provisions of the Act relating to the effective date of proposed reorganizations stating that if an election is held and approved prior to April 30th that the Administrative School District would come into effect on the following July 1st, but that if the election occurred after April 30th, the Administrative School District would become effective a year from the following July 1st.

Mr. Patch stated that it was his intention to call for statements from each common school district starting with the lowest numbered district and rotating until all had had an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. Patch called for statements by any patron from District No. 25J, Latham; District No. 31, Blue Mt.; District No. 40, Creswell:

Mr. Tom Wright, Creswell - stated that he was a resident of the Walker area, which was apparently a major source of trouble - wanted to know if the people in the split area would have any representation or if their votes could be counted separately.

Mr. Patch stated that voting would be held by common school district boundaries. Mr. Patch suggested that a survey of the people in the area might possibly be conducted to find out how they feel about the Reorganization.

Mr. Wright asked again if Mr. Patch would explain how the people of the Walker area could make their wishes known. Mr. Wright stated that his interest was to be sure that he held his high school.

Mr. Patch again repeated that the voting would be done by common school districts.

Mr. Patch called for patrons from District No. 45, Cottage Grove:

Mr. Grant Lovegren, Cottage Grove Dist. 45 School Board, asked if the Plan called for the abolishment of the Creswell High School.

Mr. Swanson replied that it did not and read from the Plan, Section 5, Utilization of Existing Buildings and Recommendations Regarding the Location and Construction of New Buildings.

Mr. Lovegren asked if the Committee had considered the possibility of placing Creswell in the Eugene School District.

Mr. Swanson replied that there had been many possibilities considered but at the time this Plan was made the combination of the Creswell and Cottage Grove area seemed to be the best solution.

Mr. Lovegren stated that he did not feel that it was desirable for Creswell to come to Cottage Grove in light of the prevalent public opinion in Creswell against this proposal and he intimated that the Cottage Grove Board did not particularly desire to have the Creswell area incorporated in this Reorganization.

Mr. Roy Duerst, Delight Valley, stated that he felt the attendance was poor because at the original hearing four out of every five questions were answered by the Committee "Well, I don't know" or "We will have to wait and see". Stated that he felt it was very simple to take care of this matter just to turn out when the election was called in their local school district and vote "No".

Mr. Swanson stated that the Committee had studied the organization of school districts throughout the entire County and had found that the efficiency, economy and quality of education was greater in larger school districts. Stated that the Committee did not have the power to specify where schools were to be built or how they would be used. Stated that the combining of assessed valuations in this area was another advantage of the Plan R-2.

Mr. J. G. Griffith, Union High No. 12 Board, stated that he agreed with the District No. 45 Board Member, who stated that the Creswell area should go to Eugene under Reorganization instead of to Cottage Grove. Wanted to know if there was anything that the patrons of the district could do except to go to the polls and vote against the proposal.

Mr. Patch replied that it was possible the State Board of Education may alter or reject the Plan before it has a chance to come to a vote.

Mrs. Charles Thorn, Dorena, asked when the Board would be elected after Reorganization. Mrs. Thorn stated that she felt the situation could be compared to offering a blank check to a person and asking them to fill it in the way they wanted to.

Mr. Patch replied that school district boards have been representing the people for many years and the question was merely one of how much faith we had in board members.

Mr. Wilt pointed out that the seven-man board would be elected to serve only the R-2 area and would not have jurisdiction elsewhere.

Mrs. Doris Olsen, Delight Valley, asked what the plan of procedure would be after this hearing.

Mr. Patch indicated that the State Board would have the responsibility of either approving or rejecting the Plan.

Mrs. Olsen stated that she didn't think there was a purpose for these hearings if there wasn't going to be some changes made as a result of the hearing.

Mr. Overholser, District No. 48, commended the Committee on their work and said it seemed to him the only logical thing to do was to go ahead and vote.

An unidentified patron from Gulp Creek wanted to know what effect this Reorganization would have in his district.

Mr. Patch, in reply, pointed out the first criteria of the law was that each Administrative School District should provide education in Grades 1 through 12, and that this automatically ruled out elementary districts and union high schools. He briefly reviewed the other criteria that were considered in making a Plan, including equalization of financial resources and natural, social and economic communities. (The patron did not understand the Plan and made several vague statements regarding it.)

Mr. Swanson suggested that the patron obtain a copy of the Plan.

Clifford Foster, District No. 48, wanted to know the aims of modern education.

Mr. Patch stated that it was to educate students.

Mr. Lloyd Griggs, Districts No. 45 and U-14J, stated that he felt the Committee had done an excellent job in preparing the Plan but said he had one question about the zoning, and he would be particularly interested in knowing if there was any way that the people in the area could know ahead of time how the district would be zoned.

Mr. Swanson stated that he didn't know at this time where the zone boundaries would lie. He stated that the law provided only that zones be provided so that they contained, as nearly as possible, an equal number in population.

Mr. Patch pointed out that the law definitely states that the zoning will be done after the election is held.

Mr. Stoker stated that he did not believe that administrative costs were considered in computing the per pupil costs that were mentioned in the Plan. He also said that he felt if a district became larger that administration would become more complex and therefore costs would undoubtedly rise.

Mr. Roy Duerst, Delight Valley, wanted to know what would be the ratio of students to teachers and asked if one teacher would teach each grade in the proposed reorganization.

Mr. Wilt, in answer to Mr. Duerst, pointed out that the problems posed by Mr. Duerst were not pertinent to the Plan at the time and were not the responsibility of the Committee - namely, the disposition of classes and assignment of teachers

and the assignment of classes to buildings.

Mr. Wilt stated further that this was an administrative reorganization and it was not the intention of the committee to provide a detailed educational plan that would leave the local board with no freedom to exercise their powers and duties in regard to the operation of the schools.

Meeting adjourned.

P-1

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION PUBLIC HEARING ON
PARTIAL PLAN OF REORGANIZATION R-1
Pleasant Hill Union High School
April 15, 1959

The following members and guests were present: Mrs. Moore Hamilton, State Board of Education; Dennis Patch, Director, School District Reorganization; Ray Swanson, Lane County Committee Chairman; Ed Efteland; Earl Garoutte; William Wilt; Joe Swift, and Wm. R. Woodie, Secretary.

Chairman Ray Swanson opened the meeting and introduced the members and guests.

The Plan R-1 was presented by Ed Efteland. Mr. Efteland described the boundaries of the proposed R-1 and noted the overlapping situation on upper Rattlesnake Creek. He described the adjustment of assets and liabilities pointing out that the agreement called for a sharing of all property, debts, assets and liabilities.

Chairman Swanson introduced Director Dennis Patch who opened the hearing on the Plan.

Mr. Patch stated that the Plan had been presented to the State Board on March 16th, and that the State Board had reviewed the Plan and scheduled this hearing for the purpose of discussing the Plan with the patrons of the district. He stated that the State Board will review the Plan within sixty (60) days of this hearing and will approve or reject it. Within sixty (60) days after the approval an election will be scheduled by the County Committee and the patrons will vote to accept or reject the final Plan. He stated that if the Plan was approved by the voters before April 30th it would become effective on the following July 1st. If it was approved after April 30th it would become effective on the July 1st of the next year. He explained the rules for the conduct of the hearing as listed in the agenda.

Mr. James Large, District No. 71. Stated that he was of the opinion that most of the people knew his stand on Reorganization and pointed out that he was representing the people of his area. Stated that many patrons were more concerned with community pride than they were with the welfare of the children. Stated that it was his understanding there was a petition being circulated to request that Pleasant Hill be eliminated from the proposed Reorganization. Pointed out that the Dexter-Lost Creek area would not be willing to support such a proposal but instead were in favor of the entire Reorganization. Pointed out that he felt, and his patrons felt, that an improved educational situation could be arrived at through Reorganization.

Grover Kelsay, District No. 1. Stated that he felt the State of Oregon, through the Legislature, had adopted the philosophy of Reorganization. Pointed out that eventually all high schools will be of the size commonly known now as A-2 or A-1 schools. Asked the secretary what districts under the proposed Reorganization would remain in "B" size. Secretary

replied that under the proposal only McKenzie, Blachly, and possibly Mapleton, would remain in the "B" classification. Reviewed the history of the Pleasant Hill district pointing out that it had grown from seven (7) small elementary districts. Compared this with the growth throughout the State and pointed out that since Reorganization was a National, State, and County trend, now is the time to approve this Plan.

Earl Drury, District No. U-9, felt that there was a danger in the Plan of causing the district to end up a sort of "financial cripple". Stated that he carried a petition which he would present opposing the Plan as presented, and requesting that 67, 71 and U-9 be placed in one district. Said he felt there were enough signers to this petition to defeat the measure in his area.

Howard Convers, District No. 67, asked for explanation of the 60% rejection feature of the present law. Mr. Patch explained the rejection feature of the Act in its present form.

Jim Large, District No. 71, referred again to his statement that the people in the Dexter-Lost Creek area were not in favor of a Reorganization of Lowell and Fall Creek alone, but instead would favor the entire Reorganization. He pointed out that the Dexter-Lost Creek area contained approximately half of the students in District 71. He stated that if this plan as proposed was not approved that the patrons in his area would seek a transfer of their territory from the Lowell district to Pleasant Hill.

Mr. Brown, District No. 1, pointed out that the nine-man Committee was elected by School District Boards of Lane County and that they had spent many hours and much research in preparing the Plans. Stated that he felt the information that the Committee had distributed to the patrons of the area was accurate and pointed definitely towards the advantages of the Plan and recommended that the Plan should be adopted.

Mrs. Franklin, District No. 1, asked if all of District No. 1 was included in this proposal. Mr. Efteland stated that there had never been any consideration of splitting District No. 1 in their preliminary work.

Mr. Haym, District No. 1, asked for a more specific statement of the criticism offered by Mr. Drury from U-9. He asked if anyone who had signed Mr. Drury's petition would explain what was wrong with the plan.

Howard Convers, District No. U-9 stated that the difficulty of the Plan was that it did not specify definitely what was going to happen to the schools in the area but instead merely pointed out that the Administrative School District Board would make these decisions after Reorganization but that the people wished to know these things before casting their vote.

Meeting adjourned.

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

April 8, 1959

Special meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County School Office with the following members present:

Edgar Rickard	Joe Swift
Ray Swanson	Earl Garoutte
Marvin Hendrickson	William Wilt
Wm. R. Woodie, Secretary	

The following persons were present, at the request of the Committee, to discuss the proposed Partial Plan R-4, comprising School Districts No. 4 and 43:

John Jaqua (Bd. Member #43, Resident Deadmond's Ferry area)
Lowell Swartz (Dist. #43, City of Coburg)
John Luvaas (Attorney for Dist. #43, Coburg Farmers)
Lloyd Millhollen (Superintendent, Dist. #4)

Also present were:

Frank Bocci (Attorney for Dist. #43, City of Coburg)
Kenneth Williams (Superintendent, Dist. #43)

Minutes of the Committee meeting of March 26th, held at Cal Young Junior High School, were read and approved.

Mr. Swanson then opened the meeting for discussion.

Dr. Millhollen - presented the recommendation of the Board of District No. 4, regarding Districts No. 4 and 43: That the election on proposed R-4 not be held prior to May 4th (the date of the annual school meeting), as they felt they could not devote much time to publicity should the election be held before May 4th.

Lowell Swartz - Requested Frank Bocci to speak for him. Bocci stated that District No. 43 has a bond issue in process at present which will not be completed until June 15th. Requested that election on proposed R-4 be held at a much later date.

Lowell Swartz - Stated that petition was presented to Committee previously, requesting that the election be held after July 1, 1959.

Wm. R. Woodie - Informed those present that he had received a call from Dennis Patch, State Director, School District Reorganization, informing him that Partial Plan R-4 had been approved by the State Board.

Kenneth Williams - Informed Committee that he had been requested by one or more board members of District No. 43 to sit in and act as a resource person.

John Jaqua - Who is at present a board member in District No. 43 and resides in the Deadmond Ferry section of School District No. 43, which will become a part of School District No. 4 on June 30, 1959, made the following statements:

1. Patrons were concerned about what happened in District No. 43, but they wished to have the advantages of District No. 4's schools.
2. District No. 43 board knew that bond issue was a calculated risk when it was set up but felt it should go ahead, since it would be necessary to add on to the Grade School building even though the building might be used by District No. 4.

3. He felt that the bond issue is minor in comparison with the education of 300 or 400 children.
4. Desired that election be held prior to May 4th.

John Luvaas - stated the following:

1. School Board of District No. 43 has not officially taken any action on when the election shall be held.
2. Is aware that John Jaqua requests that election be held on or before April 28th.
3. Felt the people of Coburg should not have a year's delay but if it would affect bond election in District No. 4 they would not fight the election being held on May 4th. However, in doing this a suggestion was made to arrange on a tuition basis for 1959-60 and not hold a High School in District No. 43. The following condition was suggested:

That they receive assurance from District No. 43 by letter and an agreement with District No. 4 School Board so that in the event the reorganization election carries another election will be held on the question of suspending high school and transporting grades 9-12 to Eugene. This gives District No. 43 patrons a chance to vote on Reorganization and if it carries gives them an opportunity to vote on the question of whether or not to send their High School children to District No. 4 for 1959-60.

If the above can be agreed upon the group he represents will not fight the request of Eugene to hold the election on May 4th.

Kenneth Williams - Stated the reasons for adding three additional classrooms onto the Grade School building is the result of standardization requirements. It might be possible to squeeze two additional rooms without a bond issue, since approximately \$30,000 is available.

Ray Swanson - If election date is set prior to April 30th, would that invalidate the sale of the bonds in Coburg?

John Jaqua - Yes, and also if election is held on May 4th.

Wm. R. Woodie - If bond issue is invalidated will District No. 43 go ahead and build three rooms?

Kenneth Williams - Would have to revise budget to build three rooms. Might be able to build two rooms with the money available.

Ray Swanson - If Reorganization election fails would it invalidate bonds?

John Jaqua - No, but if election carries, District No. 43's bonds would be cancelled and it would be District No. 4's problem.

Dr. Millhollen - Suggested that John Shuler, Bond Attorney in Portland, be contacted. (A phone call was made to Shuler but he did not know the answer. Suggested they go to the Legislature and clear it up.)

Dr. Millhollen - Risky to hold election until after May 15th, due to issuing of bonds in Eugene. Bocci supported Millhollen's statement.

John Luvaas - Felt certain District No. 4 would be alright but concerned about District No. 43. Suggested that election be held about May 18th, 19th, or 20th.

Ray Swanson - Feels Plan R-4 is sound. Prefers that election be held sometime before July 1st to make it valid July, 1960, and also to give the people who reside in old School District No. 49 (Deadmond's Ferry) an opportunity to express their opinion. Does not wish to upset any plan District No. 4 and District No. 43 has on bonds. Suggested that they set the election date back far enough not to invalidate District No. 4 bonds and still give the people of Deadmond's Ferry area a chance to vote.

Frank Bocci - Regarding Swanson's comments - suggested election between June 15th and June 30th (except 60-day limitation) in order to make effective date July 1, 1960. Main issue is to save District No. 4's bond issue.

Lowell Swartz - It was the feeling of the 133 persons signing the petition to wait until District No. 4 builds a high school toward Coburg. They wish assurance the High School will be built on Queens Way. Would rather stick out two more years until High School is built.

Dr. Millhollen - Might have Queens Way High School by 1962.

Lowell Swartz - Does not wish to send high school students to North Eugene High.

MOTION was made by Edgar Rickard that election on Partial Plan R-4, comprising School Districts No. 4 and 43, be set for May 19th. Seconded by Marvin Hendrickson. Motion carried.

YES ----- 6
NO ----- 0
ABSENT --- 3

The secretary was authorized and directed to prepare election notices and materials as required by law.

Mr. Woodie presented map showing Partial Plans of Lane County. Brought attention to District No. 1J, Douglas County (Joint with Lane County 102J) and felt committee must prepare for an arbitration hearing on this disputed territory.

Mr. Woodie also presented to Committee a chart to be included with proposed R-5, relative to suggested attendance units.

Committee was reminded of the following State and Committee hearings:

State Hearings

- April 15 --- R-1, 8:00 p.m., Pleasant Hill Union High School.
- April 16 --- R-2, 8:00 p.m., Cottage Grove Union High School.
- April 20 --- R-3, 8:00 p.m., Oakridge High School.

Committee Hearings

- April 28 --- R-11, 3:00 p.m., Laurel Elementary, 1401 Laurel St., Junction City.
- April 28 --- R-12, 8:00 p.m., Willamette High, 1801 Echo Hollow Rd., Eugene.

Next meeting of the Committee will be held on April 28th following R-12 hearing at Willamette High School.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION

Ray Swanson, Chm.
_____, Sec.

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

March 26, 1959

A special meeting of the Lane County Committee for Reorganization of School Districts was held at Cal Young Junior High School commencing at 7:00 o'clock p.m., with the following present:

Ray Swanson	Edward Efteland
Joe Swift	Clarence Jackson
Edgar Rickard	William Wilt (present only for meeting following R-4 State Hearing)
Marvin Hendrickson	Wm. R. Woodie, Secretary

Minutes of the meetings of January 20th, January 26th, February 9th, February 16th and February 19th were read. Motion was made by Mr. Efteland, seconded by Mr. Hendrickson, and carried that said minutes be approved.

Action was taken on the following Partial Plans:

R-5 - Motion was made by Mr. Hendrickson and seconded by Mr. Rickard, to approve Partial Plan R-5 and submit to the State Board in present form.

Yes ----- 5
No ----- 0
Absent -- 4

R-6 - Motion was made by Mr. Rickard and seconded by Mr. Swift, to approve Partial Plan R-6 and submit to the State Board in present form.

Yes ----- 5
No ----- 0
Absent -- 4

R-7 - Motion was made by Mr. Hendrickson and seconded by Mr. Rickard, to approve Partial Plan R-7 and submit to the State Board in present form:

Yes ----- 5
No ----- 0
Absent -- 4

R-8 - Motion was made by Mr. Swift and seconded by Mr. Hendrickson, to approve Partial Plan R-8 and submit to the State Board in present form:

Yes ----- 5
No ----- 0
Absent -- 4

R-9 - Motion was made by Mr. Rickard and seconded by Mr. Swift, to approve Partial Plan R-9 and submit to the State Board in present form:

Yes ----- 5
No ----- 0
Absent -- 4

R-10 - Motion was made by Mr. Hendrickson and seconded by Mr. Efteland, to approve Partial Plan R-~~10~~¹⁰ and submit to the State Board in present form.

Yes ----- 5
No ----- 0
Absent -- 4

Motion was made by Mr. Hendrickson and seconded by Mr. Efteland, to set the date of April 28 at 3:00 P.M., Laurel Elementary School, Junction City for the public hearing on proposed R-11 (comprised of District No. 69J, Lane County, and District No. 69J, Linn County). Motion carried.

Motion was made by Mr. Hendrickson and seconded by Mr. Efteland, to set the date of April 28 at 8:00 P.M., Willamette High School, for the public hearing on proposed R-12 (comprised of Districts No. 52 and No. 186). Motion carried.

Letter was presented to the Committee from the School Board of School District No. 4, Eugene, stating their stand on the R-4 election (if approved by the State Board) and requesting that the election not be held prior to May 4th.

Committee was temporarily adjourned for State hearing on R-4..

Committee reconvened at 9:30 p.m. following adjournment of State Hearing on R-4.

Date of Wednesday, April 8th, at 3:30 P.M. was set for special meeting of Committee. The secretary was instructed to invite the following to appear before the Committee:

John Luvaas
John Jaqua
Lowell Swartz
Lloyd Millhollen

Letter was presented from Mr. & Mrs. R. E. Yates, Mr. & Mrs. Wm. Friesen, Mr. & Mrs. Al B. Adams, Mr. & Mrs. Norman L. Frank, and Mr. & Mrs. Robert Meisenholder, requesting the Committee's approval of their proposal to transfer certain described territory from School District No. 52 to School District No. 4.

Motion was made by Mr. Hendrickson and seconded by Mr. Efteland, to table request until a more accurate representation is obtained from the area. Motion carried.

Motion was made by Mr. Hendrickson, seconded by Mr. Rickard, and carried, to request a 30-day extension from State Board to submit all Plans.

Letter was presented from Representative Montgomery relative to the Oregon State Grange's stand on House Bill #40.

Letter was presented from Mrs. L. D. Montgomery of District No. 118, also enclosing petition, indicating the number of people who would not favor the consolidation of Districts No. 88 and 118.

Page 3-Reorganization minutes

The Committee considered the above proposed consolidation election and motion was made by Mr. Rickard, seconded by Mr. Wilt, and carried, that School Districts No. 88 and 118 be permitted to conduct a consolidation election under Section 42 of the Reorganization Law.

Letter and petition was presented from School District No. 143, stating they are desirous of joining Lincoln County Unit School District through the mechanics of the State Reorganization Law.


Letter was presented from Kenneth Barneburg, Superintendent of Douglas County, informing the Committee that he had posted Douglas County Hearing Notices in Latham and Linslaw (Lane County).

Meeting adjourned.

Lane County Committee for School
District Reorganization



Chairman



Secretary

B-4

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION PUBLIC HEARING
ON PARTIAL PLAN OF REORGANIZATION FOR
LANE COUNTY, Cal Young Jr. High School
March 26, 1959
8:00 P.M.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Ray Swanson. Members present were Ray Swanson, Chairman, William Wilt, Joe Swift, Pat Rickard, Dennis Patch, State Director, Ed Efteland, Marvin Hendrickson, Mr. Jones of the State Board of Education, and Secretary Wm. Woodie.

The Chairman asked Mr. Efteland to present the plan for R-4. Mr. Efteland briefly reviewed the plan R-4 as it was presented at the preliminary hearing on February 16, 1959. Chairman Swanson relinquished the chair to Dennis Patch for the beginning of the State Board hearing, on R-4.

Mr. Patch stated that the plan had been presented to the State Board on March 3, and according to law the State Hearing had to be held within 30 days. He stated that within 60 days of the State Hearing the State Board must meet and adopt or reject the plan. Mr. Patch stated that if there were questions during the Hearing regarding the plan that he would direct the questions to Mr. Swanson who could answer them or call on any member of the Committee.

John Luvaas, District 4. Mr. Luvaas asked if the Committee intended to get into the question as to when the election would be held or if the meeting was going to be devoted entirely to the plan. Mr. Patch stated that Mr. Luvaas should go ahead and make his statement. Mr. Luvaas stated that he represented a large group of people from District 43 who wanted to see this plan go through. Speaking as a resident of the Eugene district he stated that he was looking forward to and would like to have the Coburg people in the Eugene district because Coburg and Eugene were all a part of the same social, economic community. He pointed out that he thought Coburg needed this plan particularly in regard to their high school youngsters, but that the Eugene school district did not necessarily need this plan, but their policy always had been not to actively seek consolidation of outlying areas with Eugene. He stated that he thought it was important that the election be held soon, and stated that one portion of the Coburg district had petitioned successfully to be admitted to Eugene. He said that he believed that the election should be held prior to the time that this transfer is accomplished. He reminded the Committee that there was still time to hold the election prior to April 30th so that it would become effective this July 1st.

Mr. Patch called on June McPherson, District 43. Mrs. McPherson stated that she had a petition signed by a number of persons in the Coburg area asking that the election be held so that it could become effective prior to July 1st. She stated that there were only 18 possible voters in the Deadmond's Ferry area and that she felt that if people did not want them to vote along with the rest of Coburg, that the 18 votes would hardly make any difference. She stated that she definitely felt that the election should be held before April 30th.

Mr. Patch called on Otto Vonderheit, chairman of the School Board, District 4. Mr. Vonderheit asked when the action would take place

for the State Board to either approve or reject the plan. Mr. Patch stated that this would occur on April 7th. Mr. Vonderheit asked who would set the date of the election. Mr. Patch answered that the local committee would set the date. In further explanation Mr. Patch stated that within 30 days after the State Board approves and returns the plan a Committee must set an election. He stated that it was his understanding that the Committee had considered holding an election just one week prior to the annual school meeting upon which date Eugene would be voting on their budget. He stated that the Eugene Board had been unable to get a decision regarding jeopardizing the bond issue that they have voted since they thought that some of the bonds would not be issued by the time the reorganization election occurred if it was held on April 27th. Mr. Vonderheit also stated that it might be advisable to hold the reorganization election on May 4th at the same time the district election is held. He stated that if the reorganization were successful, it would be necessary to add three rooms to the Cal Young school, and the funds for this project had not been budgeted, but if one more year were allowed to lapse it would be possible for the board to make proper plans for all the children of the Coburg district. He stated that the budget was at a stage of development where it would be difficult to alter it at this date. He again repeated that he felt that it would be unwise to hold a reorganization election prior to the time when Eugene has their own district election on May 4th.

Lowell Swartz, Coburg School district presented a petition requesting an election to be called on the question of reorganization after July 1, 1959 and signed by 135 persons. Mr. Patch asked if there were any additional persons from School District 4 wishing to make statements.

Otto Vonderheit, Eugene, stated that he wished to make it clear that the Eugene School Board is not opposed to this reorganization in any way or manner, but only that they wished to have the election take place on May 4th or after.

Mrs. Frazell from Coburg requested what advantages would be had for her partially-sighted youngster if he attended Eugene instead of Coburg. Mr. Julfs, assistant superintendent of Eugene district, was called upon to answer the question and stated that he felt the facilities for non-sighted students would continue to be improved in the Eugene district.

Mr. Patch called on anyone from District No. 4 to make a statement or ask a question, and then called on patrons from District 43. Mr. McPherson, District 43, asked what the attitude of the Eugene district would be if the election carried after April 30th and would not become effective until July 1 of the following year. Mr. Swanson said that he wondered what might be the effect of the reorganization if after its passage but before its effective date the Coburg district should impose upon itself further indebtedness. He then referred this general problem to Otto Vonderheit.

Mr. Vonderheit stated that if the reorganization election carried that it would be the duty of the Eugene district and the Coburg administration to work closely together during the period before the effective date. He stated that he was not prepared to answer the question as to whether or not the bonds could be voted after the election had been held on reorganization. Mr. Swanson pointed out that the plan contained a section describing the distribution of all assets and liabilities and if

subsequent liabilities were added they would not be a part of the plan and it would appear therefore, that bond issues voted after the election would not be valid.

Ken Williams, Superintendent of District 43, stated that since the consolidation election recently held was defeated that the Coburg district board had gone ahead to accomplish the needed improvements in the elementary school and stated that these improvements would be needed regardless of which district the school resided in. He also pointed out that since the question of reorganizing the two districts had come up the two administrations had worked very closely together, and stated that if the two districts merged they would each use their own budgets anyway.

John Jaqua, District 43 stated that he felt postponing this election another six days would not be appropriate since it would result in the Coburg district existing as is for another year when the plan called for a complete reorganization of the two districts.

Forrest Dornon, of the Coburg School district wanted to know what percentage of votes were necessary to approve the reorganized district, and what percentage was necessary to turn it down. Mr. Patch stated that the first requirement was that a favorable vote be cast in the overall district. He stated that the second premise was that if the plan carried in the first election, but if one of the pre-existing districts rejected it by a 60% vote or more, that district would have an opportunity to file a petition within 30 days requesting a second election to be held in that district alone on the question of whether or not they wished to be included in the administrative school district. This second election would require a simple majority to approve or reject the question of whether they would be included or not.

Harry Harbert, Coburg in conjunction with John Jaqua asked if the Secretary, Mr. Woodie would make a statement as to what his beliefs were as to the reorganization. Mr. Woodie stated that he was in favor of the reorganization. Mr. Jaqua asked when Mr. Woodie thought the election should take place. Mr. Woodie stated that he thought the election should take place before July 1, but declined to make any opinion as to whether it should take place prior to April 30th.

Mr. Swanson directed the attention of the group to a letter that had been received from School District 4 requesting reasons why the election should be held on or after May 4th. He stated that the Committee had to make a decision as to when the election would be held. John Luvaas stated that he felt that it would be possible to have an opinion from the State Bonding Attorney whether or not this reorganization would affect or imperil Eugene's bond issue, and stated that he did not feel that a reorganization election on the 27th, 28th, 29th would imperil the bond election, and stated that if Coburg's bond election passed on April 1st it would be impossible for them to issue bonds by the 27th. He stated that he did not feel that it was fair to the people of Coburg to delay the election beyond April 30th.

Otto Vonderheit, Eugene, asked Mr. Luvaas what would happen to the Coburg bonds if the election was held April 27th. Mr. Luvaas stated that under these circumstances the Coburg bonds could not be issued. He said he thought it was correct to state that there would be no bond money in Coburg whether or not the bond issue was voted before April 30th or on May 4th. Mrs. Jaqua asked if it would be possible to hold the election on

May 4th and still become effective on July 1. Mr. Patch stated that this particular feature was a feature of the law and therefore the State Board had no control over it. Mr. Swanson stated that he felt that maybe Mrs. Jaqua had the solution to the problem.

William Wilt asked Mr. Patch if he knew of any way the two districts could become unofficially combined prior to the effective date set up in the law on July 1, 1960. Mr. Patch replied that he felt an agreement could be reached between the two districts for the interim period.

Mr. McPherson, Coburg asked if his understanding was correct that even though a bond issue was passed this spring there would still be no building in Coburg for this next year. He stated that he did not feel that there was any reason in having a bond election if this was true, since he hoped that they would be in Eugene by that time. Mr. Williams stated that the reason that the Coburg school board decided to take a chance on their bond issue was to provide for repairing and building in the district that would bring the school up to state standards, if the reorganization election should fail, but that if the reorganization election carried the bond issue would not be issued. He stated that he felt that even if the bond issue were defeated or was invalidated that he thought the district could build the additional rooms needed with available cash on hand. Mr. Luvaas questioned the statement made by Mr. Williams that district 43 and district 4 could operate with their own budgets if they consolidated after the date the budgets were prepared. He stated that if there was a merger after budgets had been prepared that the consolidated district would be able to operate by merging both budgets in assets and estimated expenditures.

Mr. Patch declared the hearing adjourned.

PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED R-8 & R-9
Springfield Junior High School
March 9, 1959

A public hearing on Administrative School Districts R-8 and R-9, was held in the Springfield Junior High School on March 9th, 8:00 P.M. with Ray Swanson, Pat Rickard, William Wilt, Ed Efteland, and Secretary Wm. R. Woodie present. The Secretary, at the request of the Chairman, explained the Reorganization Law. Mr. William Wilt presented the plan R-9. In discussing Item V, Utilization of Existing Buildings and Recommendations regarding the location and construction of new buildings, Mr. Wilt emphasized the fact that the decision concerning the use and location of buildings and attendance unit boundaries would be the responsibility of the reorganized school district board and that the Committee can only make recommendations.

Discussing Item VI, Adjustment of Assets and Liabilities, Mr. Wilt pointed out that the \$12,000 increase in teacher's salaries in Marcola which is planned for next year will cost the taxpayers approximately 7½ mills while under the proposed reorganization a million dollar bond issue would cost the taxpayers approximately 3½ mills. He further pointed out that under the proposed reorganization 2 million dollars worth of bonds could be obtained for the same millage rate that the taxpayers of Marcola would be paying for a \$12,000 increase in teacher's salaries.

In explaining Schedule 3, Mr. Wilt pointed out that there apparently was considerable building capacity remaining in Springfield in grades 7 through 12.

In explaining Schedule 4, Mr. Wilt directed the attention of the group to the particular courses that were offered in Springfield High School that were not offered in Marcola High School.

Mr. Swanson called for comments of persons from the McKenzie School District who wished to comment on the Committee's proposal for that area. Ben Huntington, Superintendent of School District 68, McKenzie stated that he felt that the proposal of the Committee for district 68 would be acceptable. David Burwell from district 68 asked who had the responsibility for zoning the school district after it had become reorganized. The Chairman answered that the zoning would be done by the Committee according to population. Mr. Burwell asked if there would be any such thing as a school district member at large. Mr. Swanson replied that except in districts of over 40,000 population they would all be elected from zones. Mr. Burwell asked when the Committee would take care of the zoning. Mr. Swanson answered that there would be no zoning until after the election had taken place. Frances O'Brien from district 68 wanted to know if directors would serve the same term of office. Mr. Swanson quoted the law stating that School Board Members would serve for five years. Mr. Huntington asked when the new board took over. Mr. Swanson replied that the new board would be elected

upon the completion of the reorganization.

Mrs. Leo Paschelke, School District 79. Mrs. Paschelke read a prepared statement. She said that they had been accused of hating the Springfield district and for this reason they voted down the consolidation. She wished to assure those present that they had a great deal of admiration for the people of Springfield in providing for the many thousands of children they had to educate. She pointed out that Marcola had been providing education in grades 1 through 12 for a long time. She indicated that Marcola's expansion had already taken place and had been met by the school board. Also indicated that their indebtedness was practically paid off. Stated that reports in regard to the course offerings in Marcola were exaggerated, and stated that one teacher had been maintained on the faculty for the past several years who was ready to teach one of two foreign languages to any student who requested it. Pointed out the advantages in having the teachers know the students better, and the advantages of having parents, teachers, and pupils in closer personal relationships. Stated that there were many residents in the Marcola area, from her personal knowledge, who had moved into the area in order to place their pupils in small schools. Indicated that the evidence was available to support the fact that Marcola High School graduates were able to hold their own academically with the graduates of any school district. Indicated in summary, that she felt that the reasons that she had cited indicated a clear case against consolidation of Marcola and Springfield.

In reply to Mrs. Paschelke, Mr. Swanson cited factors taken under consideration by the Committee in preparing reorganization plans, pointing out that items other than a 12 year program were considered by the Committee. Mr. Swanson again referred to the comparison of courses between the two districts pointing out the difference in the number offered and in the number of preparations expected by the teachers in each respective district.

Mr. Wilt asked the Springfield Board members who were present what the plans were in Springfield for the building of a new high school and what they felt would be done with the students if this reorganization became effective. Mr. Beall indicated that the new high school on 58th avenue would probably be started in September and pointed out that the addition of all the high school students of Marcola would accomplish approximately one child per classroom. Dale Parnell, District 19 asked what the millage rates would be in the respective school districts if there were no county equalization. Mr. Woodie indicated that the millage rate in Marcola would be reduced and the millage rate in Springfield would be increased, since Marcola was a contributing district to the amount of better than \$5,000. Mr. Wilt pointed out that if the Springfield district were to have a second high school ready to occupy by 1960 that it would be as soon as Marcola would be ready to put students in this school. The Chairman of the Springfield District School Board stated that the Springfield Board felt that the Committee had prepared a good plan and stated that he wished to make it clear that the Springfield Board would do the best they could by the Marcola students should the reorganization become effective.

Meeting adjourned.


Chairman

Secretary

RE-HEARING ON PROPOSED R-6
Mapleton High School
March 4, 1959

A hearing was held at the Mapleton High School on the proposed Administrative School District R-6 at 8:00 P.M. with 27 persons present. The chairman, Mr. Brewer, asked the Secretary to explain the revised plan. The Secretary pointed out that the plan had been changed so that all school children presently residing in District 102J would attend Mapleton schools. An adjusted plan was distributed to those present showing the western boundary of the proposed district and where it was changed to include approximately three (3) sections of land presently in the Elmira Union High School.

The chairman called for questions or statements from the audience.

1. What effect does Elmira High School have on this reorganization?

Answer: Both the proposed R-5 and R-6 must be approved before either can become effective.

2. Explain election of directors in a reorganized district.

Answer: Directors would be elected by the entire electorate, but must reside one each in seven (7) zones.

3. Will all school districts have seven-man boards if reorganized?

Answer: Yes.

4. Please explain the rejection feature of the law.

Answer: Mr. Brewer explained in detail the process wherein a school district may reject.

5. How long can districts continue to reject plans?

Answer: As long as they can command a majority of the voters. (60%)

6. When does the Non-High school law go out of existence?

Answer: July 1, 1960.

Mr. Brewer explained that a consolidation election under Section 42 of the Law would take place on March 9th in Mapleton and Deadwood.

Meeting adjourned.



Chairman

Secretary

PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED R-10
District No. 90, Blachly
February 25, 1959

Hearing was held on Administrative School District R-10 in the high school gymnasium with approximately 95 patrons present from School District No. 90 and the following members of the Reorganization Committee - Ray Swanson, Chairman; Ed Efteland; Wm. R. Woodie, Secretary; and Margaret Blanton, Assistant Clerk.

Mrs. Winifred Hult, Alternate to the Committee was also present in the audience.

Mr. Swanson requested the secretary to present an outline of the Reorganization Law.

There were seven (7) people present from the Junction City district and two (2) people present from Mapleton School district.

Mr. Swanson pointed out to the group that the Committee had made no specific plans for this area and went over basic statistics involving the sizes of the districts and the relative wealth, cost of operating schools, and enrollments, as they affected the Blachly School district. He then called for a 10-minute break preceding the question and answer period.

Following the break Mr. Swanson asked for questions from the group.

Mr. Swanson indicated that an opinion poll had been received indicating that there was a difference of opinion on the part of the people in the Mt. Carmel area concerning their school attendance.

Mr. James from School District No. 69J stated that the opinion poll was an accurate representation of the wishes of the people in the Mt. Carmel area regarding their attendance unit.

Mr. Hamper from District No. 90 wants to know what the Committee's decision was in regard to District No. 90.

Mr. Swanson repeated that the Committee has made no recommendation for a change for the Blachly school district. Mr. Swanson stated that the hearing was held in Blachly because of an opinion on the Committee that there might be some persons who would like to suggest a plan or a change for the Blachly School District.

Warren Marshall, Superintendent, School District No. 90, asked if District No. 90 would rank 11th of the 12 reorganizations in wealth.

Mr. Swanson stated that this was not the case but that their millage rate would rank 2nd highest.

Mr. Marshall asked which district would have a higher millage rate than Blachly.

Mr. Swanson stated that this district would be the proposed R-1 which would have the highest millage rate of all proposed districts.

Winifred Hult, District No. 90, stated that she thought the hearing should be held in Blachly in order that the community would have the best chance of understanding the Reorganization program. Mrs. Hult expressed her appreciation for the Committee coming to Blachly in order that they might be more fully informed about the Reorganization program in case some of the patrons in Blachly should desire to have change accomplished.

Ed. Steinhauer from Blachly stated that he felt the distance to either Junction City or Mapleton was an excessive distance for students to travel to school. Also stated, that if either of these districts had facilities somewhat closer that the people in the area would be very much interested in a consolidation movement.

Mr. Swanson explained in detail the proposed millage rates for all of the twelve (12) proposed administrative school districts.

Mr. Efteland stated that he had been contacted prior to the meeting in regard to a difference of opinion on Reorganization centered in the old Mt. Carmel district. He stated that the Committee had attempted to organize school districts throughout the county in such a fashion that the control would still be retained in each local area by the local citizens. He suggested that the opinion poll that had been circulated would have been better if counsel had been secured since the questionnaire was circulated by persons unknown.

Mr. Swanson directed the attention of the group to two typographical errors in the data presented to the group, pointing out that where the average assessed value per census child in Lane County stated \$6,443 the figure should be \$3,881. Pointed out that in the operating costs there was an error in the bonded debt of District No. 90, where it read \$150,000 it should have been \$15,000.

Mr. Vorhees, Mt. Carmel, stated that the opinion poll had been circulated by him in an attempt to survey the wishes of the people in the area in case they should desire some change in their school boundaries.

Mrs. Miller, District No. 69J, asked if a proposed boundary change in the Mt. Carmel district would be acted upon by the Committee at this time. She further stated that the people in that area had worked five years to become consolidated with Junction City and would not want to lose that status.

Mr. Swanson indicated that this particular change would not appear to be too favorable due to the apparent opinion of the people in the area as expressed by the opinion poll. Mr. Swanson asked the secretary to explain the procedures in boundary changes under Section 42 of the Act.

Mr. Woodie stated that a boundary change by action of the Boundary Board ordinarily would not take a vote of the people involved but would require instead the permission of the Reorganization Committee followed by a petition to the District Boundary Board who would decide whether or not the change of territory should be made.

Meeting was adjourned.



Chairman

Secretary

PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED R-5
Elmira High School
February 23, 1959

Members present: Ray Swanson, Edgar Rickard, William Wilt, Joe Swift, and Edward Efteland; Auditor, Ronald Babcock; Wm. R. Woodie, Secretary; and, Margaret Blanton, Assistant Clerk.

The chairman called upon the secretary to explain the Reorganization Law.

Mr. Charles Foster, alternate to the Committee, was present as a guest.

The Preliminary Plan was presented by Mr. Swanson. In referring to Item V, Mr. Swanson pointed out that only the boundaries and the adjustment of assets and liabilities would be binding upon the reorganized school district board. He also pointed out that the attendance units would be designated and controlled by the reorganized school district boards. Mr. Swanson pointed out the difference existing at present in the millage rates in various Lane County districts and suggested that the reorganization will accomplish a reduction in the spread of millage rates.

Upon completing the presentation of the Plan, Mr. Swanson called for a 10 minute recess.

At the conclusion of the recess there were five people registered to speak.

Mrs. Dale A. Riddle, District No. 66		
Mr. Dale Riddle,	"	"
Mrs. John Gurton,	"	"
Mr. Edward Cooper,	"	"
Mr. R. E. Berry,	"	"

Mrs. Dale Riddle stated that she came from a rural area in California and moved into the Crow-Applegate district because they felt it met their needs. Stated that she believes a smaller school is better, at least for her youngsters. Also stated that she believed there was a tendency for the bad students to obtain a larger following in bigger schools than they could in small schools.

Mr. Wilt stated that most of the benefits attributed to reorganization occurred in the high school grades.

Mr. Swanson asked if any of her children attended college after high school.

Mrs. Riddle replied that they had not.

Mr. Dale Riddle, District No. 66, referred to the California District where they recently lived and the consolidation attempt that was held there. Stated that their taxes increased, their transportation troubles increased, and they did not feel that education was improved.

Mr. Efteland questioned Mr. Riddle about the area he was from.

Mr. Swanson asked about the enrolment in the school.

Mr. Riddle replied about 200, before the consolidation.

Mrs. Riddle stated that after consolidation the schools ran double sessions.

Mr. Riddle indicated that in the California district where he lived it was the suburban areas or the rural areas that was supporting the rapid growth of the cities.

Mr. Efteland pointed out to Mr. Riddle that there were only 33,000 youngsters in daily attendance in all of Lane County and about 160,000 in Los Angeles. Pointed out that the Committee is attempting to do as far a job as possible in recommending twelve (12) districts for 33,000 students. Mr. Efteland pointed out that Elmira Union High School was chosen for this hearing in accordance with a policy adopted by the Committee. Directed the attention of the group to the difference in the number of courses offered between the high schools presently existing in R-5 and Eugene. Also stated that he felt the Reorganization was within the limits of size that would allow for patrons to contact their school board members with problems directly.

Mr. Swanson pointed out to the Riddle's that the plan calls for all of the territory in the County being incorporated into Administrative School Districts. Mr. Swanson pointed out that the parents of many of the children now attending in the Elmira Union High School area were presently residing and contributing to the economy of the Crow-Applegate district.

Mrs. John Gurton, District No. 66, stated that she felt the basic education at Crow-Applegate was good. Does not believe there is any reason for re-organization of this area because the education is top-notch at the present time.

Mr. Edward Cooper, Superintendent, District No. 66, stated that he felt that it was insufficient information presented to make a decision. Mr. Cooper stated again that he hasn't been able to find the answer for this area.

Mr. Wilt stated that the Committee had spent over a year working on this particular proposal. Suggested that some of the answers to Mr. Cooper's questions might be found in the County Superintendent's Office. Suggested several points that should be investigated before the voters make up their minds. Indicated that the law did not provide sufficient funds to do the job they should have done in the first place.

Mr. Swanson asked Mr. Cooper if he thought it would be possible to estimate millage rates more accurately.

Mr. Cooper stated that he thought it could be computed within five mills.

Mr. Wilt pointed out that the computation of the millage figures has not taken into account any savings or any increase in expenses. Mr. Wilt pointed out that 5.0 mills in R-5 would represent \$36,000.

Mr. Efteland asked Mr. Cooper if he was for or against the proposal.

Mr. Cooper replied that he did not know.

Mr. Efteland referred to the comparison in operating millage rates between Junction City and the proposed R-5, showing that the predicted millage in the R-5 was more than the actual operating millage existing in Junction City, and that the two districts were comparable. Mr. Efteland suggested that Mr. Cooper obtain the criteria supplied by the State Board of Education and invited him to participate in some of the Reorganization Committee meetings.

Mr. Cooper stated that he did not find anything in the report that he felt was a bad thing.

Mr. R. E. Berry, District No. 66, indicated that he did not wish to speak, that he had given his time to Mr. Cooper.

Mr. Swanson read from the list of questions supplied the Committee by the Crow-Applegate P.T.A.:

1. Have all other possibilities been investigated? If so, what are the alternatives?

Mr. Swanson said that other possibilities had been investigated but he did not believe we could ever investigate all possibilities. Referred to the part of the law that specifies that we should consider natural, social, and economic communities. Cited several alternative consolidations or reorganizations that have been considered. Stated that in the beliefs of the Committee the R-5 as proposed was the most equitable solution.

2. Would double bus runs be continued at Lorane?

Stated that the bus runs would be the business of the reorganized school district board, but indicated that the board would no doubt attempt to run the buses in the most efficient manner.

3. Where would the students from Wolf Creek and Hadleyville attend elementary school?

Stated that the Central School could be utilized for a primary unit. Cited Veneta as a possible attendance unit for the Wolf Creek students.

4. Would the school at Central be continued? If so, how many grades would be taught there?

Continuation of the school at Central and the grades that are taught there would be decided by the board of the reorganized school district.

5. Would it be necessary to operate some elementary schools with more than one grade to a teacher.

Swanson stated that there were two schools that had more than one grade per teacher. Stated that it did not appear to him that it would be necessary at the present time under this reorganization to split grades.

6. If the answer to question five is 'yes', would some pupils, now attending elementary schools with one grade per teacher, be changed to a school with more than one grade per teacher?

Mr. Swanson stated that it would be highly unlikely that any students now attending schools with one grade per teacher would be transferred to schools with more than one grade per teacher.

7. If through reorganization an increased program of studies were made possible at the junior high and secondary level would the reorganization also result in sufficient available wealth to realize the full potentialities of the change?

Pointed out that the Plan had stated that this junior high school would compare favorably with junior high schools in other parts of the state. Stated that he and Mr. Babcock would reply relative to this question at a later time.

8. Has the possibility of growth in population been considered? If so, what is the predicted pattern?

Mr. Swanson stated that the over-all pattern of enrolment in the whole district would indicate a slow but steady growth.

9. One of the apparent problems of the area included in R-5 is the number of children in relation to the assessed valuation. Has the reorganization committee considered these two factors without regard for existing district boundaries? In other words, has a minimum valuation for a maximum of children been considered?

Stated that the Committee has not set any minimum standards for assessed value per pupil below which they would allow any district to go.

10. Does a study of the probable educational improvements inherent in R-5 reveal that no substantial minority will be adversely affected.

11. Stated that it would be difficult to make any change without someone feeling they had been adversely affected.

11. What are the weaknesses, if any, in the plan?

Stated that the disadvantage that he saw would lie in transportation and stated that due to the fact that the district would go to a junior high under this reorganization it would require some change in the transportation pattern which a few individuals might look upon as an inconvenience.

12. What would the relative financial position of R-5 be, after reorganization, with other proposed reorganized areas in the county? In the state?

Mr. Swanson called on Mr. Babcock. Mr. Babcock called attention to Schedule I showing the predicted millage rates for the twelve (12) proposed reorganizations. Mr. Babcock concluded that the financial

condition for position of R-5 would be about average compared to other districts in the county. Mr. Swanson pointed out that a determining factor in this reorganization would not be the relative financial condition of the consolidated District No. 66 as opposed to the consolidated Elmira Union High School.

Mr. Swanson called for direct questions from the floor.

Vern Bloom, District No. 66 - In case the schools were consolidated how would the boards be elected?

Mr. Swanson stated that the board would continue in existence until the new board was elected. Mr. Swanson stated the earliest date the consolidation could be effected would be a year from now. Mr. Swanson stated that someone had requested him to clarify the voting procedures on the 60% rejection. He reviewed the voting procedures.

Mr. Keiper, District No. 66 - Asked what happens if one district or more rejects the Plan.

Mr. Wilt stated that if one district rejects the Plan would fail as far as that particular district is concerned.

Mr. Blazer, District No. 66, stated he felt he paid his share of taxes. As a matter of fact he might pay more than his share. Stated that he was opposed to any consolidation with an urban area.

Mr. Wilt asked Mr. Blazer if he felt that it would be advisable for his school to incorporate new subjects for better opportunities by becoming bigger.

Mr. Blazer pointed out that when districts get too big the people lost interest in the schools.

An unidentified patron from District No. 28 asked the question - in the event the plan failed what would happen to the junior high school program?

Mr. Swanson answered - that the junior high school program was not a certainty under any circumstances, bringing out the point that no present district has a sufficient enrolment to support a junior high school program on their own.

Mr. Kelly, District No. 44, asked if there had been any consideration given to the limitation of number of pupils, for instance, limiting each school to 300 pupils.

Mr. Swanson stated that an investigation had been made into the respective size of schools and it was found that none approached a size that the Committee felt was too large.

Mr. Riddle, District No. 66, stated that he understood the primary objective was for a better education. Stated that most of the things for a better education were confined to the high school and junior high school. Stated that the elementary school at Crow-Applegate was a very fine school and stated that his children would be transported to another school and would probably be getting poorer education.

Mr. Efteland asked recognition and referred to the fact that there was a member present at this assembly who tried to engineer the election of this board in order to combat the prevalent idea that the larger districts would dominate and try to reach out and take in the rural areas. Pointed out that this had not occurred. Stated that he felt that the question would be settled on financial basis. Mr. Efteland stated that after hearing evidence he could not see any place where the plan might be improved.

Mr. Utter spoke in favor of the Plan, said that he thought this plan would offer a very desirable tax base upon which to build a more desirable school system.

Mr. Stephen Ford, District No. 66, stated he felt District No. 66 was operating an excellent school system and criticism of small districts did not apply to this district. Stated that his taxes were presently so high that they exceeded the amount for which he could rent his farm. Stated that he is going to be asked to vote yes or no on this subject and with nothing concrete upon which to base his opinion. Stated that he was viewing this proposition from a personal and selfish basis.

An unidentified patron from Noti district stated that he felt the Noti district was doing as good a job of education as being done anywhere in the County. Asked why the millage had increased so much in Noti while the tax base did not increase proportionately. Mr. Swanson replied that the millage change was due to changes in the rural school district law.

Frank Walker, District No. 44, asked if there had been any proposed changes in the rejection feature of the law. Mr. Swanson replied that there had not.

Meeting adjourned.


Chairman

Secretary

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE
February 19, 1959

A special meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held at the Pleasant Hill Union High School on Thursday, February 19, 1959, following the public hearing on proposed ASD R-1, with the following present:

Ray Swanson
Joe Swift
Paul Ehinger
Edgar Rickard

Wm. Wilt
Edward Efteland
Marvin Hendrickson
Wm. R. Woodie, Secretary

The Committee discussed the matter of taking action on Proposed R-1 (Comprising School Districts No. 1-Pleasant Hill, No. 67-Fall Creek, No. 71-Lowell, No. U-9-Lowell Union High, and No. U-1-Pleasant Hill Union High).

Motion was made by Mr. Swift and seconded by Mr. Wilt, to adopt and submit ASD R-1 to State in proposed form. The vote was as follows:

YES - 6

NO - 0

1 abstained (Ehinger)


Attention was called to the next hearing to be held at the Elmira High School on Monday, February 23rd, on proposed R-5.

Meeting adjourned.

Lane County Committee For School
District Reorganization



Chairman



Secretary

PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED R-1
Pleasant Hill Union High
February 19, 1959

Members present: Edward Efteland, Ray Swanson, Joe Swift, Marvin Hendrickson, Wm. Wilt, Paul Ehinger and Edgar Rickard.

The chairman, Ray Swanson, opened the meeting and introduced the secretary Wm. Woodie who explained the law. Mr. Efteland was called upon to explain the comprehensive plan R-1.

Efteland called for a show of hands representing elementary school districts.

Patrons from Lowell	-----	30
" "	Fall Creek	- 22
" "	P. Hill	----- 35

Efteland called attention to the requirement that each administrative school district be as near as is practicable a natural social-economic community. Also, pointed out that the administrative school district could encompass all of the territory in the county. Efteland pointed out, while reading Section 5, that the use of existing buildings and recommendations regarding the location and construction of new buildings, was merely a recommendation, and the final authority rested with the 7-man school board. He called attention to the number of courses that he had noted were being offered in the Eugene district that were not offered in either the Lowell High School or the Pleasant Hill High School. He called attention to the difference in the offerings between U-1 and U-9 as indicated in the Program of Studies for the school year ending June 30, 1958. Efteland also pointed out that it could have been any one of the members present who could have been serving on the committee instead of himself and that the Committee had done a sincere job in trying to meet the requirements of the law.

Swanson directed their attention to the differences in school millage presently existing in Lane County, citing the lowest millage rate as 24.4 mills and the highest as 91.4 mills. He used this illustration to show the need for equalizing taxes through the Reorganization. Swanson said that he has heard that patrons often lose contact with their school district. He drew their attention to an amendment to the Reorganization Act pending before the Oregon State Legislature that would provide for the establishment of advisory committees for localities to advise school boards. Advised them that if they are interested in this amendment they should contact their legislators and express their interest.

Mr. Swanson adjourned the group for a 10-minute recess.

The first person registered to speak to the Committee was Mr. Earl Drury, Director, Lowell Union High School Board. He stated that he has been a high school director for 1/3 of the time since the union high school has been erected. He expresses the fear that the tax base of the reorganized

district would not be wide enough to give them an advantage over that which they now have. He pointed out that they have a remaining bonding capacity of \$1,300,000 which would just about build a new school. He stated that most of us agree that this new school will have to be built. He expressed a fear that the money used for building might be needed more for operating expenses. He was afraid that if the millage rate should ever exceed 80 mills or thereabouts, the taxpayers would rebel. Repeated again that he felt that the tax base of the proposed reorganization was not broad enough to give them the relief they should have.

Committee members did not desire to question Mr. Drury on his statement.

Mr. Swanson indicated that as much equalization of accessible property has been accomplished as the Committee could devise and still protect adjacent school districts.

Mr. Drury stated that if the comprehensive job of reorganization was to be done he would think it would be better that all of the districts involved in this proposed reorganization should reorganize with the Springfield school district.

The second person desiring to speak was Mr. James Large from District No. 71 (School Board Director). Mr. Large stated that in considering the Reorganization he preferred to put the educational angle first and the taxpayer's angle second. He cited that taxes would continue to have to be paid and that they would probably continue to increase as long as the costs in general increases. He stated that his opinion was that the children in this area are not getting the amount of education that they should get in comparison to the number of dollars that the patrons are paying. Pointed out that neither the Lowell or the Pleasant Hill High School could offer the best opportunity for students to develop into the professions or into successful college students but instead ended up as green chain workers in the mills. Stated that taxes would inevitably rise but would we have any more offerings for kids. Pointed out that if the Reorganization succeeds the area should be able to operate just the way they are for the next couple of years. Repeated that the point he wanted to get across was that we were still going to have to pay taxes, that he was not sure we were getting our money's worth in better education and probably would not get better education unless Reorganization is successful.

Mr. Swanson made the comment that apparently most of the people at the hearings instead of pointing^{ing} out areas of defect in the plan have supported it and expressed appreciation for the two statements that were given.

Chairman Swanson called for questions or comments from the floor.

George-Bradshaw, Pleasant Hill District - Cited that \$71,000 bonded indebtedness of District No. 1. Asked the question - would someone on the Committee explain how that bonded indebtedness is equalized.

Chairman Swanson called on Ron Babcock to answer the question.

Mr. Babcock pointed out that the bonded indebtedness of the Pleasant Hill Grade School would be borne by all of the territory in the reorganized district. Mr. Babcock indicated that it would be a share and share alike proposition.

Mary Hoffman, Pleasant Hill - Asked the question that if the Reorganization were voted down on these two elections what would happen.

Mr. Swanson indicated that the present law there is no provision as to what should happen if the plan were continually voted down.

Lyman Tinker, Pleasant Hill - Pointed out that the music room that they have in Pleasant Hill was left out of the Plan. Asked why their total value of sites, buildings and equipment was lower than that of Lowell.

Mr. Swanson stated the leaving out the description of the music room in the report was just an oversight.

Mr. Babcock asked Mr. Tinker if he wanted to know about the respective values of the buildings, sites and equipment. Mr. Babcock pointed out that the figures that appear in the booklet had been supplied by each district's clerk. Pointed out that these figures are usually obtained from insurance appraisals and appear as such in the report.

Mr. Efteland - asked that he be allowed to reply to some of Earl Drury's statements. Referred to Page 6 of the Plan, which is a schedule of proposed tax levies for the proposed reorganization. Directed the attention of the group to the differences in millages particularly between Junction City and R-1, as proposed. He indicated that the operating levies in Junction City were less than the predicted levy for R-1 indicating that there must be some economies effected. An unidentified patron requested attention of the group be focused on the fact that a million dollar school may be needed in the Dexter area.

Mr. Swanson indicated that no million dollar school will be built in any reorganized district without a vote of the people.

Earl Drury - In answer to Mr. Efteland, indicated that some of the differences in mills might be due to the number of pupils per dollar valuation. Indicated that transportation in the Pleasant Hill-Lowell area was more of an expense in referring to the comparison drawn by Mr. Efteland in the millage rates between Junction City and the proposed R-1. Mentioned that a member from Jasper had talked about a million dollar school and stated that the million dollar figure seemed reasonable in light of the fact that the Central Linn High School cost more than a million dollars.

Mr. Efteland pointed out that the cost of transportation as indicated on page 7 was larger in Junction City than in R-1. Pointed out that Junction City district finished a new high school and did not spend a million dollars on it. Also pointed out that the valuation and enrolments of Junction City was comparable to R-1. Mr. Efteland and Mr. Swanson both cited examples tended to demonstrate that a million dollars for a high school in the R-1 area was an excessive estimate.

Bill Berg, Pleasant Hill - Referred to Cost Per Pupil figures, pointed out that a combination should result in a reduction in the cost per pupil.

Mr. Ellison, Pleasant Hill - Pointed out that migrant workers often move into a school district and help pass a bond issue and then move on to another area and leaving the people remaining to retire the bonded indebtedness. Stated that he felt the taxes were rapidly approaching the breaking point especially for the farmer who was really not a farmer in this area but just a peasant. Very curious as to why some school district's cost should be less than others. Thinks it indicates that there is a lack of economy. Also asked, what is the advantage of dumping part of our indebtedness on the Lowell-Fall Creek area.

Margaret Broderick, Pleasant Hill - Stated that she thought we may be losing sight of what we should all be working for. Asked the question, do we want the very best possible education that we can afford for our students? Believes that we should move forward in trying to prepare as good an education as is possible for our children. Mrs. Broderick received applause from the crowd.

Lyman Tinker asked what the procedure would be after the hearing. Mr. Swanson explained to Mr. Tinker that the Committee would have to decide whether or not the plan should be changed as a result of this hearing, and then the plan would be sent to the State Department, who would in turn hold another public hearing. If, as a result of this second hearing, the plan should remain unchanged it would be returned to this area and placed to a vote within the boundaries of the proposed district.

Meeting adjourned.


Chairman

Secretary

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE
February 16, 1959

A special meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the Conference Room, Cal Young Junior High School, on Monday, February 16, 1959, just prior to the public hearing on proposed ASD R-4, with the following present:

Ray Swanson
William Wilt
Edward Efteland

Edgar Rickard
Earl Garoutte
Paul Ehinger
Wm. R. Woodie, Secretary

R. E. Yates and Al B Adams, School District No. 52, appeared before the Committee and requested their approval to transfer certain territory from School District No. 52 to School District No. 4 -- said territory located East of Southern Pacific Railroad in Santa Clara-River Road area. The reasons which they presented to the Committee for requesting transfer: safety and convenience.

The Committee requested that an informal petition be submitted from the people living in the area requesting the change, listing proposed boundaries, approximate valuation, number of children, and the number of people in the area that are in favor of said transfer -- said petition to be presented to the Committee at their next regular meeting.

Mr. Woodie presented minutes of proposed R-2, held in the Cottage Grove Union High School on February 9th.

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Garoutte, and carried, to submit ASD R-2 to State in proposed form.


Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Efteland, and carried, to submit ASD R-3 to State in proposed form.

Attention was called to the next hearing to be held at the Pleasant Hill Union High School on Thursday, February 19th, on proposed R-1.

Meeting adjourned.

Lane County Committee For School
District Reorganization



Chairman


Secretary

PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED R-4
Cal Young Junior High School
February 16, 1959

Public hearing on proposed R-4 (comprising Districts No. 4 and 43) was held in the Cal Young Junior High School, on Monday, February 16, 1959, commencing at 8 o'clock p.m., with approximately eighty (80) persons present.

Mr. Swanson requested that a district roll call be taken:

School Dist. No. 4, Eugene ----- 4
School Dist. No.43, Coburg -----76

The meeting was called to order by the chairman, Ray Swanson, who introduced the following Committee members and guests: Irma Martin and Margaret Blanton, County School Office; Wm. R. Woodie, County School Superintendent; Earl Garoutte, Edward Efteland, Paul Ehinger, Edgar Rickard, William Wilt, Committee members; and Ronald Babcock, School District Auditor.

The Reorganization Program in general was explained by Superintendent Woodie. He stressed that Reorganization is the law of Lane County and the State of Oregon, and the Committee is bound by the law. When casting a vote you will be asked whether or not you favor the particular Plan as submitted by the Committee. Mr. Woodie also referred to summary of Lane County High Schools dealing with curriculum and etc., as taken from the Standard High School Reports for the school year ending June 30, 1958.

Mr. Woodie explained the voting procedure in detail.

Mr. Swanson thanked Gilbert Sprague for providing facilities for the hearing.

Mr. Swanson then explained the matter of the petition requesting the transfer of the former School District No. 49, Deadmond's Ferry, now a part of School District No. 43, to School District No. 4, Eugene. Hearing date before the District Boundary Board on this petition has been set for March 12th. Another request has been suggested requesting transfer of all the area in School District No. 43, excepting the incorporated city of Coburg to School District No. 4. No action was taken on this proposal, since it contains the school buildings in District No. 43.

Mr. Efteland, chairman of subcommittee II, then reviewed the Report of the Committee on proposed R-4.

After a short recess the meeting was opened to discussion and questions.

Mr. Swanson presented petitions from School Districts No. 4 and 43, requesting the Reorganization Committee to hold an election under the Reorganization Act immediately. He asked the secretary to explain the

sequence of events in reorganization.

Mr. Woodie - referred to the time schedule as outlined on Page 5 of the Brochure. According to the deadline, elections must be held before September 30, 1959. If elections take place on or before April 30th and are in favor, the effective date will be July 1, 1959. If after April 30th, effective date would be July 1, 1960.

Joe Richards, Attorney, Eugene - Spoke in favor of Reorganization. He recommended that they consider the Reorganization Plan before adopting change of territory. Regarding time table, Plan could be approved and sent to State and elections held before April 30th. This would stop withdrawal of territory. Feels Reorganization is reasonable from the standpoint of courses offered, and condition of the Coburg High School building. Size and low valuation makes it unable to offer an up-to-date program. A small number of taxpayers are paying the bill. Consider what is best for the children of the community. Plan of Reorganization is definitely the best plan.

Walter Swanson, District No. 4 - Directed to Mr. Efteland - Referred to Page 3 of the Committee's Report relative to indebtedness. If consolidation takes place and District No. 43 goes to District No. 4, will Coburg assume some of their indebtedness?

Ronald Babcock, Auditor - Proportionate share. Valuations and indebtedness of two districts will be combined.

Ray Swanson - Prior election was under consolidation. Election on proposed R-4 will be under the Reorganization Act.

Walter Swanson - Differed with Joe Richards that better education is offered in a larger system. Stated he has four children in Eugene schools and has to spend a good many evenings teaching them the 3 R's, and is not too happy about it.

Ray Swanson - Referred to Schedule 4, Courses Offered in High Schools of both districts. Invited him to draw comparisons.

Walter Swanson - Questioned value of certain courses. Feels that some children are reaching a complicated situation.

William Wilt - Are children you help in grade or high school?

Walter Swanson - Both High School and Elementary.

Bill Bowerman, District No. 43 - Stated that he also attended a smaller school but found it advantageous to attend a larger school.

Mrs. Dershon, District No. 43 - What about District No. 43 being assessed for kindergartens if they are voted in Eugene?

Dr. Lloyd Millhollen, Acting Supt., District No. 4 - District No. 4 is not planning kindergartens in the Eugene district immediately - the school board has taken no action. Until another source of revenue is available

it is unlikely that kindergartens will be provided. No immediate plans for the future regarding this.

Lowell Swartz, District No. 43 - Consolidation election did not go over, feels perhaps Reorganization will not go over. Proposed an Administrative district of territory from Willamette River to County line.

Mr. Swanson - No request on this has been submitted to Committee for consideration.

John Jaqua, District No. 43 - If district desires to hold vote before April 30th, what must they do?

Mr. Woodie - Committee must approve Plan, send to Salem, State Board to hold second hearing, advertise and post for an election before April 30th.

Mrs. McPherson, District No. 43 - Directed to Mr. Swartz - why won't consolidation pass in Coburg?

Mrs. Moore, District No. 43 - Her children formerly attended in School District No. 4. Why was consolidation voted down?

Leon Funke, District No. 43 - Stated the following three reasons why he favored consolidation:

1. Children would have better education.
2. Much easier to go to higher education.
3. Better off tax dollar wise.

Mr. Efteland - Pointed out that when he attended a meeting at Coburg sometime back the difference between consolidation and reorganization was outlined. Made it known that Committee had no hand in the consolidation election. Committee had already approved Plan before consolidation election was decided upon. Coburg does not have industry to back the kind of a school that will be demanded. Committee is trying to do the job under Reorganization, not consolidation. Committee is charged with duties under Reorganization.

Mr. Swanson - Committee go ahead with Plan as they feel it is the best Plan for education at a reasonable per pupil cost.

Mrs. Harbert, District No. 43 - Referred to Walter Swanson's remarks. She has two children - one graduated from Eugene and one graduated from Coburg. Felt that child who graduated from Eugene was better prepared for college.

Walter Swanson - Referred to better possibility of athletics for pupils in a small school. It is more difficult for a boy in a large school to participate in team sports. Great need for athletics and you have your body longer than you have your mind.

Mrs. Williamson, District No. 43 - Does Mr. Walter Swanson happen to be related to persons in Coburg? Is he representing them?

Walter Swanson - No!

Laverne McPherson, District No. 43 - Should Reorganization program fail would the State approve Coburg going ahead and building for a proper education.

Mr. Wilt - Coburg has a low tax base and will need a high school within the next few years. Coburg must decide what they will do about their building if they desire to remain independent. Cited their bonding capacity. Consolidation election was approved by the Committee as it did not interfere with the Reorganization Committee's Plan. Felt that perhaps some people wished more time to think things over.

Mr. McPherson - To build would probably cost around 17 mills. With the increase in teachers, etc., it would probably mean about 100 mills for the next twenty years.

Lowell Swartz - Does not feel taxation would change.

Mr. Ehinger - Compared District No. 117, Westfir, to District No. 43, Coburg. Westfir is operating both grade and high school and has a bonded indebtedness of over \$200,000. Their millage is around 17 to 20 mills for bonds and the total millage around 91 mills for their over-all program. He did not feel that getting into a larger district would solve all problems. Larger districts are made up of the same teachers as small districts. Small schools cannot offer as great a number of courses. It is possible in both sized schools to have low teachers. Consolidation will not clear this up. Our aim should be to do the most good for the greatest number of children. If Coburg assumes debt of District No. 4, Eugene, they would also assume a high school for their high school students.

Harry Harbert, District No. 43 - Would Committee look favorably in getting this Reorganization through in time for the coming year?

Mr. Swanson - Most surely would if there are no unforeseen obstructions.

Mr. Lawson - District No. 43 - Will Mr. Woodie please state why Rural District taxes were higher last year than this year.

Superintendent Woodie - Under old Rural School Law first class districts did not participate. Also, under the old law the board reviewed the budgets. Under present law first-class districts are included and the amount is based upon 50% of the total of the previous school levy excluding bonds, acquisition of sites, and constructing and equipping new facilities or major additions to existing facilities. Less valuation, more taxes; higher valuation, less taxes. Pointed out that under the Rural equalization Coburg is a receiving district.

Kenneth Williams, Superintendent, District No. 43 - Pointed out that last year's budget had \$10,000 Sinking Fund and that this year's budget did not contain such.

Mr. Efteland - Referred to Page 4, Section 7, Par. 2, of the Reorganization Law, which states: "The comprehensive reorganization plan shall provide for the incorporation of all areas of the county into one or more adminis-

trative school districts that maintain and operate a program that will meet the minimum standards adopted by the State Board of Education. Committee could have presented County Unit plan but did not believe it feasible for Lane County.

Harry Harbert - Would the Committee go ahead and approve holding an election prior to April 30th?

Mr. Swanson - Can if Committee Members are willing.

Mr. Efteland - Directed to Superintendent Millhollen - Do you think of any unfairness in this proposal?

Superintendent Millhollen, District No. 4 - On March 3rd District No. 4 is voting on a Serial Levy and bond issue. If vote is favorable on March 3rd, the board would have to sell bonds in a hurry so that bonds would not be invalidated. They had not planned to sell these bonds until summer but perhaps this could be worked out.

Superintendent Woodie - Questioned change of boundaries affecting bond issues. Committee would have to check into this matter.

The Committee then voted on Proposed R-4:

Motion was made by Mr. Rickard and seconded by Mr. Wilt, to go on record adopting proposed R-4 and to forward to the State without modification.

Yes - 5

No - 0

1 abstained (Efteland)

Meeting adjourned.


Chairman

Secretary

MINUTES OF LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE
February 9, 1959

A special meeting of the Lane County Reorganization Committee was held following the Public Hearing on Proposed R-2, with the following present:

Earl Garoutte
Edward Efteland
Joe Swift
Edgar Rickard

Paul Ehinger
William Wilt
Ray Swanson
Wm. R. Woodie, Secretary

Mr. Woodie presented poll taken in School District No. 186, Alvadore, signed by more than 60% of the legal voters in said district, indicating their desire to be included in an Administrative School District with District No. 52, Bethel.

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Swift, and carried, to recommend that School District No. 186 and District No. 52 be organized into one school district. (Former proposal was to include District No. 186 with District No. 69J.)

Next meeting of the Committee was set for 7:00 o'clock p.m. on February 16th, Cal Young Junior High School (prior to Public Hearing on proposed R-4).

Meeting adjourned.

Lane County Committee For School
District Reorganization



Chairman



Secretary

PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED R-2
Cottage Grove Union High School
February 9, 1959

A public hearing on proposed R-2 (comprising Districts No. 25J, 31, 45, 48, 75, 80, 84, 93, 128, 40, U-12, and U-14J), was held in the Cottage Grove Union High School on Monday, February 9, 1959, commencing at 8:00 o'clock p.m., with approximately 180 persons in attendance.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Ray Swanson, who introduced the following committee members and guests: Earl Garoutte, Edward Efteland, Edgar Rickard, Joe Swift, Paul Ehinger, and William Wilt, Committee Members; Wm. R. Woodie, County School Superintendent; Margaret Blanton, Irma Martin, and Thomas Newton, County School Office; Ronald Babcock, Auditor; and Clarence Jackson, Committee Alternate.

The Reorganization Program in general was explained by Superintendent Woodie.

Mr. Ehinger, Chairman of Subcommittee III, Reorganization Committee, reviewed the report of the Committee on proposed R-2.

After a short recess the meeting was opened to questions and discussion.

The following persons posed questions to the Committee:

Frances Quinn, Walker area, Creswell District - stated a concern with the Walker problem. She suggested that ballot include a guarantee against a double tax and, that Committee go to legislature and have old law repealed making them liable for existing bonds. Iron this out first with legislature to repeal existing law or give guarantee on where they will be on their taxes.

Mr. Woodie - This situation of double taxation could not exist under proposed reorganization. All assets and liabilities would be shared. Attention was brought - should Sections 23 and 24 be removed from U-12. School District No. 40 would become a unified district. If Walker find themselves in position of double tax they could carry through petition with District Boundary Board.

J. G. Griffith, Creswell Union High School - In addition to the courses listed in Schedule 4 of the Committee's Report, Creswell Union High this present year is offering: General Business, Spanish, extra Shop Classes; Library, Physics, American History, Driver Training, and combined Chorus and Band. He stated that these additional subjects are permanent with the exception of shop classes, which are alternated. He further stated that they would undoubtedly have more courses if there were enough students for them.

Mr. Swanson - The report in the preliminary plan shows the subjects offered for the school year 1957-58 and the number of students who took them.

Marian McCoy, Latham - Felt that presentation of Reorganization and proposed R-2 was only in general. She would like to know how any district is to know if they want to join or not unless more details are given -- regarding use of buildings, curriculum, etc.

Mr. Swanson - Only assets and liabilities and boundaries up to Committee; other is up to the new board. The district school board would be responsible to the people and should be entrusted with the details of running the district.

Mr. Efteland - How long has Latham been connected with U-14J?

Mr. Rickard - about 20 years.

Mr. Efteland - If this has been the case it should be proof enough that the city of Cottage Grove has been considerate of outlying areas.

Mr. Moore - London - If a district should elect to keep out of reorganized district can they not use high school buildings they helped to build?

Mr. Woodie - Does not make any provision at present for district included in Union High district if said district rejects. He pointed out that if there is reason any district might reject the Committee would like to know so they can correct.

Mr. Moore - What is total population of proposed R-2?

Mr. Woodie - Adult population not known. There are 2,327 students in Grades 1 through 8; 856 students in Grades 9 through 12. District No. 45 has 1426 students.

Mr. Moore expressed a fear that Cottage Grove might control. Will the seven board members be apportioned geographically?

Mr. Woodie - No, population wise.

Mrs. Cohen, Latham - If a district rejects the plan could they send high school students to Cottage Grove as they are doing at the present time?

Mr. Swanson - Each district must provide education grades 1-12.

Mrs. Cohen - If the Reorganization is effective will U-12 be abolished and students sent to U-14?

Mr. Swanson - This is decision of 7-man board. Committee could only make recommendations.

Mrs. Cohen - How about a Junior High School for Cottage Grove and vicinity?

Mr. Swanson - Up to 7-man board.

Mrs. Cohen - If district refused to go into Reorganization would they lose state funds?

Mr. Woodie - Only if district does not meet state standards.

Mrs. Cohen - Expressed a fear of young students traveling a long distance to Cottage Grove for junior high school.

Mr. Woodie - Schools should be where the children are and Committee has made no recommendation on this. Whether Reorganized district has a Junior High School would be up to the people of the Reorganized district.

Mildred Babcock, Creswell - According to the grade enrollment from the 6th grade down does it not appear that Creswell would soon have a high school of around 300 students?

Mr. Woodie - Walker has 14 students attending Cottage Grove High School and there are approximately 30 to 35 students attending grade school from that area. Does not seem likely that U-12 will reach 300 in near future. Without an accompanying increase in tax base it would be a disaster.

Mr. Ehinger - Problem Creswell faces is that of low valuation. The problem will increase as students increase. Compared Westfir and Creswell districts valuation and attendance wise. Creswell will be faced in the future with an insufficient tax base.

Mildred Babcock - So many Creswell people feel they should keep taxes and children there. Bus transportation will cost more. How will Cottage Grove feel about taking on a bedroom district.

Mr. Ehinger - Referred to courses offered. Also, that the matter of how many high schools buildings, transportation, etc., would be up to the board.

Mildred Babcock - War babies influx 6th grade down, which will make a good-sized high school in Creswell. We think more about our children than we do the taxes.

Mr. Ehinger - Walker area is the problem. Some districts worry over being steam-rolled. Doubt if Cottage Grove would do that. Suggested that present boards get together and talk over these things. Act of interest is the only thing that will change a vote. Committee desires to get the best education for the children and feel that this can be accomplished by reorganization. Small districts will not be hurt if they take an active interest.

Doris Olsen, Delight Valley - Thinks Committee's plan is evasive. What will reorganization do to each particular area? Wish more information.

Mr. Woodie - What is your school board going to do about all phases of education in your school next year? This is up to them the same as it would be under a reorganized district -- the board would have jurisdiction. Believes it takes faith - the same as faith placed in present board.

Doris Olsen - People are asking for more information.

Mr. Woodie - Cannot spell out such things as are commonly the business of the board of directors.

Mrs. Cohen - High school students already go to Cottage Grove. Wish guarantee that lower grade children will remain in present buildings.

Clifford Foster, Silk Creek - What is the procedure for election of the 7 man board?

Mr. Swanson - District is zoned into 7 zones but elected by a majority vote at large.

Roy Duerst, Delight Valley - Stated that he would like district to remain as they are at present. In case a majority of the districts vote down plans continually and Union High would remain, what then?

Mr. Swanson - No doubt you would still be in business, unless Basic School Support is cut off

Mrs. Babcock - After board is elected is there any provision for recall?

Mr. Woodie - Subject to recall under existing law.

Mr. Moore - What advantage is reorganization? Will we be better off after reorganization than we are at present?

Mr. Swanson - Suggested that comparison of curriculum be made. Could offer more subjects for less money. Study various programs. Cost is down in larger high schools where more subjects are offered.

Mrs. Seablom - Delight Valley - Would individual grades be placed in various buildings?

Mr. Woodie - Lesser number of grades per teacher. Special helps for children would be more readily obtainable.

Archie Powell, London - Why didn't Committee propose County unit?


Mr. Swanson - Committee could have suggested County Unit but did not feel it was feasible. Committee proposed 12 districts.

Mr. Swanson called for representation from districts:

#25J - 12; #31 - 15; #45 - 32; #48 - 4; #75 - 7; #80 - 4; #84 - 3; #93 - 15; #128 - 9; #177 - 0; #191 - 15; #40 - 35.

Doris Olsen - Extended her sympathy in advance to the 7-man board of directors.

Meeting adjourned.


Chairman

Secretary

Minutes of Public Hearing on Proposed ASD R-3

Oakridge High School - January 26, 1959

Public hearing on proposed R-3 (comprising Districts No. 76 and 117), was held in the Oakridge High School on Monday, January 26, 1959, commencing at 8 o'clock p.m., with approximately 180 persons present.

The meeting was called to order by the chairman, Ray Swanson, who introduced the following Committee Members and guests: Thomas Newton, County School Office; Margaret Blanton, Secretary, County School Office; Irma Martin, Secretary, County School Office; Wm. R. Woodie, County School Superintendent; Edward Efteland, Joe Swift, William Wilt, and Paul Ehinger, Committee Members.

The Reorganization program in general was explained by Superintendent Woodie.

Mr. Swanson then reviewed the Report of the Committee on Proposed R-3.

After a short recess the meeting was opened to discussion and questions.

The following questions were submitted:

1. "Why should Oakridge pay into Springfield? Oakridge has a higher millage rate than Springfield."

Mr. Swanson answered that the above question pertained to Rural School District law and no change could be made in this unless it was done by legislative action.

2. "If R-3 is formed how does this affect the thirty (30) three-year teacher contracts now in force in Oakridge?"

Mr. Ehinger stated that these contracts would remain in force.

3. "Where does percent of capacity figure come from?"

Mr. Woodie replied that these figures were obtained from information supplied by local school officers early in the Reorganization program.

Mr. C. A. Paddock, Oakridge - Requested tax information as to whether it would increase or decrease the millage in Oakridge should the two districts be included in one administrative district, and if so, how much? He stated he would not oppose or approve such a move until he had concrete information.

Mr. Swanson answered by calling to his attention Schedule I, tax breakdown on the proposed Administrative Districts. This schedule shows an approximation of the tax levy for R-3 based on current costs and assessed values.

Mr. Ehinger quoted figures from tax study made by Ronald Babcock, school auditor, which indicated an increase in tax for Oakridge and a decrease in tax for Westfir in the event of Reorganization. The predicted rate is 55.6 mills.

Mr. Swanson also suggested that they compare the Curriculum as offered in each high school.

Mr. Alfred Johnson, Westfir - Referred to the comparison of subjects offered in the two high schools and suggested that the information listed in the Committee's re-

port be disregarded and that the correct information listed in the materials prepared by Paul Elliott, Alfred Johnson, and J. V. Laswell, be used, as it was more representative of the actual curriculum in each school.

Richard Bear, Oakridge - Asked if bonded indebtedness can be equalized? He suggested that an equalization of assets and liabilities be made prior to Reorganization. He was not in favor of sharing liabilities after reorganization. He did not feel that each district should assume the other's debt. He felt that it would be better for each district to assume its fair share of indebtedness.

Mr. Wilt stated that there was no concrete way to really tell how the asset-liability picture will be affected. He informed patrons that Committee was open to suggestions.

Ray Ramey, Oakridge - How will the Educational picture be affected? He asked to hear from educators as to whether or not under Reorganization a better education could be offered.

Mr. Johnson commented and referred to the information prepared by the local educators. Courses offered in each high school were compared by number and were approximately equal.

Mrs. Follett, Oakridge - Asked how the use of the buildings would be arranged.

Mr. Swanson called to attention that this would be up to the new board.

Dwight Nesmith, Oakridge - Clarified Mr. Ramey's question. Asked Mr. Johnson that in case the districts are combined will the offering of additional courses be made.

Mr. Johnson stated that should the districts go together it would give a larger valuation and enable the reorganized district to offer more subjects than at present.

Mr. Swanson - Over-all picture would improve.

Ronald Paddock, Oakridge - Would the increase in tax in the event of reorganization be justified by better schools?

Mr. Woodie, in discussing the course offerings in the various high schools, pointed out that the schedule contained in the Report of the Committee was taken from the Standard High School Reports for the year ending June 30th, 1958, as submitted by the individual high school principals. He suggested that principals be contacted for up-to-date information on their particular high school. Comparisons of programs of study in different sized high schools were presented and discussed. These comparisons indicated that complete programs were more likely to occur in larger high schools and usually occurred at a more reasonable cost per pupil.

Mr. Woodie ^{stated} ~~called to attention~~ that if Reorganization is voted he felt that better education would result.

Mrs. Keeney, Oakridge - What would be the board's recommendation regarding junior high school. She feels that junior high school students are too young for the high school and too old for the grade school.

Mr. Swanson stated that this would be up to the board of the reorganized school district.

Mrs. Penelope L. Miller, Westfir - In case of Reorganization would the kindergarten be maintained in the Westfir district.

Mr. Swanson stated that in the event of Reorganization the matter of the kindergarten would be up to the new school board.

Mr. Johnson stated that the figure of per capita cost based on 4 years of high school, listed in the plan, did not correctly reflect the true cost figure because Westfir is operating as a 6-year high school.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION



Chairman



Secretary

WRW:m
j

Eugene, Oregon,
January 26, 1959.

A special meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County Office on January 26, 1959, with the following Committee members present:

Ray Swanson
William Wilt
Joe Swift

Earl Garoutte
Ed Efteland
Wm. R. Woodie, Secretary

A delegation of about fifteen (15) people, headed by Mr. Leon Funk, was present to address the Committee. Mr. Funk explained to the Committee that the recent consolidation election between Coburg and Eugene school districts failed in his opinion primarily because of the large negative vote within the city of Coburg. He further requested that the Committee grant permission to the group to petition for removal of all of the area within School District No. 43, except for the incorporated City of Coburg, from District No. 43 to be annexed to School District No. 4, Eugene. Mr. Lowell Swartz, director of School District No. 43 pointed out to the Committee that the school property and buildings in Coburg is located outside the Coburg city limits.

Mr. Efteland stated that he felt that the future of Coburg was with Eugene under the Reorganization Plan as proposed by the Committee and that he would be concerned, under the proposal, about the portion of the district that would remain relative to their ability to support an educational program.

Mr. Swanson suggested that the Committee should postpone a decision on this matter until after the February 16th hearing at Cal Young Junior High School where the question should be discussed in detail.

Mr. Wilt stated that it was his feeling that the District Boundary Board would be unwise to rule on this boundary change prior to the hearing. He further stated that he would rather work toward getting Coburg to approve consolidation.

Mr. Funk stated that his group would be willing to exclude the school buildings and property from the portion of land that they wish to have annexed to Eugene and that their major purpose is to obtain as good a high school as possible at a price comparable to that in reorganized school districts. The consensus of opinion, among those present on the Committee, that no action be taken at this time but that an opportunity be provided for full discussion of this item at the hearing on February 16th.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION



Chairman



Secretary

Eugene, Oregon
January 20, 1959

Meeting of the Lane County Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts was held in the County School Office with the following present:

Ray Swanson
Joe Swift
Edgar Rickard
Earl Garoutte

Edward Efteland
Paul Ehinger
William Wilt
Winifred Hult

Motion was made, seconded and carried, that the minutes of the meetings of December 1st and January 12th, be approved. The reading of the minutes was dispensed with since each member had previously received a copy.

Mr. W. J. (Bill) Bowerman, resident of School District No. 43, presented a request from residents of the area which was formerly known as Deadmond's Ferry (or District No. 49), asking the Reorganization Committee's approval to petition the Boundary Board to have the old Deadmond's Ferry district made a part of District No. 4.

Mr. Bowerman informed the Committee of the following pertaining to said area:

1. Approximately 17 children living in this area.
2. Approximately 12% of District No. 43's valuation is in this area.
3. Consists of approximately 15 to 20 legal voters.
4. Distance from Armitage bridge east not in excess of 4 miles to family living farthest in area.

After some discussion a motion was made by Mr. Rickard and seconded by Mr. Garoutte, that should the District Boundary Board approve the transfer of this territory from School District No. 43 to School District No. 4, said transaction would not conflict with the plan of reorganization. The vote result was as follows:

0 - NO
6 - YES
1 - ABSTAINED (Ehinger)

Mr. Woodie presented to the Committee the implications of two sections of land lying at the present time in School District No. 1 and Union High School District No. 12 (Sections 23 and 24, T19S, R2W). Mr. Woodie recommended that this matter be brought to the attention of the School Boards of School Districts No. 1, 40, U-12, and U-14J. If the District Boundary Board should be petitioned to change the boundary of School District No. 40 or School District U-12 in such a way as to remove the portion of School District No. 1 now in U-12 from the Union High School District and if such a petition should be granted the Union High School District would be abolished and School District No. 40 would become a unified district. (ORS 335.505). Since a portion of School District No. 40 lies in the Cottage Grove Union High School (Walker) such a procedure would result in double taxation for the Walker area for high school purposes. This double taxation situation, if it were to come about, could probably be avoided if the District Boundary Board was also petitioned either (1) remove the Walker

area from the Cottage Grove Union High School (ORS 335.338) or (2) remove the Walker area from School District No. 40, Creswell, and place it in School District No. 45, Cottage Grove. (ORS 329.730).

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Garoutte, and carried, that facts pertaining to change in districting these two sections be made known to Districts No. 1, 40, U-12 and U-14J. Mr. Woodie was so instructed.

Report was made by Mr. Efteland relative to meeting with the Junction City School board to discuss proposed ASD R-11. Mr. Efteland informed the Committee that he was shown an opinion poll taken in District No. 186 and the results showed sixty-one (61) to eleven (11) in favor of being included with School District No. 52 for reorganization purposes. This information was tabled for consideration at a later date. The records in the County School Office show that there are twelve (12) high school students from District No. 186 attending Willamette High and twelve (12) attending Junction City High.

The matter of proposals offered at the public hearing on R-6 held in Mapleton on January 12th were considered. The Committee, in attempting to better place the dividing line in School District No. 102J that would be included in R-6 and which would comply with the request that the majority prefer to be included in ASD R-6, requested information from Mr. Woodie relative to this. Mr. Woodie informed the committee it was his findings that if the boundary line was moved approximately 1 mile East it would take in all children residing in the district and still leave valuation in Union High District 4.

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Swift, and carried, that Mr. Woodie be instructed to reestablish R-6 to include that portion of District No. 102J wherein all of the children presently live so that all grade school children presently enrolled will attend at Mapleton.

Report on joint meeting of Lane and Douglas County Reorganization Committees held in Drain on January 6th relative to District No. 1J, Douglas County, was made by Mr. Swanson. Both counties felt that this district should be included in their County's comprehensive plan and no agreement could be reached.

Mr. Swift recommended to the Committee that at the public hearings, time be allowed for a "break" prior to discussion period to formulate questions. Said procedure was approved.

Motion was made by Mr. Swift, seconded by Mr. Garoutte, and carried, to set hearing on proposed R-1 on February 19th.

Mr. Woodie informed the Committee that he had received a phone call from Alfred Steinhauer, Clerk, School District No. 112, requesting that he present to the Committee their desire to hold consolidation elections in School Districts No. 32 and 112.

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Swift, and carried, to approve the holding of consolidation elections in Districts No. 32 and 112.

Motion was made by Mr. Garoutte, seconded by Mr. Swift, and carried to authorize the Secretary to set the date for a rehearing on proposed ASD R-6.


Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Rickard, and carried, that the hearing on proposed ASD R-10 (School District No. 90) be set for February 25th at Triangle School.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR
SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION



Chairman



Secretary

WRW:m
j

Minutes of Public Hearing on Proposed ASD R-6 and ASD R-7

Mapleton High School - January 12, 1959

Public hearing on proposed R-6 (comprising Districts No. 32, 112, and 102J, non-high portion) and R-7 (comprising the present boundaries of School District No. 97J5) was held in the library of the Mapleton High School on Monday, January 12, 1959, commencing at 8:00 o'clock p.m., with thirty-eight (38) persons present.

The meeting was called to order by the chairman, Ray Swanson, and the following Committee Members and guests were introduced: Margaret Blanton, Secretary at County School Office, Wm. R. Woodie, County School Superintendent, Ronald Babcock, Auditor, William Wilt and John Brewer, Committee Members, Irma Martin, Secretary at County School Office, and Thomas W. Newton, County School Office. (Winifred Hult, Committee Alternate, was present but remained in the audience.)

Chairman Swanson requested that School Board members from the above mentioned districts stand and introduce themselves - Emil Brainard, District No. 112; Ida R. Dutcher, Elden Dutcher, and Ira Larson, District No. 102J; Walter Camp and Don Davidson, District No. 32.

The Reorganization program in general was explained by Superintendent Woodie.

Mr. Swanson then reviewed the Report of the Committee on Proposed R-6. Mr. Swanson called upon Ronald Babcock to explain in detail his proposal relative to the retirement of the present outstanding bonds (\$9,000.00) in School District No. 102J. Mr. Babcock suggested that School District No. 102J arrange for the retirement of their total bonds outstanding during the present school year. This he felt could be accomplished with cash on hand and future receipts. He suggested that the persons holding bonds be contacted to see if they would be willing to retire bonds in full before retirement date.

The meeting was then opened to questions and the following persons posed questions to the Committee:

Mrs. Dutcher, District No. 102J, stated that she was not at all happy with the division of District No. 102J. She did not favor sending the grade school children now in the U-4 part of the district to Elmira (or closest adjacent school).

Mr. Larson, District No. 102J, stated that he would be more in favor of including all of School District No. 102J in R-6 rather than splitting the district -- but he would rather leave the district as it is at the present time. If all of District No. 102J were included in R-6 he felt the only persons that might not be in favor would be the Jeffers family who has a girl at present attending the Elmira High School but who will complete the 12th grade this year.

Elden Dutcher, District No. 102J, stated he would not be in favor of splitting the district.

Mrs. Dutcher, stated that District No. 102J would have no high school students for the next three or four years.

Phil Franklin District No. 32, requested slide that would show the entire boundary of School District No. 102J. (Slide No. 15, showing the entire boundary, was shown.)

Mr. Woodie explained to the people that in the event all of School District No. 102J should be included in R-6 it would be necessary to remove the U-4 portion of District No. 102J from Union High School District No. 4.

Mrs. Dutcher stated that there was a family by the name of Colby who lived at the end of the district but she believed the best place for them to attend would be at Crow.

Mr. Martin, Superintendent, District No. 32, asked the effective date of Reorganization. Mr. Woodie stated that in the event elections were held before April 30, 1959, it might be possible the effective date would be July 1, 1959.

Mr. Franklin requested further information on Reorganization elections; the percentages to carry the elections; how a district could reject a plan, etc. Mr. Woodie stated that a pre-existing district must vote 60% against a plan before they are given an opportunity to reject.

Mrs. Steinhauer, District No. 112, requested Mr. Woodie to reiterate concerning the responsibility of their district after July 1, 1960, relative to high school education. Mr. Woodie stated that it would be necessary for District No. 112 to make budget provisions for education of Grades 1 through 12 for the school year beginning July 1, 1960.

Mr. Steinhauer, District No. 112, requested information as to when they could proceed with the Reorganization election on R-6. He was wondering if a move for a Reorganization election could be made before their budget is made up for the coming year. Mr. Woodie explained that possibly the only steps they could take to have a vote before the budget is submitted would be to carry through a consolidation election as they had done previously (losing by one vote).

Mr. Steinhauer then stated that if the Reorganization vote could not be held before the budget is submitted that it be held at a later date under Reorganization rather than holding a consolidation election.

Mr. Woodie submitted a letter from the State Fire Marshal relative to inspection findings and recommendations on the Deadwood School, indicating that extensive renovation of the school would have to be made before March 5, 1959.

Mr. Steinhauer then asked where District No. 112 would secure the money to repair the building as required in the State Fire Marshal's report. Mr. Woodie asked if District No. 112 had a sufficient amount in their 1958-59 budget to take care of these repairs. When informed they did not, he suggested that they go on warrants and include the amount in their 1959-60 budget.

Page 3 - Minutes of Public Hearing on Proposed ASD R-6 and ASD R-7.

Mr. Swanson asked if any persons were present from School District No. 97J5 that would like to speak relative to proposed Administrative School District R-7. No one spoke from the above area.

There being no further questions the chairman declared the meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION



Chairman

Secretary

WRW:m

3

Eugene, Oregon
December 1, 1958

Meeting of the Lane County Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts was held in the County School Office with the following present:

Ray Swanson
Joe Swift
Earl Garoutte

William Wilt
Paul Ehinger

The reading of the minutes was dispensed with since each member had previously received a copy.

Information for a proposed brochure on Reorganization was presented by Mr. Woodie. The rough draft of the brochure was discussed and amended.

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Wilt, and carried, that the brochure as amended, be adopted.

Auditor Ronald Babcock presented information to the Committee relative to tax levies as they are at present and projected on the proposed Administrative School Districts. It was noted that the proposed administrative school districts would accomplish some equalization by reducing the spread in millage rates from more than 70 mills to less than 20 mills. The auditor was directed to prepare complete tax rate schedules based upon 1958-59 data.

Mr. Woodie informed the Committee that petitions were received from School Districts No. 4 and 43, Eugene and Coburg, and that the District Boundary Board had set the date of January 6, 1959, as the date of election.

The request of the Coburg School Board made at the November 18th meeting, was brought before the Committee, relative to the Committee attending a public meeting in Coburg before the consolidation election.

Motion was made by Mr. Swift, seconded by Mr. Wilt, and carried, that as many members as possible attend the public meeting at Coburg prior to January 6th (consolidation election date), in accordance with the request of the Coburg School Board at the November 18th meeting.

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Swift, and carried, that the schedule of hearings as set forth in minutes of November 18th, be adopted.

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Swift, and carried, that the following Procedures for Hearings be adopted:

I. Physical Arrangements

- A. Tables and chairs at the front of the auditorium or on the stage for committee members, alternates and clerks.
- B. A table and chair near the entrance for registration and distribution of materials.
- C. A public address system and lectern for the chairman.

II. Procedure

- A. Prior to the hearing date
 - 1. Reorganization Brochures and abstracts of the plan distributed to school board members, administrators and teachers.
- B. At the hearing
 - 1. Distribute Brochures and pertinent data to the persons attending the hearing.
 - 2. Presentation of the plan by the committee.
 - 3. Discussion of the plan.

III. Rules and Regulations

- A. The chairman will conduct the meeting. The secretary will provide for the presentation of materials and the recording of minutes.
- B. People attending the hearing may present opinions in one or more of the following ways:
 - 1. Present a signed, written statement to the committee.
 - 2. Mail a signed, written statement to the committee in care of Wm. R. Woodie, 858 Pearl Street, Eugene, Oregon.
 - 3. Address the committee or the assembly from the floor (3 minute time limit).
- C. Those persons wishing to speak will register at the door and will be called upon in the order they are registered. Persons who wish to ask questions or make statements, but are not registered, will be given an opportunity to speak after those who have registered have been heard.
- D. An opportunity will be provided for committee members to ask questions.
- E. Persons wishing to speak will be recognized by the chair and will be asked to state their name and school district.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR
SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION


Chairman

Secretary

WRW:m
j

Eugene, Oregon
November 18, 1958

Meeting of the Lane County Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts was held in the County School Office with the following present:

Edgar Rickard
Edward Efteland
Clarence Jackson

Joe Swift
Earl Garoutte

Since Ray Swanson, Chairman, was not present, Edgar Rickard, Vice-Chairman, presided.

The following persons appeared before the Committee from Douglas County #3J, (Lane County #25J): Mr. and Mrs. Albert Irvine, and Mrs. Wallace Potter. They appeared before the Committee with respect to remaining in the Lane County Administrative District R-2. The reasons they stated for wishing to remain in Lane County for school purposes rather than being included in Douglas County, were as follows:

1. Cottage Grove is their natural community.
2. Better school program.
3. Nearer to the Cottage Grove and Latham schools.
4. Historically.
5. Better highway travel.

Mrs. Irvine informed the Committee that only three (3) families with a total of six (6) children are affected in #3J: Perini's, Potter's, and Irvine's.

The Secretary presented a letter to the Committee previously received from Wallace and Betty Potter listing further reasons for wishing to remain in Lane County.

Mr. Woodie explained the Reorganization procedure to the delegation from #3J, Douglas County.

The following persons appeared before the Committee from School District No. 43, Coburg: Kenneth Williams, Superintendent; Jim Green, Stan Jensen, and John Jaqua, Board Members.

Mr. Williams informed the Committee that the Coburg School Board went on record to initiate consolidation petitions with District No. 4, Eugene--to become effective for the 1959-60 school year.

The purpose set forth in meeting with the Committee was to try to work out a cooperative plan to gain the same objective of consolidation between School Districts No. 4 and 43. The Coburg Board requested that the Reorganization Committee, at a public meeting in Coburg, explain why the Reorganization Committee concluded that Districts No. 4 and 43, Eugene and Coburg, make up ASD R-4. They felt that a public hearing on proposed ASD R-4 would be beneficial to the voters and would answer questions before a consolidation election is held. They would like to hold the consolidation vote before January 15th, if possible, or not later than February 1st. In case of defeat the board would have sufficient time to prepare the budget for 1959-60.

Since a quorum of the Reorganization Committee was not present, action will be taken at the next meeting, relative to the Reorganization Committee participating in a public hearing before a consolidation election.

Mr. Woodie explained to the Committee the possible effect of the 1958-59 tax levies upon Reorganization. Several districts were cited where the Rural School District equalized levy resulted in the district being a "receiving" or "contributing" district. This will no doubt have a definite effect on Reorganization.

The following procedure was suggested for public hearings:

1. Meetings to be conducted according to rules and regulations commonly adopted for such occasions.
2. Statistical and other information should be placed on slides wherever possible.
3. Consultant from State Department (Dennis Patch) be invited to attend all hearings.

The following hearing schedule was proposed:

- R-1 -- January 5, 1959 at Pleasant Hill Union High School. (Proposed R-1 consists of School Districts No. 1, 67, 71, U-1, and U-9).
- R-2 -- February 9, 1959 at Cottage Grove Union High School. Proposed R-2 consists of Districts No. 25J, 31, 45, 48, 75, 80, 84, 93, 128, 177, 191, 40, U-12, and U-14J).
- R-3 -- January 26, 1959 at Oakridge High School. (Proposed R-3 consists of Districts No. 76 and 117).
- R-4 -- February 16, 1959 at Cal Young Junior High School. (Proposed R-4 consists of Districts No. 4 and 43).
- R-5 -- February 23, 1959 at Elmira Union High School. (Proposed R-5 consists of Districts No. 28, 44, 88, 102J (U-4 part), 118, 139, 66, U-4, and Joint 1, Douglas).
- R-6 -- January 12, 1959 at Swisshome. (Proposed R-6 consists of Districts No. 32, 112, and 102J (Non-High part)).
- R-7 -- No hearing or vote required. (Proposed R-7 consists of District No. 97J, Lane, and 5J, Douglas - present boundaries).
- R-8 -- No hearing or vote required. (Proposed R-8 consists of District No. 68 - present boundaries).
- R-9 -- March 9, 1959 in Springfield. (Proposed R-9 consists of Districts No. 19 and 79).
- R-10 - No hearing or vote required. (Proposed R-10 consists of District No. 90, present boundaries).

Page 3 - Reorganization Board Minutes of November 18, 1958

R-11 - March 2, 1959. (Proposed R-11 consists of Districts No. 69J, Lane, 69J, Linn, and 186).

R-12 - No hearing or vote required. (Proposed R-12 consists of District No. 52, present boundaries).

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION



Chairman

Secretary

Eugene, Oregon,
October 21, 1958.

Meeting of the Lane County Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts, was held in the County School Office with the following present:

Marvin Hendrickson
John M. Brewer
Edgar Rickard
Ray Swanson
Winifred Hult

Joe Swift
Edward Efteland
Clarence Jackson
Paul Ehinger
Wm. Wilt

Motion was made, seconded and carried, that the minutes of the meeting of September 16, 1958, be approved. The reading of the minutes was dispensed with since each member had previously received a copy.

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded and carried, that Mr. Swanson appoint a committee to meet with the Douglas County Reorganization Committee relative to Douglas County Joint 1.

Motion was made by Mr. Brewer, seconded by Mr. Hendrickson, and carried, that the Lane County Committee rescind their former action and approve the inclusion of District No. 114J, Lane County, in the Benton County comprehensive plan.

The following action was taken on the establishment of proposed Administrative School Districts for Lane County:

R-1 ---- Consisting of School Districts No. 1, 67, 71, U-1, U-9. Approved by Committee previously.

R-2 ---- Consisting of School Districts No. 25J, 31, 45, 48, 75, 80, 84, 93, 128, 177, 191, 40, U-12 and U-14J.

Group III, Subcommittee, recommended to the Committee that the above districts comprise ASD R-2 with a minor change in the present southern boundary of District No. 48.

Committee Action: Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Hendrickson, and carried, that recommendations as submitted by subcommittee be incorporated in final report.

R-3 ---- Consisting of School Districts No. 76 and 117

Group III, Subcommittee, recommended to the Committee that the above districts comprise ASD R-3.

Committee Action: Motion was made by Mr. Rickard, seconded by Mr. Swift, and carried, to accept recommendation of subcommittee.

R-4 ---- Consisting of School Districts No. 4 and 43.

Subcommittee recommended to the Committee that the above Districts comprise ASD R-4.

Committee Action: Motion was made by Mr. Wilt, seconded by Mr. Ehinger, and carried, to accept recommendation of subcommittee.

R-5 ---- Consisting of School Districts No. 28, 44, 88, 102J (U-4 part), 118, 139, 66, U-4 and Joint 1, Douglas.

Subcommittee recommended to the Committee that the above Districts comprise ASD R-5.

Committee Action: Motion was made by Mr. Hendrickson, seconded by Mr. Ehinger, and carried, to accept recommendation of subcommittee.

R-6 ---- Consisting of School Districts No. 32, 112, and 102J (Non-High part).

Subcommittee recommended to the Committee that the above Districts comprise ASD R-6.

Committee Action: Motion was made by Mr. Brewer, seconded by Mr. Rickard, and carried, to accept recommendation of subcommittee.

R-7 ---- Consisting of School Districts No. 97J, Lane and Joint 5, Douglas, (Present boundaries).

The entire Committee considered this proposal. Motion was made by Mr. Brewer, seconded by Mr. Swift, and carried, that the above be established as ASD R-7.

R-8 ---- Consisting of School District No. 68 (present boundaries).

The entire Committee considered this proposal. Motion was made Mr. Rickard, seconded by Mr. Hendrickson, and carried, that the above be established as ASD R-8.

R-9 ---- Consisting of School Districts No. 19 and 79 and certain boundary adjustments in Linn County.

Subcommittee recommended to the Committee that the above Districts comprise ASD R-9.

Committee Action: Motion was made by Mr. Wilt, seconded by Mr. Hendrickson, and carried, to accept recommendation of subcommittee.

R-10 --- Consisting of School District No. 90 (present boundaries).

The entire Committee considered this proposal. Motion was made by Mr. Brewer, seconded by Mr. Hendrickson, that the above be established as ASD R-10. The vote result was as follows:

1 - NO
3 - YES
4 - ABSTAINED

Motion carried.

R-11 --- Consisting of School Districts No. 69J, Lane - 69J, Linn, and 186.

The entire Committee considered this proposal. Motion was made by Mr. Brewer, seconded by Mr. Ehinger, that the above be established as ASD R-11. The vote result was as follows:

7 - YES
1 - ABSTAINED (Efteland)

Motion carried.

R-12 --- Consisting of School District No. 52 (present boundaries).

The entire Committee considered this proposal. Motion was made by Mr. Hendrickson, seconded by Mr. Ehinger, and carried, that the above be established as ASD R-12.

School
Districts No.

55J ---- Committee approved -- that said district be included in the Linn County Comprehensive Plan, in accordance with the Linn County recommendation.

114J ---- Action of Committee on October 21, 1958, to include District No. 114J in the Benton County Comprehensive Plan, in accordance with the Benton County recommendation.

143 ----- Former action of Committee that said district be included in the Lincoln County Comprehensive Plan, in accordance with the Lincoln County recommendation.

154J ---- Former action of Committee that said district be included in the Benton County Comprehensive Plan, in accordance with the Benton County Recommendation.

155J ---- Committee approved -- that said district be included in the Linn County Comprehensive Plan, in accordance with the Linn County recommendation.

165 ----- Former action of Committee that said district be included in the Lincoln County Comprehensive Plan, in accordance with the Lincoln County recommendation.

U-11J --- Former action of Committee that said district be included in the Linn County Comprehensive Plan, in accordance with the Linn County recommendation.

After some discussion it was decided that the establishment of dates and places for hearings on the above proposals be postponed until the next meeting of the Committee.


Next meeting of the Committee will be held November 18th.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION



Chairman



Secretary

Eugene, Oregon,
October 20, 1958.

Meeting of the Lane County Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts, was held in the County School Office with the following present:

Ray Swanson
Wm. Wilt
John M. Brewer
Joe Swift
Edgar Rickard

Paul Ehinger
Winifred Hult
Clarence Jackson
Charles Foster

Letter was presented from Gerald Detering, Chairman, Linn County Reorganization Committee, relative to the Lane County Reorganization Committee's request regarding possible future boundary changes in Noraton district, in the event of their consolidation with Harrisburg. The following statement was made by the Linn County Reorganization Committee: "In the event of consolidation of Noraton District with Harrisburg, the Linn County Reorganization Committee would look with favor upon a proposal for a boundary change from the consolidated district to Junction City, if such change seemed desirable to the voters involved and educationally more feasible."

Letter was presented from Kenneth Barneburg, Secretary, Douglas County Reorganization Committee, stating:

"This is to advise you and the Lane County Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts that the Douglas County Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts has concurred with the Lane County Committee, in the matter of School Districts Joint 3 and Joint 5, as per your notification to us September 25, 1958."

"However, our committee was unable to concur in the matter of the disposal of Joint 1. Therefore, we are writing at this time, to request that arrangements be made for representatives of our committee to meet with your committee or representatives of your committee, in an effort to adjust any differences that might occur, concerning the disposition of Joint 1."

Letter was presented from Helen P. Baker, Secretary, Benton County Reorganization Committee, in response to Lane County's proposal on joint districts. The letter states as follows:

"The board approved your plan for District No. 154J, Lane County - 25jc, Benton."

"No action was taken on No. 155J, Lane - 29J, Benton, since this area lies in a Union High School District - Harrisburg. The law covers the Union High district in reorganization."

"In the case of No. 114J, Lane - 7cj, Benton, the Benton Board rejected the plan. The plan as suggested takes from Alsea the property value, but leaves the children. Perhaps some compromise can be worked out."

Page 2 - Reorganization Board Minutes of October 20, 1958.


The chairman, Ray Swanson, then instructed the sub-committees to go into session and complete proposals for the October 21st meeting.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION



Chairman



Secretary

Eugene, Oregon,
September 16, 1958.

Meeting of the Lane County Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts was held in the Conference Room, School District No. 4 Administration Building, with the following present:

Ray Swanson
Earl Garoutte
Edgar Rickard
Joe Swift
Clarence Jackson

Edward Efteland
William Wilt
Paul Ehinger
Marvin Hendrickson

Motion was made, seconded and carried, that the minutes of the meeting of August 4, 1958, be approved. The reading of the minutes was dispensed with since each member had previously received a copy.

Mr. Woodie requested the committee to consider the matter of joint school districts, i.e.: No. 155J, Lane (29J, Benton); No. 55J, Lane (63J, Linn); No. 154J, Lane (25J, Benton); No. 69J, Lane (69J, Linn); No. 25J, Lane (3J, Douglas); No. 114J, Lane (7J, Benton); No. 97J, Lane (5J, Douglas); No. 102J, Lane (1J, Douglas).

School District No. 155J (29J, Benton) - Noraton
Committee action taken previously.

School District No. 55J (63J, Linn) - Ward-Wyatt
Petition was presented to the Committee by Mr. Woodie, containing signatures of nine (9) persons living in Lane County, requesting that said District No. 55J be included in the Linn County Plan. Motion was made by Mr. Wilt, seconded by Mr. Swift, and carried, to table District No. 55J until outcome of the University of Oregon study for this area is received.

School District No. 154J (25J, Benton) - Monroe
Motion was made by Mr. Efteland, seconded by Mr. Ehinger, and carried, to go on record approving the inclusion of District No. 154J, Lane County, in the Benton County Plan.

School District No. 69J (69J, Linn) - Junction City
Motion was made by Mr. Efteland, seconded by Mr. Ehinger, and carried, that School District No. 69J, Linn County, remain in the Lane County Plan.

School District No. 25J (3J, Douglas) - Latham
Motion was made by Mr. Rickard, seconded by Mr. Ehinger, and carried, approving the inclusion of District No. 3J, Douglas County, in the Douglas County Plan.

School District No. 114J (7J, Benton) - Alsea
Motion was made by Mr. Wilt, seconded by Mr. Ehinger, and carried, that the southern boundary line of District No. 114J be established on Section line approximately 1½ miles South of County line -- said proposal be transmitted to Benton County for approval.

School District No. 97J (5J, Douglas) - Florence
Motion was made by Mr. Wilt, seconded by Mr. Garoutte, and carried, that District

No. 5J, Douglas County, remain in the Lane County Plan.

School District No. 102J (1J, Douglas) - Linslaw

Motion was made by Mr. Garoutte, seconded by Mr. Rickard, to refuse the request of Douglas County Reorganization Committee to include District 1J, Douglas County, in the Douglas County Plan. Amendment to this motion was made by Mr. Wilt, seconded by Mr. Hendrickson, that the motion is made on the basis that territory is tributary to Lane County. Vote on the amendment to the motion carried. Vote on the motion carried.

Letter was presented by Mr. Woodie from Mr. Kenneth Barneburg, Secretary, Douglas County Reorganization Committee, relative to Douglas County school districts joint with Lane County. The Committee favors that Douglas County 3J and U-14J, Latham and Cottage Grove, be eliminated as a joint district; that Douglas County 1J, Linslaw, organize everything on the Douglas side of the County boundary line into an administrative district in Douglas County; that Douglas County 5J, Florence, be left as a joint district and should continue to be a part of the Florence district.

Letter was presented from Mr. Huff, Secretary of the Lincoln County Reorganization Committee, relative to School Districts No. 143, 165, and the northern part of District No. 97J, Florence, South to China Creek. Mr. Woodie informed the Committee that in checking with the Florence School District he found that students are serviced by the Florence district as far north as Big Creek at the present time, and that he had informed Mr. Huff of this fact. Mr. Huff was under the impression that children in the North end of the Florence district were not serviced by Florence, but since this fact was verified they would certainly withdraw taking any of District No. 97J -- thus including Districts No. 143 and 165, only, in the Lincoln County Administrative Plan.

Mr. Woodie reported to the Committee that as yet the petition from Mr. and Mrs. Albert Fine, requesting the transfer of certain territory from School District No. 117 to School District No. 76, had not been presented to the District Boundary Board.

Letter was presented to the Committee from John and Elizabeth Vetsch, requesting the transfer of approximately 115 acres from School District No. 139 to School District No. 28. Motion was made by Mr. Hendrickson, seconded by Mr. Garoutte, and carried, that the Reorganization Committee not approve said transaction.

Slides pertaining to data on proposed Administrative School Districts R-1, R-2, R-3, R-5, and R-6, were presented by Mr. Woodie. The proposed Administrative Districts were discussed by the Committee. Administrative School District R-1, was previously approved by the Committee; R-2, R-3, R-5, and R-6, will be considered further by the Committee. Mr. Woodie called to the attention of the Committee the necessity of completing comprehensive plans, as the deadline for completion is near. Areas yet to be considered by the Committee are: Junction City, Alvadore, Eugene, Coburg, Springfield, Bethel, Marcola, McKenzie, and Blachly.

Mr. Woodie reported to the Committee that the consolidation election held in School Districts No. 32 and 112 on September 11th, failed to carry in District No. 112.

Motion was made, seconded and carried, that meetings of the Committee be held on Monday and Tuesday, October 20th and 21st, in the County School Office.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION



Chairman



Secretary

Eugene, Oregon
August 4, 1958

Meeting of the Lane County Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts was held in the County School Office with the following present:

Ray Swanson
Edgar Rickard
Earl Garoutte
John Brewer

Joe Swift
Edward Efteland
Paul Ehinger

Minutes of the meeting of July 15th were read and approved.

Mr. Swanson called for reports from the various sub-committees.

Sub-Committee Reports -

Group III

Mr. Ehinger reported on the Creswell-Cottage Grove area. He stated that since he was unable to attend the meeting held on July 21st, with the Directors of the Creswell grade and high school districts, he asked that Mr. Rickard and Mr. Garoutte comment on the meeting. Mr. Rickard said he felt that Creswell was happy to remain as they are and that a consolidation with Cottage Grove would not be satisfactory to them. Mr. Garoutte remarked that since only the school boards and administrators were represented at the meeting only a minority opinion was received, and that sentiment could change. It was the concensus of opinion that the Walker portion was the problem.

R-3-Oakridge-Westfir. Mr. Ehinger stated that the sub-committee on this area feels that the formation of one administrative school district in this area is the logical solution and recommends that meetings be called in Oakridge and Westfir to discuss the situation with each community.

Mr. Woodie handed each committee member a suggested outline for School District Reorganization Report, which includes these 7 points: 1. Existing school buildings. 2. Existing boundaries. 3. Proposed boundaries. 4. Utilization of existing buildings and recommendations regarding the location and construction of new buildings. 5. Adjustments of assets and liabilities. 6. Transportation. 7. Purposes in recommending this reorganization. He asked that the Committee keep these seven points in mind when working on the various sub-committees.

Group I-sub-committee. Mr. Swanson reported on the sub-committee meeting held on July 24th, when the following tentative proposals were made:

Area I-97J, Florence. A motion was made by Mrs. Hult, seconded by Mr. Hendrickson and carried, that school district 97J, Florence, the territory just north of Florence not now in any district, and 5J, Douglas County, form an administrative school district.

It was suggested that the Lane County District Boundary Board be petitioned for a boundary change which would annex the unorganized territory, on the northern boundary of 97J. Mr. Brewer suggested that the School Board of Florence be contacted concerning this.

Area II. Motion made by Mr. Foster, seconded and carried that District 32, Mapleton, the unorganized territory on the west boundary of District 32, District 112, Deadwood, and the Non-High portion of District 102J, Linslaw, form one administrative school district. A discussion followed concerning the use of the existing facilities. Mr. Brewer suggested it might be possible to include the unorganized territory in District 97J, rather than District 32. Mr. Brewer requested that a meeting be held to discuss reorganization with the people of this area. Mr. Brewer recommended that the reorganized district plan for a primary unit at Deadwood to cut down on transportation time for primary students.

District 90-Blachly. No changes recommended.

Area III. Motion made by Mr. Hendrickson, seconded by Mrs. Hult, and unanimously carried that the following be included in one administrative district: Union High 4, Elmira; District 66 (which now includes Lorane, District 36) and the Non-High portion of District 44, Central.

Mr. Swanson stated that academically it is very practical, but politically it may not be possible.

A discussion was held on the use of existing buildings and the consensus of opinion was that new buildings would have to be constructed.

Area IV. - Bethel. No recommendations made. A request has been made by some patrons on Stewart Road for a boundary change. The Committee has postponed action on minor boundary changes between large first class districts until other more pressing problems can be disposed of.

Alvadore. No action taken. The Alvadore Board is meeting tonight and will contact the sub-committee later.

Mr. Swanson stated that the sub-committee will continue their work on these various areas.

A phone call was received from Marcola reporting the vote in Marcola. For consolidation - Yes, 121 - No, 176.

Mr. Efteland asked concerning the Noraton consolidation and inquired if any communication had been received from the Linn County Reorganization Committee or Linn County District Boundary Board. Mr. Woodie stated that the letter sent on June 20, 1958, had not been answered, but Mr. Dolmyer, Linn County School Supt., (contacted by phone) stated that they were waiting for a report from the University of Oregon (Dr. Goldhammer) concerning the study being made in this area.

Motion by Ehinger, seconded and carried, that the Reorganization Committee approve the consolidation of Noraton and Harrisburg in order that the election might proceed.

The next meeting was set for Tuesday, September 16th.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION



Chairman



Secretary

WRW:im

Eugene, Oregon,
July 15, 1958.

Meeting of the Lane County Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts was held in the County School Office with the following present:

Ray Swanson
Edgar Rickard
Winifred Hult
William Wilt
Earl Garoutte

Joe Swift
Edward Efteland
Marvin Hendrickson
Clarence Jackson
Paul Ehinger

Minutes of the meeting of June 17th, 1958, were approved. The reading of the minutes was dispensed with since each member had previously received a copy.

Dr. Keith Goldhammer and Dr. Miles Romney from the University of Oregon, were introduced to the Committee. Both Dr. Goldhammer and Dr. Romney presented their findings and suggestions on proposed Administrative School District R-1. They also expressed to the Committee their proposals relative to several areas. They felt that the main objective of the Reorganization Committee was that of improving the present situation as to quality of education.

Summary of remarks made by Dr. Keith Goldhammer and Dr. Miles Romney:

1. Administrative School District R-1, although somewhat small, will make it possible for a better program of education to develop than is likely in any one of the pre-existing districts.
2. The proposed reorganization will not result in a school district large enough to provide the best program of education at the best unit cost, according to most authorities in school organization. (Dr. Goldhammer suggested 2000 students in Grades 1-12 as a reasonable size for an administrative school district.)
3. The Creswell area is probably more closely affiliated with Cottage Grove than with Pleasant Hill.
4. If administrative school districts of less than 2000 enrolment are formed the county school office will need to provide expanded administrative services to the districts.

Sub-Committee Reports -

Group II

Mr. Efteland reported that he had contacted some of the people in the Lane County portion of the Ward-Wyatt district and found that quite a majority were interested in going to Harrisburg. The chairman of this district has agreed to circulate a petition in the area to secure a

Group II, Cont'd.

more thorough indication from the people. The petition will be presented later to the Lane County Committee.

Mr. Wilt reported that the consolidation election of School Districts No. 19 and 79 will be held on Monday, August 4, 1958.

Mr. Woodie informed the Committee that to date no report relative to the Noraton situation had been received from either the Linn County District Boundary Board or the Linn County Reorganization Committee.

Relative to the Noraton District, motion was made by Mr. Efteland, seconded by Mr. Ehinger, and carried, to instruct the secretary to write to representatives in the Noraton District and inform them that since we have not as yet received a report from Linn County we will be unable to make a decision. However, we suggest that Noraton go ahead and start proceedings and if word is received from Linn County, action will be taken at a later meeting.

Group III

Mr. Ehinger reported that Group III - Sub-Committee, was exploring the Creswell-Cottage Grove area and the Westfir-Oakridge area. Meetings are being planned to consult with board members in these areas.


Group I - No report.

Mr. Woodie asked the Committee if he should do anything further on proposed Administrative School District R-1. Motion was made by Mr. Rickard, seconded by Mr. Garoutte, and carried, that the secretary make any necessary minor changes and that the present program be adopted.

Next meeting of the Reorganization Committee - August 4th.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE



 Chairman



 Secretary

Eugene, Oregon,
June 17, 1958.

Meeting of the Lane County Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts was held in the County School Office with the following present:

Ray Swanson	Earl Garoutte
Edgar Rickard	Wm. Wilt
Paul Ehinger	John Brewer
Edward Efteland	Gordon Hale
Joe Swift	

Minutes of the meeting of May 20th, 1958, were approved. The reading of the minutes was dispensed with since each member had previously received a copy.

Report of Group II Sub-Committee was presented by Mr. Efteland:

Relative to the Noraton area - a recommendation was drafted and approved by the Sub-Committee that the Reorganization Committee take no action which will block the proposed consolidation of Noraton and Harrisburg. However, since a substantial number of Lane County citizens have expressed a desire to be included in the Junction City School District, the sub-committee felt that the Lane County Reorganization Committee should request a statement from the Linn County District Boundary Board and the Linn County Reorganization Committee. This statement should indicate what their policy would be if after the consolidation part of the minority group would petition for a removal of territory from the consolidated district.

After the above report and recommendation was discussed by the Committee, the following motion was made by Mr. Efteland, seconded by Mr. Brewer, and carried:

Motion - To request a statement from the Linn County District Boundary Board and the Linn County Reorganization Committee indicating what their policy would be if all or part of this dissenting group should petition for transfer of the property they occupy from the consolidated district at Harrisburg to the Junction City School District. This statement to be obtained before the Lane County Reorganization Committee acts upon the request to approve the Noraton-Harrisburg consolidation.

Group II Sub-Committee submitted a proposed partial plan recommending the formation of Administrative School District R-1, comprising the area of the following existing common school districts: Districts No. 71 - Lowell, No. 67 - Fall Creek, and No. 1 - Pleasant Hill. Materials, maps, reports and proposals were distributed to the Committee members.

The above proposed partial plan formulating Administrative School District R-1 was discussed at length by the Committee.

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Garoutte and carried, to continue the study of proposed Administrative School District R-1.

Motion was made by Mr. Efteland, seconded by Mr. Swift and carried, to authorize the secretary to secure professional assistance and advice on proposed R-1.

The petition requesting addition of the Lane County District No. 55J, Ward-Wyatt, to Union High School District No. 5J, Harrisburg, was again discussed. Action on this petition was postponed pending further investigation. Mr. Efteland offered to contact persons living in this area to secure their feeling in the matter.

Petition was presented by the secretary, from School District No. 79, Marcola, requesting the consolidation of School Districts No. 19 and 79. (Petition from School District No. 19 had not yet been received.) Relative to the Committee's action on this consolidation - a motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Garoutte, and carried, that School Districts No. 19 and 79 be permitted to conduct a consolidation election under Section 42 of the Reorganization Law.


The Secretary informed the Committee, that School Districts No. 36 and 66 will hold a consolidation election on July 14th, 1958, under Section 42 of the Reorganization Act.

The request for approval of the transfer of territory belonging to Albert and Violette Fine (160A.) in School District No. ^M117 to School District No. 76, was reviewed. Motion by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Rickard, and carried, to concur in the transfer of territory as requested by Albert and Violette Fine in their letter of May 16th, should the District Boundary Board allow said change.

Next meeting of the Reorganization Committee - July 15th.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE



Chairman



Secretary

Eugene, Oregon,
May 20, 1958.

Meeting of the Lane County Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts was held in the County School Office with the following present:

Ray Swanson	John Brewer
Charles Foster	Marvin Hendrickson
Edgar Rickard	Joe Swift
Earl Garoutte	Edward Efteland
Winifred Hult	Paul Ehinger
William Wilt	Gordon Hale

Minutes of the meeting of April 15th were read and approved.

Mr. Swanson introduced the following persons who appeared before the Committee:

William Nelson - Board Member, School District No. 36, Lorane
Fred Archer - Superintendent, School District No. 36, Lorane
Earl Cooper - Superintendent, School District No. 66, Applegate

The above persons requested action on their letter presented to the Committee on April 15th, relative to request to consolidate School Districts No. 36 and 66. Also, offered to answer any questions the Committee might have relative to the above proposed consolidation.

Mr. Ehinger informed the above representatives that the Committee or Sub-Committee had taken no action on their request. He suggested that they meet with the Sub-Committee to discuss their plan further.

Mr. Woodie presented letter from the clerk of School District No. 44, Central, informing the Committee the outcome of a poll taken in their district relative to reorganization proposals.

Mr. Swanson requested that letters, petitions and requests received by the secretary be turned over to the respective Sub-Committee for their study and recommendations. The Sub-Committees then went into session.

Report of Sub-Committees to entire Committee:

Group I - John Brewer, Chairman.

The representatives present informed the Sub-Committee that the Committee's action on the above consolidation request is urgent - due to the immediate need of necessary repairs and additions.

Motion was made, seconded and carried by the Sub-Committee, to recommend that the request to consolidate Districts No. 36 and 66 be postponed.

The Committee discussed the question of the above consolidation at length. Mr. Swanson stressed to the Committee to consider a desirable unit to include the Districts No. 36, 66, and U-4 area. The question was raised as to whether or not the consolidation of Districts No. 36 and 66 would jeopardize the possible creation of an administrative unit to include the U-4 area.

Group I - Cont'd.

Mr. Brewer requested that it be made a matter of record that he would approve a consolidation election of School Districts No. 36 and 66 under Section 42 of the Reorganization Act, on the grounds that further reorganization of the area could be accomplished at a later date.

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Garoutte, that School Districts No. 36 and 66 be permitted to conduct a consolidation election under Section 42 of the Reorganization Law. Those in favor: Edgar Rickard, Earl Garoutte, William Wilt, John Brewer, Marvin Hendrickson, Joe Swift, Paul Ehinger. Those opposed: Ray Swanson, Edward Efteland. Motion carried.

Group II - Edward Efteland, Chairman.

1. Relative to School District No. 155J - Petition was received from Linn County, requesting the consolidation of School District No. 155J, Lane County, to School District No. 42, Linn County. The Sub-Committee recommended that the Lane County Committee not approve the consolidation vote.

A petition signed by thirty-two (32) voters in School District No. 155J, opposing any consolidation of all of District No. 155J with School District No. 42, Linn County, was presented.

After some discussion the Committee recommended that a plan of partition regarding the above be prepared by the Sub-Committee and submitted to the Linn County Committee.

2. Petition from Linn County to add School District No. 55J to the Harrisburg Union High School Dist. No. U-5J. The Sub-Committee recommended to the Committee that this request be investigated further before recommendation is made.

No action was taken on the Linn County petition pending further investigation by the Sub-Committee.

3. The Sub-Committee recommended that no action be taken by the Committee relative to piece-meal, minor adjustments of boundaries between Eugene and Bethel until such time as all boundaries between Eugene, Bethel and Springfield could be evaluated for possible adjustments.

Motion was made by Mr. Wilt, seconded by Mr. Swift, and carried, that the petition requesting the transfer of territory from School District No. 4 to School District No. 52 (see minutes of April 1, 1958) be disapproved.

Group III - Paul Ehinger, Chairman.

No report.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE



Chairman



Secretary

WRW:m

Eugene, Oregon,
April 15, 1958.

Meeting of the Lane County Committee for the reorganization of school districts was held in the County School Office with the following present:

Ray Swanson	Paul Ehinger
Edgar Rickard	Joe Swift
Earl Garoutte	John Brewer
Marvin Hendrickson	Edward Efteland
William Wilt	

Minutes of the meeting of April 1st were read and approved with the following corrections: Line 2 in No. 1, at top of page 3, change "recommends" to "appeared that the Committee would recommend." Also, Line 5, in No. 2, page 3, change "committee" to "Superintendent".

Ray Swanson appointed the following sub-committees to consider the following areas:

GROUP I - John Brewer, Chairman; Winifred Hult; Charles Foster; Marvin Hendrickson; and, Ray Swanson -

<u>Dist. No. and Name</u>	<u>Type of District</u>	<u>High School Status</u>
28 - Veneta	Elementary	U-4
32 - Mapleton	Unified	Unified
44 - Central	Elementary	U-4 and N.H.
36 - Lorane	Unified	Unified
52 - Bethel	Unified	Unified
88 - Noti	Elementary	U-4
66 - Applegate	Unified	Unified
90 - Blachly	Unified	Unified
97J- Florence	Unified	Unified
102J- Linslaw	Elementary	U-4 and N.H.
112 - Deadwood	Elementary	N.H.
118 - Lyons	Elementary	U-4
139 - Elmira	Elementary	U-4 and N.H.
143 - Ten Mile	Elementary	N.H.
165 - Ryan	Elementary	N.H.
186 - Alvadore	Elementary	N.H.
U-4 - Elmira Union High	High	High

GROUP II - Edward Efteland, Chairman; William Wilt; Gordon Hale; David Burwell; Joe Swift.

<u>Dist. No. and Name</u>	<u>Type of District</u>	<u>High School Status</u>
1 - Pleasant Hill	Elementary	U-1
4 - Eugene	Unified	Unified
19 - Springfield	Unified	Unified
43 - Coburg	Unified	Unified
55J- Ward-Wyatt	Elementary	N.H.
67 - Fall Creek	Elementary	U-9
68 - McKenzie	Unified	Unified
69J- Junction City	Unified	Unified

GROUP II - continued

71 - Lowell	Elementary	U-9, U-1, N.H.
79 - Marcola	Unified	Unified
114J- Alsea	Unified	Unified
154J- Monroe	Elementary	N.H.
155J- Noraton	Elementary	U-11J
U-1 - Pleasant Hill U.H.	High	High
U-9 - Lowell Union High	High	High
U-11J- Harrisburg U.H.	High	High

GROUP III - Paul Ehinger, Chairman; Edgar Rickard; Clarence Jackson; Earl Garoutte.

<u>Dist. No. and Name</u>	<u>Type of District</u>	<u>High School Status</u>
25J- Latham	Elementary	U-14J
31 - Blue Mt.	Elementary	U-14J
40 - Creswell	Elementary	U-12 & U-14J
45 - Cottage Grove	Elementary	U-14J
48 - Silk Creek	Elementary	U-14J
75 - London	Elementary	U-14J
76 - Oakridge	Unified	Unified
80 - Lynx Hollow	Elementary	U-14J
84 - Culp Creek	Elementary	U-14J
93 - Dorena	Elementary	U-14J
117 - Westfir	Unified	Unified
128 - Mount View	Elementary	U-14J
177 - Disston	Elementary	U-14J & N.H.
191 - Delight Valley	Elementary	U-14J
U-12- Creswell U.H.	High	High
U-14J- Cottage Grove U.H.	High	High

Secretary Woodie reported to the Committee that Dennis Patch, State Director of School District Reorganization, had contacted him relative to Statement of Policies, Lane County Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts, as adopted at the April 1st meeting. Mr. Patch commended the Committee on this Statement of Policies and requested permission to include same in a newsletter to the Reorganization Committees.

Request was again presented to the Committee by the Secretary, from R. L. Dusenberry, Superintendent, Cottage Grove Union High School, requesting the Reorganization Committee's permission to annex that portion of School District No. 177, Disston, which is at present non-high area, to Union High School District No. U-14J, Cottage Grove. Mr. Rickard reported to the Committee relative to his conference with the Cottage Grove Union High School Board.

Motion was made by Mr. Rickard and seconded by Mr. Garoutte, "that should the District Boundary Board approve the annexation of the non-high portion of District 177 to Union High School District No. 14J, said transaction would not be likely to conflict with the general reorganization of school districts throughout Lane County." Motion carried.

The Secretary presented a letter from the board of School District No. 36, Lorane, requesting the opinion of the Lane County Committee for School District Reorganization in regards to instituting plans for the consolidation of Lorane School District #36 and Applegate District #66. The Board would like to know also if such action was taken by both of the Districts concerned, would it meet with the approval of the Reorganization Committee at this time.

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger that the subject of consolidation of School Districts #36, Lorane, and #66, Applegate, be referred to the sub-committee studying that particular area in Lane County, and the decision and disposition of the case will be given at a later date and also pending receipt of letter from District #66 stating their desire of such a consolidation. Motion was seconded by Mr. Brewer and carried.

Mt. Wilt reported on Reorganization progress in Marcola.

Mr. Brewer reported that meetings are planned comprising the School Boards of District No. 32 and 112, and 32 and 102J.

Mr. Brewer raised the question of the possibility of adjusting boundaries between districts, when it would not affect valuation or pupils.

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Hendrickson, that the next meeting of the Reorganization Committee be devoted in part to sub-committee meetings. Motion carried.


Mr. Swanson reminded the Committee of the Interim Education Committee Meeting to be held at Erb Memorial Building, U. of O. on Friday, April 25th, and urged their attendance.

The Committee discussed problems confronting the Committee and requested Mr. Swanson to attend the Interim Education Committee meeting on April 25th, and present questions and suggestions in writing to the Committee.


Next meeting of the Committee will be held on Tuesday, May 20th.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE



 Chairman



 Secretary

Eugene, Oregon,
April 1, 1958.

Meeting of the Lane County Committee for the reorganization of School Districts was held in the County School Office with the following persons present:

Ray Swanson
William Wilt
Paul Ehinger
Edgar Rickard

Joe Swift
Edward Efteland
Charles Foster
Winifred Hult

Minutes of the meeting of February 18th were read and approved with the following correction: Page 2, line 3 of tentative appointments should read - LORANE, APPLGATE, and ELMIRA.

Mr. Woodie reported to the committee that the consolidation elections held in School Districts No. 27 and 69J on March 24th, carried by a large majority. Concurrence of the Linn County District Boundary Board was received April 1, 1958. According to the action of the Lane County Boundary Board the consolidation of said two districts will become effective on April 1st, 1958.

A proposed Statement of Policies, as made up by a committee comprised of Edward Efteland, Earl Garoutte, and William Wilt, was presented to the Reorganization Committee. After considerable discussion a motion was made by Mr. Ehinger, seconded by Mr. Wilt, to adopt the following Statement of Policies. Motion carried.

Statement of Policies

Lane County Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts

LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COMMITTEE

The Committee is required by law to formulate a plan or plans for reorganization in accordance with minimum standards and objectives contained in the Act as interpreted by the Committee. The Committee is required by law to conduct public hearings on plans or partial plans giving all persons ample opportunity to express themselves in regard to the plan.

FORMULATING REORGANIZATION PLANS

The Committee shall encourage the initiation of local action which will lead to recommendations for such reorganization as will make possible an adequate and efficient program of education. Local district school boards will act as consultants to the Committee and will be given the opportunity to express their opinions and the opinions of their patrons. After local district suggestions and recommendations have been compiled and reviewed the Committee will then begin to formulate the plan. Preliminary plans will be evaluated according to the following MINIMUM STANDARDS:

1. The plan shall provide for the inclusion of all of the area of the County in one or more administrative school districts which can furnish efficient and adequate educational opportunities for all the

pupils in grades 1 through 12.

2. Each administrative school district should be as nearly as is practicable a natural social and economic community.
3. Each administrative school district should have a sufficient pupil enrollment to provide for a reasonable educational program at a reasonable per pupil cost.
4. All administrative school districts should be organized in a manner that will provide the greatest possible equalization of financial resources.
5. No administrative school district shall be organized in a manner that will tend to impair the existing educational standards of a neighboring district.

GENERAL POLICIES

1. Endorsement by the Committee of any reorganization plan will not be authorized except by a majority vote of the members recorded in the minutes.
2. Local school board members, employees and patrons will be encouraged to participate as consultants in the formulation of preliminary plans.
3. The five alternates to the Committee will be ex-officio members of the Committee.
4. A copy of the minutes of each regular and special meeting of the Committee will be supplied to each local district board.
5. Professional aid and counsel from the University of Oregon School of Education and the State Department of Education may be utilized.
6. Consolidations and boundary changes under Section 42 of the Act will generally be allowed when the Committee finds that such action will not be likely to conflict with the comprehensive plan of reorganization for the County.
7. No plan of reorganization will be approved by the Committee until the local school boards have had ample opportunity to make suggestions and recommendations concerning the disposition of their school district.

Research Bulletin #9, Pupil Measures Used in Oregon Schools, as issued by the State Department of Education, was distributed to the members and alternates. Mr. Woodie discussed said booklet, which explains in detail the pupil measures in Oregon Schools.

Mr. Efteland reported on the Benton County Reorganization Committee meeting, which he attended. The areas which the Benton and Lane County Committees are jointly concerned are:

1. Area in Lane County (#114J) lying south of Alsea. The Benton County Committee recommends that this area should be included in the Benton County comprehensive plan.
2. Area in Lane County (#154J) lying south of Monroe. The Benton County Committee recommends that this area should be included in the Benton County comprehensive plan.
3. The Benton County Committee recommends that District No. 155J, Lane County, should become a part of Linn County District No. 42.

Mr. Efteland also reported on the local reorganization meeting held at Marcola.

Mr. Wilt reported on the local reorganization meeting held at Marcola.

Mr. Foster reported on the local reorganization meeting held at Lorane.

Petition was presented by the Secretary from patrons residing on Stewart Road, signed by ten (10) persons, requesting the Reorganization Committee to "change the block of land whose boundaries are 11th Street on the South, Stewart Road on the East and North, and Bertelsen Road on the West, from School District #4 to School District #52." The reasons listed on the petition for requesting change was "because of the greater convenience in the use of the school buses and the desire of us as parents to send our children to the Bethel Schools."

After considerable discussion the Secretary was instructed to notify the petitioners to contact the School Boards of Districts No. 4 and 52 to secure their recommendation regarding the requested change.

Letter was presented by the Secretary from Dennis Patch, State Director of School District Reorganization, requesting a summary of the work done by the Lane County Committee. The secretary's reply was read to the Committee.

Letter was presented by the Secretary from R. L. Dusenberry, Superintendent, Cottage Grove Union High School, requesting the Reorganization Committee's permission to annex that portion of School District No. 177, which is at present non-high area, to Union High School District No. 14J. After some discussion the Committee instructed Mr. Rickard to contact Mr. Dusenberry for additional information and report back to the Committee at their next meeting, April 15th.

Attorney General's opinions dated February 13th and March 6th, 1958, bearing upon Reorganization, were presented by the Secretary.

Letter was read by Mr. Swanson relative to the Interim Education Committee Meeting to be held at the Erb Memorial Building, U. of O., on Friday, April 25th, commencing at 10:00 a.m. This meeting is being held for the purpose of hearings on School District Reorganization. Members were urged to attend.

Results of the Surveys of Lane County Schools were presented to the Committee.

Meeting adjourned.

CORRECTION

- No. 1 . appeared that the Committee would recommend.
 No. 2. Superintendent

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
 DISTRICT REORGANIZATION

Ray C. Swanson Chairman
H. R. Hodie Secretary

Eugene, Oregon
February 18, 1958

Meeting of the Lane County Committee for the reorganization of School Districts was held in the County School Office with the following persons present:

Ray Swanson	Earl Garoutte
John Brewer	William Wilt
Edward Efteland	Gordon Hale
Edgar Rickard	Winifred Hult
Marvin Hendrickson	Clarence Jackson
Joe Swift	

Minutes of the meeting of January 21st were read and approved.

Letter was presented by the secretary from Mrs. Helen Baker, Secretary, Benton County Reorganization Committee, stating that the Benton County Planning Board is interested in knowing what disposition the Lane County Planning Board has planned for Lane County School Districts No. 114J and 154J; also, recommending that Lane County School District No. 155J become a part of the Linn County School District No. 42; Invitation was extended to the Lane County Committee to visit at their next meeting to be held Thursday, March 6, at 8:00 p.m., Court House, Corvallis.

Letter was presented by the secretary from Mr. Harold Drew, Chairman, School District No. 69J, Junction City, requesting petitions to consolidate School Districts No. 27, Liberty, and 69J, Junction City. Also, requesting the approval of the Reorganization Committee, that should the elections be in the affirmative in both districts, such a consolidation would be in line with the general reorganization of school districts throughout the county. Said petitions were requested ready for circulation on February 19th.

Letter was presented by the secretary from Mr. Ernest E. Dowling, Chairman, School District No. 27, Liberty, requesting petitions to consolidate School Districts No. 27, Liberty and 69J, Junction City. Also, requesting the approval of the Reorganization Committee, that should the elections be in the affirmative in both districts, such a consolidation would be in line with the general reorganization of school districts throughout the county. Said petitions were requested ready for circulation on February 19th.

Relative to the above requests from School Districts No. 27 and 69J, a motion was made by Mr. Efteland and seconded by Mr. Garoutte, that the Lane County School District Reorganization Committee approve the proposed consolidation of Junction City School District No. 69J and Liberty School District No. 27, in line with their letters of presentation. Motion carried.

Mr. Woodie explained the handling of payment of claims for the Reorganization Committee. He stated that the Lane County Committee was allocated an amount of \$1460 by the State, until July 1, 1958. He also stated that he had been informed by the State Department that in the event a county committee did not anticipate using the entire amount the State Department should be informed, in order that the balance could be transferred to another county committee. Mr. Woodie recommended to the committee that they look ahead and

anticipate their needs. Mr. Woodie explained the need for secretarial assistance and requested the committee to submit a claim for same. The committee gave their permission for submitting secretarial claims as needed.

Mr. Woodie informed the Committee that he had been contacted by persons residing in Lane County School Districts No. 143 and 165, informing him that they are still interested in going to Lincoln County but are waiting for Lincoln County to make the move.

Motion was made by Mr. Brewer, seconded by Mr. Swift, that Lane County School Districts No. 143 and 165 go to Lincoln County as part of the Lane County Comprehensive Reorganization Plan. Motion carried.

Relative to the above, Mr. Swanson requested that letters be sent to School Districts No. 143 and 165, stating that the Lane County Committee is favorable to said Lane County School Districts No. 143 and 165 going to Lincoln County. Mr. Swanson also suggested that copies of said letter be sent to the Secretary of the Lincoln County Committee and to Dennis Patch, State Director of School District Reorganization.

Mr. Woodie presented Reports and Forms from the State Department of Education relative to the work of the Committee.

Mr. Swanson brought up the matter of the vast extent of work facing the committee and suggested that the county be divided into areas with a sub-committee for each area. These sub-committees would be responsible for obtaining information for their particular area and presenting their findings to the entire County Committee.

Motion was made by Mr. Rickard, seconded by Mr. Brewer, that the chairman be authorized to appoint sub-committees for the various areas. Motion carried.

Mr. Swanson made the following tentative appoints for the following areas -- subject to revision:

Florence and Mapleton -----	John Brewer
Blachly -----	Winifred Hult
<i>Lorane</i> Elmira, Applegate, and Elmira -----	Ray Swanson, Charles Foster
Junction City -----	Edward Efteland
Bethel -----	Marvin Hendrickson
Eugene -----	Edward Efteland
Coburg -----	William Wilt
McKenzie -----	David Burwell
Springfield -----	Gordon Hale
Oakridge and Westfir -----	Paul Ehinger
Marcola -----	William Wilt
Pleasant Hill and Lowell -----	Joe Swift
Creswell -----	Clarence Jackson
Cottage Grove -----	Edgar Rickard

Mr. Woodie suggested to the committee the possibility of a tape and slide presentation being made available to the committee members for use in

public meetings. A motion was made by Mr. Efteland, seconded by Mr. Hendrickson, authorizing Secretary Woodie to devise an educational program of what materials he feels would be beneficial to the committee's presentation of this program. Motion carried.

Mr. Swift reported on local reorganization meetings held at Lowell and Pleasant Hill.

Mr. Jackson reported on the local reorganization meeting held at Creswell.

Mr. Wilt reported that the School Boards of Springfield District No. 19, and Marcola District No. 79, had met to discuss reorganization.


Mr. Efteland requested that the committee establish a policy relative to the responsibilities of the Committee. After some discussion Mr. Swanson was authorized to appoint a committee of three members to draw up a policy to present to the Committee. He appointed the following: Edward Efteland, Chairman, Earl Garoutte, and William Wilt.

Mr. Woodie was authorized by the Committee to secure and prepare a County map with the information as required by the Committee.

Mr. Swanson brought up the matter of the date of the next meeting scheduled for March 18th, since it falls during the week of spring vacation in most schools and the County Office personnel would be attending the O.E.A. Convention. A motion was made, seconded and carried, that the March 18th meeting be changed to Tuesday, April 1st.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION



Chairman



Secretary

Eugene, Oregon,
January 21, 1958.

Meeting of the Lane County Committee for the reorganization of school districts was held in the County School Office with the following persons present:

Ray Swanson
William L. Wilt
Joe Swift
John Brewer
Paul Ehinger
Marvin Hendrickson
Gordon Hale

Winifred Hult
Charles L. Foster
Earl Garoutte
Clarence Jackson
Edward Efteland

Minutes of the meeting of December 17th were read and approved.

Dr. Carl Huffaker appeared before the committee and made comments on the School District Reorganization Act. A summary of his comments follows:

There is a need for larger attendance units and larger administrative units in many Lane County School districts. According to studies made, Dr. Huffaker finds that the larger units, i.e. 100-400 for grade schools and 150-1200 for high schools have shown significantly better results. Studies also show that the number of drop-outs is less and the quality of the education is better in unified districts as compared to union high school districts. Dr. Huffaker stated that these conclusions were drawn upon averages and that exceptions would naturally exist.

In his estimation the Committee has the responsibility to set up a plan that will do the job of reorganization, however, unless changes are made in the Rural School District Law their efforts may be wasted.

Regarding the new Rural School Law, Dr. Huffaker states that it conflicts with State equalization, although it was presented as an equalization measure. He believes it to be a poorly written measure and predicts that it will not remain beyond the next session of the legislature.

Dr. Huffaker suggested the following areas as possible administrative units:

1. West of the Coast Range:
 - a. Two districts be joined to Lincoln County.
 - b. Mapleton and Florence seem to be adequately organized ←
at the present time.
2. Up the Willamette:
 - a. Consolidation of Oakridge and Westfir may be desirable
but is probably not possible in the immediate future.
3. Fall Creek, Lowell, and Pleasant Hill could form a good administrative unit.
4. West of Eugene:
 - a. Blachly, due to geographic conditions, should remain as is.
 - b. Lorane and Applegate could become an effective unit.
 - c. Elmira Union High School could become an effective unit

through the unification of the component elementary districts.

5. Districts that may become part of one of several choices:
 - a. Liberty - possibly to Junction City.
 - b. Alvadore - to Bethel or Junction City.
 - c. Noraton - possibly to Junction City.
6. Coburg - to Harrisburg or Eugene.
7. Marcola - to Springfield.
8. Cottage Grove area - unify except for Walker area.
9. Creswell area - unify including Walker.
10. Springfield - adequate in size at present.
11. Eugene - adequate in size at present.
12. McKenzie area.

Dr. Huffaker feels that a Junior High School may be advantageous in the Elmira area.

He believed the Committee would find problems in two areas:

1. Territory within Union High School Districts.
2. Certain Non-High School Districts.

He believes the most difficult area to be the Lowell, Pleasant Hill, Creswell to Cottage Grove; the Elmira area the easiest.

The Secretary read letters from the following: Dennis Patch - listing pertinent information to the committee; Lincoln County - excerpt from the Lincoln County Committee minutes regarding Lane County School Districts No. 143 and 165; Junction City - regarding possible consolidation of Liberty and Junction City at a future date. No action was taken on the letters read.

The Secretary reported on returns from the Surveys of Local School Districts and stated that a full report would be made at the March meeting.

Mr. Swanson reported that he had been contacted by Gerald Detering, Chairman of the Linn County Reorganization Committee, relative to the possibility of Coburg going to Harrisburg. After some discussion the committee decided to wait for recommendations from the Coburg district.


Joe Swift reported that he has been contacting many individuals in the Pleasant Hill-Creswell area, and requested that he be supplied with additional copies of information as to desirable size of schools and other reorganization materials.


Page 2 - Reorganization Minutes of January 21, 1958.

Next meeting of the Committee will be held on Tuesday, February 18th.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION


Secretary


Chairman

Eugene, Oregon,
Dec. 17, 1957.

A meeting of the Lane County committee for the reorganization of school districts was held in the County School Office with the following persons present:

Ray Swanson
Joe Swift
Earl Garoutte
William L. Wilt
Gordon Hale

John Brewer
Marvin Hendrickson
Paul Ehinger
Edward Efteland
Clarence Jackson
Wm. Woodie

The minutes of the meetings of October 30 and November 26, 1957, were read and approved.

Motion by Garoutte, seconded by Wilt and carried, that the alternates to the committee be asked to participate as ex-officio members.

Motion by Efteland, seconded by Hendrickson and carried, that the secretary be authorized and directed to survey each school district board to find what proposals they may have for solution of their problems in accordance with the reorganization law. This material was to be obtained before March 17, 1958.

Motion by Garoutte, seconded by Wilt and carried, to send a duplicate copy of the minutes of each meeting to all school district clerks with a request that the minutes be read to the board members.

Motion by Ehinger, seconded by Hendrickson and carried, that all schedules and general information prepared for, or by, the committee be supplied to interested persons upon request.

Motion by Ehinger, seconded by Hendrickson and carried, that the third Tuesday of each month be set as the regular meeting date with the time of the meeting to be 7:30 P.M. and the place of the meeting to be announced.

The secretary was authorized to investigate the possible loss of revenue from basic school support through consolidations that may occur under reorganization.

Motion by Garoutte, seconded by Efteland and carried, that an invitation to appear and speak to the committee relative to his views of the reorganization law be extended to Carl Huffaker of the University of Oregon.

Joe Swift reported that residents of the Pleasant Hill, Lowell, Fall Creek and Creswell districts have expressed some concern over possible changes in their district organization. A list of questions that came out of meeting held in the Creswell area were read and discussed. Joe Swift, Clarence Jackson and Wm. Woodie agreed to attend a meeting on January 7th with certain board members and administrators of the Pleasant Hill-Creswell area. The

Page 2, Minutes of December 17, 1957.

secretary was directed to notify Earl Petty, School District No. 40, Bill Markley, Union High School District No. 12, and J. G. Griffith, Union High School District No. 12, that no action regarding reorganization of the Creswell area has been taken by the committee.

Chairman Ray Swanson reported that the Benton County Reorganization Committee had unofficially requested a joint meeting with the Lane County Committee. No action was taken on this report.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR THE REORGANIZATION
OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS


Secretary


Chairman

MINUTES OF JOINT REORGANIZATION COMMITTEES, LANE AND
LINCOLN COUNTIES, REGARDING SCHOOL DISTRICTS 143 & 165.

Joint meeting of the Lincoln and Lane County Reorganization Committees and representatives of School Districts No. 143 and 165, Lane County, was held on Tuesday, November 26, 1957, at the Lane County Court House, Eugene, 7:00 o'clock p.m. -- just prior to the Regional meeting of Reorganization Committees.

Mr. Ray Swanson, Chairman of the Lane County Committee, called the meeting to order and stated that the purpose of the meeting was to consider the problem of Lane County School Districts No. 143 and 165, who are at present attending Lincoln County Schools.

The following committee members were present from Lincoln County: Members - Marvin Noble, Sherill Dodson, Dr. George Henderson, Mrs. Oscar Crawford, Kenneth Litchfield, Mrs. Marian Finley, H. E. Hermanson, Walter Pierce, Mrs. Clare Bump. Secretary: M. C. Huff.

The following committee members and alternates were present from Lane County: Members - Ray Swanson, William L. Wilt, John J. Swift, John M. Brewer, F. Earl Garoutte, Marvin Hendrickson, Edward Efteland, Paul Ehinger. Alternates: Charles Foster, David Burwell. Secretary: Wm. R. Woodie.

The following board members and clerk were present from District No. 143, Lane County: Doris McCrae, Vivian Bray, Virginia Stevens, Grace Wilson (clerk).

The following board members were present from District No. 165, Lane County: Margaret Townsend, Ira Hyatt.

Also attending from District No. 165, ^{W.S.} were Al Hayes and ~~Mrs. Brewer~~, Secretary-Treasurer of the Coquille Lumber Company.

Mr. Woodie spoke to the group relative to the situation of Districts No. 143 and 165, Lane County, which are located in the northwest part of Lane County but who transport their students to Lincoln County. The closest school districts in Lane County to these districts are School District No. 32, Mapleton, and School District No. 97J, Florence, but it is inadvisable to transport to these districts. New law under Reorganization would allow the consolidation of Districts No. 143 and 165 to Lincoln County, a County Unit County.

Mrs. Vivian Bray, Chairman, School District No. 143, spoke for the School Board of District No. 143, stating they would like for their children to attend at Yachats. They have attended there previously and would like to continue there. Phone service and available transportation is best to Yachats. The entire board favors this.

Mr. Ira Hyatt, Chairman, School District No. 165, spoke for the board of District No. 165, stating that they feel the school building at Fisher is too small. They would like something done so children could get a fair deal in school. Situation at Fisher is very bad - rooms inadequate.

^{Hayes}
Mr. ~~Brewer~~, Secretary-Treasurer of the Coquille Lumber Company, located in District No. 165, spoke regarding the situation of District No. 165. He stated that access of district is to Lincoln County rather than Lane County, both for students and patrons. District lies north of Highway 36, approximately 18 miles, which in the past 4 or 5 years, has grown considerably. No buildings

or land are owned by the school district. To transport to District No. 32, Mapleton, would necessitate reaching an elevation of approximately 1500 ft. and poor roads; too far to District No. 32, Mapleton (32 miles). It is just as far to Fisher but roads are good. It has been very difficult for High School students to get to High School. Students must furnish their own transportation. High School students attend Waldport High School. Outlet to area is definitely Newport and Waldport. All people in area are very desirous of a consolidation.

Mr. Huff, Secretary of the Lincoln County Reorganization Committee, stated that before Reorganization, Districts No. 143 and 165, Lane County, petitioned Lincoln County Board to become a joint district with Lincoln County. In a district paying tuition to another district, it does not pay for capital outlay. Lincoln County district has hesitated about something that will not pay for this.

Mr. ^{Huff} ~~Brewer~~ again spoke stating that the Deadwood road would not be feasible. Forest road not satisfactory and almost impassable to arrange suitable transportation. Very difficult to work out bus schedules. As it is at present does not believe anything could be worked out satisfactorily with District No. 32, Mapleton.

Mr. Swanson introduced Dennis Patch, State Director of School District Reorganization. Mr. Patch stated that the case where two districts (suspended) were added to another county, would take joint action of the two Reorganization Committees, since it does not affect the Comprehensive Plan of the County -- get the sanction of the individual districts.

Mr. Huff - If Districts No. 143 and 165 would vote to come into Lincoln County would Lincoln County have to accept them by a majority vote?

Mr. Patch - It would take a simple majority to carry.

Mr. Noble, Chairman of the Lincoln County Reorganization Committee, spoke regarding the problem of District No. 143, District No. 143 does not come south far enough to serve Yachats and Florence. Line lacks about 7 miles of being a midpoint. No children living in this area at the present time. If they proceed to take District 143 now and midpoint is struck it would affect District No. 97J (Florence), Lane County, also and go south as far as China Creek.

Mr. Swanson suggested that Lincoln County draw up plans and submit to the Lane County Committee.

Mr. Patch stated that if District No. 97J (Florence), Lane County, is affected there should be an agreement set up with the Florence School Board.

Mr. Noble - If Committees of Lane and Lincoln Counties agree to consolidate said two districts (143 and 165), same could be put to a vote of the districts. In Lincoln County it would take a vote of Lincoln County.

Mr. Woodie - There are two ways this may be accomplished:

1. Vote on consolidation of two districts and Lincoln County.
2. Become a part of the Reorganization Plan.

Mr. Ehinger suggested that two plans be submitted: One (1) to include part of District No. 97J, (Florence); One not including part of District No. 97J (Florence).

Mr. Noble - suggested they put aside District No. 97J (Florence) at present and put it before the Lane County Reorganization Committee at a later date.

Motion was made by Mr. Ehinger and seconded by Mr. Noble "That the Lincoln County Committee on Reorganization be authorized to prepare plan and alternate plan at a later date to include Districts No. 143 and 165 in the Lincoln County School District Reorganization Plan and submit to the Lane County group."

Motion carried.

Mr. Huff - Policy of Lincoln County board to take care of children regardless of residence.

Mr. Noble - Bond issue last fall failed. Why should Lincoln County taxpayers vote a bond issue for providing building for Lane County children? With district change he was sure Lincoln County taxpayers would favor.

Meeting adjourned.

Minutes taken by Margaret Blanton.

MINUTES OF REGIONAL REORGANIZATION COMMITTEES
LINN, DOUGLAS, LINCOLN, BENTON, AND LANE COUNTIES

Eugene - November 26, 1957

Regional meeting of the Reorganization Committees of Linn, Douglas, Lincoln, Benton, and Lane Counties was held in Court Room No. 1, Lane County Court House, Eugene, on Tuesday, November 26, 1957, commencing at 8:00 o'clock p.m.

Meeting was called to order by Ray Swanson, Chairman, Lane County Reorganization Committee.

Mr. Swanson called upon the Chairman of each Committee to introduce members and alternates of his Committee: Those attending were as follows:

Linn County - Members: Wm. R. Grenz, Robert Mealey, James Jenks, Paul Pugh, Dr. David Reid. Alternates: George Edwards, Walter Shelby, Secretary: Wm. H. Dolmyer.

Douglas County - Members: Norman Weatherly, Wilbur Merlich, Keith Van Krevelen, Clyde Nunally, Louis Brady. Alternate: Frank White. Secretary: Kenneth Barneburg.

Lincoln County - Members: Marvin Noble, Sherill Dodson, Dr. George Henderson, Mrs. Oscar Crawford, Kenneth Litchfield, Mrs. Marian Finley, H. E. Hermanson, Walter Pierce, Mrs. Clare Bump. Secretary: M. C. Huff.

Benton County - Members: Harrison Weatherford, Ralph Hull, Howard L. Ball, Chris Linseth, David Barclay, A. R. Anderson. Alternate: Walter P. Hubbard. Secretary: Helen P. Baker.

Lane County - Members: Ray Swanson, William L. Wilt, John J. Swift, John M. Brewer, F. Earl Garoutte, Marvin Hendrickson, Edward Efteland, Paul Ehinger. Alternates: Charles Foster, David Burwell. Secretary: Wm. R. Woodie.

Mr. Swanson introduced Dennis Patch, State Director of School District Reorganization, and Mrs. Lucille O'Neill, Chairman, State Board of Education.

Mrs. O'Neill brought greetings from the State Board of Education. She stated the Board is anxious to attend as many Reorganization meetings as possible to become thoroughly familiar with problems of reorganization. She stated that all members of the State Board are in accord with the philosophy of consolidation. They are desirous of securing the best for our children for the money spent. They are not just sure how the law will work out but will work hard to administer it. Praised Dennis Patch for his capable guidance in setting up the Reorganization Law. Stressed that this is not a "hurry up" law to set up. The State Board wishes to be of assistance whenever possible.

Mr. Patch sincerely hopes that this meeting will prove both informative and beneficial to the Committees. He summed up the trend toward the present Reorganization Law:

1. In 1939 the first legislation mentioning Reorganization.
2. The above legislation lead to many consolidations.

3. In 1949, the legislature provided funds for a complete study of elementary and high school education in Oregon. (Dr. Holy).
4. The above study was referred to as the Holy Report - which urged that districting in Oregon was costly and haphazard and needed revamping.
5. In 1951 - Reorganization passed by legislature but was referred to the people and was defeated.
6. In 1953 - Reorganization not accepted.
7. In 1955 - Legislature appointed an interim committee.
8. In 1957 - Legislature passed Reorganization Act - Became law August 20, 1957.

Mr. Patch distributed printed summaries then called for questions from the committee members:

Question - Would like to have Section 22 explained. Is it constitutional?

Answer - Law states that "rejecting school district" means a common School district within which 60 percent or more of the votes cast within any one or more of such common school districts are against the formation of the administrative school district, the organization of the new administrative school district shall be delayed for a period of 30 days. During the 30-day period a petition against the formation of the new administrative school district may be filed by the legal school voters of any rejecting school district with the county superintendent. If such a petition is filed with the county superintendent, within the 30-day period and is signed by a number equal to 50 percent or more of the legal school voters who voted in the rejecting school district, another election shall be held in such rejecting school district in the manner provided by sections 19 and 21 of this Act within 60 days after the date of the election on the formation of the administrative school district. If no such petition is filed within the 30-day period, the organization of the administrative school district shall proceed in the manner provided.

Question - For 34 years Lincoln County has had a County unit. Is there a legal provision for local districts within the County Unit? Will County Unit discontinue local units?

Answer - Reorganization on a County Unit basis would become an administrative school district as provided by law. Would have to conform to the committee and be zoned into seven (7) zones. Should you desire to continue local committees it would be O.K. to include this in your Reorganization Plan, but it would take further legislative action to clarify this point.

Question - Referring to Section 22 - is there a definite regulation between a district that has Grades 1-8 and High School? Is there another type of school district other than a common school district?

Answer - No. Unified, Union High School, Common School Districts, and etc., all vote in the same manner. All districts come under the title of "common school district".

Question - Is there a common school district in a County Unit System?

Answer - No. Entire County is considered a "common school district".

Question - In County Unit County if the boundaries are reorganized in its entirety would it take a vote of the people?

Answer - A vote would be required only if the boundaries were changed.

Question - The Lincoln County Committee has many choices in their plan. What would be their procedure?

Answer - If Districts No. 143 and 165, Lane County, were brought in and a consolidation election held in Districts No. 143 and 165, Lane County, and Lincoln County. This procedure is included in the last Section of the Act. This may be done and does not have to be included in the comprehensive plan. If Districts 143 and 165, Lane County, were consolidated it would not need to have a second vote to create an administrative unit, as Lincoln County is already an administrative unit.

Question - Items 13 and 14 of Time Sequence Summary. No doubt that would be legislative action.

Answer - I wouldn't bank on that.

Question - If a common school district with grades 1-8 and part of a Union High District votes to stay out (rejecting district) what would happen to them?

Answer - There is no way of answering. Law does not indicate what would happen to them. No district that maintains a high school has to take children outside their district.

Question - In consolidating Lane County School Districts 143 and 165 to Lincoln County, would this develop an educational problem if it precedes a Reorganization Plan submitted to the voters? If consolidation election carried is it correct that the Lane County Committee would not include them in their Reorganization Plan?

Answer - That is correct.

Question - What would happen to a district that has a high school building in its district and votes the plan down?

Answer - Location of high school makes no difference.

Question - Explain No. 17. How long does a County have to make a plan before the State steps in?

Answer - Committee must meet two times during the first year. Committee would have 12 months to come up with a comprehensive plan. The Committee serves until a plan is accepted, or until July 1, 1962. If the County Committee fails to function then the State steps in and submits a plan.

Question - Regarding setting up 7 zones - how is it determined?

Answer - As nearly as practical according to census.

Question - Regarding the tax base - Lincoln County has in the past voted to exceed the 6% limitation. Does it require a new base or does it require the district to exceed the 6% limitation as it has in the past?

Answer - Vote to exceed 6% limitation until a new tax base is voted.

Question - Regarding Comprehensive Plan. Vote on entire program or on individual items such as tax base, vote to accept another district, etc. Must it be a separate vote or can it be a packaged vote?

Answer - It would be on a packaged unit.

Dennis Patch then presented the following General Plan.

Reorganization Committee will be confronted with:

1. Matter of problem of coming up with a Comprehensive Plan including all territory in the county.
 - a. In making Comprehensive Plan, studies are quite important. Study should be made and Committee should take a careful look at the entire County.
2. Under the Law there are 3 minimum standards in section 11. Any proposed plan must meet the conditions of the three minimum standards. Two are written in the law in Parts 1 and 2 of Section 11.

Standards:

 - a. A proposed administrative district shall offer Grades 1-12.
 - b. A proposed administrative district shall be as nearly as possible near a natural social unit.
 - c. Any proposed district must provide an educational program that provides education for elementary and high school, according to the State standards.
3. "Criteria for a Good School District". These should be used as a guide. The State Board in evaluating the plans will use this Criteria.
4. Thinking of the State Board of Education that to establish an arbitrary figure would accomplish this -- impossible in some areas and in some it could be made but would not be desirable.

The following publications are available from the State Department of Education, on request:

"Key to Reorganization of School Districts."

Research Bulletin recently revised - "Reorganization of School Districts in Oregon" by L. E. Marschat.

Mr. Patch stated that it is necessary that Committees make certain surveys indicated in Section 9 of the Law. Materials will be made available around the first of January and will be sent from his office.

Mr. Swanson, Chairman of the Lane County Committee, ask the various counties their policy regarding alternates. Are they attending the regular meetings, etc.?

Linn County - Is treating them as ex-officio committee members.

Douglas County- Included in meetings and expenses paid.

Lincoln County - Invitation extended to alternates.

Benton County - Invitation extended to alternates.

Mr. Patch - Statewide at least 70% are including alternates when they attend regular committee meetings. He feels this is a good policy. It is something to be decided by committee.

Douglas County stated that Committee voted to meet once a month as long as necessary and send a copy of the minutes to all school boards within the County.

Meeting adjourned.

Minutes taken by Margaret Elanton.

Eugene, Oregon,
October 30, 1957.

Meeting of the Lane County Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts was held in the County School Office with all members present except Paul Ehinger. First alternate, Clarence Jackson, was also in attendance.

Ray Swanson was nominated and elected unanimously to the position of Chairman.

Edgar Rickard was nominated and elected unanimously to the position of Vice-Chairman.

A reorganization kit containing maps, charts, and other data concerning Lane County Schools was distributed by the secretary. A discussion of the kit followed.

A tape recording of an address by Dr. C. O. Fitzwater of the U. S. Office of Education, speaking on reorganization, was played with discussion following.

A letter from D. W. Patch requesting information regarding dates for regional meetings was read by the secretary.

It was moved, seconded and carried, to inform Mr. Patch that the date of Tuesday, November 26 was satisfactory to the committee as a regional meeting date and that the committee favored evening meetings but would not object to afternoon meetings.

The secretary was requested to supply each member with a copy of the report made by the Lane County Committee for the Study of School Organization 1955-56.

The secretary was requested to supply each member with a membership roster including names, addresses, and telephone numbers.

Meeting adjourned.

LANE COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR THE REORGANIZATION
OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS


Secretary


Chairman

Minutes

LANE COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD CONVENTION

October 9, 1957
7:30 P.M.

The Lane County School Board Convention convened at the Woodrow Wilson Junior High School on Wednesday, October 9, 1957, at 7:30 P.M.

Mr. William Woodie acting as temporary chairman of the Convention, called the meeting to order. The purpose of the Convention was then read by Mr. Woodie. Acting as chairman Mr. Woodie appointed Margaret Blanton as secretary of the Convention and Ralph Cobb as parliamentarian.

Roll call of the voting members was taken by the secretary.

Rule I of Rules and Regulations was read by Mr. Woodie. Motion was made, seconded and carried, to adopt Rule I of the Rules and Regulations, which follows:

"The meeting shall be conducted according to the rules of Parliamentary Procedure as outlined in Robert's Rules of Order, Revised."

Mr. Woodie then called for nomination of a chairman for the Convention. Motion was made, seconded and carried, that Mr. Woodie serve as chairman for the remainder of the Convention.

Mr. Woodie then declared a quorum present and stated that an official notice of the Convention had been given to all board members. He then explained and discussed Oregon Laws Chapter 619, 1957 Session Laws.

Mr. Cobb, acting as Parliamentarian, discussed Rules II and III of Rules and Regulations governing the Nomination for the 9-Man Committee and Alternates and Voting on the 9-Man Committee and Alternates. Mr. Woodie appointed Mr. Cobb to act as chairman during the discussion and questions.

Motion was made by C. L. Foster, seconded and carried, to adopt Rule II of Rules and Regulations.

Mr. Grover Kelsay, School District No. 1, raised the question of having to vote for the number of positions remaining to be filled, as stated in Rule III-f. Mr. Kelsay asked that this section be repealed thus allowing legal voters to vote for a lesser number. Chairman Woodie ruled that Rule III-f would stand. Motion was made by Mr. Kelsay to appeal this ruling to the Convention and question was put to the Convention. Vote was taken and failed to carry.

Motion was made, seconded and carried, to adopt Rule III of Rules and Regulations.

Chairman Woodie then called for nominations for the 9-Man Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts. The following were nominated:

Earl Garoutte - District No. 84, Culp Creek
John Brewer - District No. 32, Mapleton
Paul Ehinger - District No. 117, Westfir
Clarence Jackson - District No. 40, Creswell

Otto Vonderheit - District No. 4, Eugene
Ray Swanson - District No. 88, Noti
Edward Efteland - District No. 4, Eugene
Marvin Hendrickson - District No. 52, Bethel
John Swift - District No. 1, Pleasant Hill
Edgar Rickard - District No. 45, Cottage Grove
William L. Wilt - District No. 79, Marcola

It was suggested that the above nominated candidates stand.

Motion was made by Mr. Garrard Force, District No. 44, that since people had arrived after the reading of the directors names, that the secretary call the names of those not present at the first reading. The secretary was so instructed.

Mr. Woodie appointed Irma Martin and Margaret Blanton to serve as tellers.

Ballots were distributed and after they were collected for tally a 10-minute recess was declared.

(Note: 176 legal voters were present - thus 89 would be considered a majority vote.)

The following are the results of the election:

John Brewer -----	169 votes
William L. Wilt -----	167 votes
Paul Ehinger -----	158 votes
Edgar Rickard -----	157 votes
John Swift -----	155 votes
Ray Swanson -----	155 votes
Edward Efteland -----	150 votes
Earl Garoutte -----	136 votes
Marvin Hendrickson -----	133 votes
Clarence Jackson -----	118 votes
Otto Vonderheit -----	58 votes

Chairman Woodie declared that the nine (9) receiving the highest number of votes cast, which was a majority vote, elected. These are as follows:

John Brewer - District No. 32, Mapleton
William L. Wilt - District No. 79, Marcola
Paul Ehinger - District No. 117, Westfir
Edgar Rickard - District No. 45, Cottage Grove
John Swift - District No. 1, Pleasant Hill
Ray Swanson - District No. 88, Noti
Edward Efteland - District No. 4, Eugene
Earl Garoutte - District No. 84, Culp Creek
Marvin Hendrickson - District No. 52, Bethel

The chairman then called for nominations for 1st Alternate.

The following were nominated:

Clarence Jackson - District No. 40, Creswell
David Burwell - District No. 68, McKenzie
Gordon Olson - District No. 4, Eugene

Ballots were distributed and after they were collected and tallied the results were found to be as follows:

Clarence Jackson ----- 78 votes
David Burwell ----- 70 votes
Gordon Olson ----- 23 votes

Since none of the three (3) candidates nominated received a majority vote, a second ballot for 1st Alternate was ordered.

Ballots were distributed for second ballot on 1st Alternate. Ballots were collected and counted and results were found to be as follows:

Clarence Jackson ----- 90 votes
David Burwell ----- 79 votes
Gordon Olson ----- 2 votes

Since Clarence Jackson received a majority of the votes cast, he was declared elected to serve as 1st Alternate to the Lane County Reorganization Committee.

Chairman Woodie called for nominations for 2nd Alternate to the Lane County Reorganization Committee. The following were nominated:

David Burwell - District No. 68, McKenzie
Charles Foster - District No. 66, Applegate
Earl Drury - District No. 71, Lowell
Mrs. K. E. Montgomery - District No. 4, Eugene

Ballots were distributed and after they were collected and tallied the results were found to be as follows:

David Burwell ----- 52 votes
Charles Foster ----- 85 votes
Earl Drury ----- 20 votes
Mrs. K. E. Montgomery ----- 5 votes

Since Charles Foster received a majority of the votes cast, he was declared elected to serve as 2nd Alternate to the Lane County Reorganization Committee.

Chairman Woodie called for nominations for 3rd Alternate for the Reorganization Committee. The following was nominated:

Mrs. Winifred Hult - District No. 90, Blachly

A motion was made, seconded and carried, to instruct the secretary to cast a unanimous ballot for Winifred Hult to serve as 3rd Alternate to the Lane County Reorganization Committee.

Chairman Woodie then called for nominations for 4th Alternate to the Reorganization Committee. The following were nominated:

- Gordon Hale - District No. 19, Springfield
- Earl Drury - District No. 71, Lowell

Ballots were distributed and after they were collected and tallied the results were found to be as follows:

- Gordon Hale ----- 111 votes
- Earl Drury ----- 50 votes

Since Gordon Hale received a majority of the votes cast he was declared elected to serve as 4th Alternate to the Lane County Reorganization Committee.

Chairman Woodie then called for nominations for 5th Alternate to the Lane County Reorganization Committee. The following were nominated:

- Larry Chapman - District No. 31, Blue Mt.
- David Burwell - District No. 68, McKenzie

Ballots were collected and canvassed and the results were found to be as follows:

- Larry Chapman ----- 60 votes
- David Burwell ----- 95 votes

Since David Burwell received a majority of the votes cast he was declared to serve as 5th Alternate to the Lane County Reorganization Committee.

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret Blanton

 Secretary

Frank R. Woodie

 Chairman

Minutes
of
Reorganization
Board

Nov. 6, 1939
to

~~Aug. 17, 1940~~
Jan. 14, 1941

Eugene, Oregon,
January 14, 1941.

A meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held in the County Court House with Judge Clinton Hurd, County Assessor Welby Stevens, L. W. Newcomb, F. W. Beaver, and L. C. Moffitt, Co. Supt., present; E. R. Lemley and A. R. Beebe, absent.

The minutes of the meeting of August 28th were read and approved.

The ballots were canvassed from the various elections held and were found to be as follows:

Combination No.	Districts Combined	Dist.	Date of Election	Result of Elec.
1	5 and 70	5 70	November 19, 1940 (No election)	YES 0 - NO 11
2	11 and 174	11 174	November 12, 1940 (No election)	YES 0 - NO 16
3	64 and 79	64 79	November 26, 1940 (No election)	YES 1 - NO 30
4	43 and 49	43 49	(No election) November 19, 1940	YES 0 - NO 12
5	65 and 126	65 126	November 26, 1940 (No election)	YES 12 - NO 22
6	57 and 95	57 95	(No election) November 12, 1940	YES 10 - NO 25
7	19 and 85	19 85	(No election) November 12, 1940	YES 8 - NO 45
8	13, 9 and 103	13 9 103	November 12, 1940 (No election) November 12, 1940	YES 7 - NO 29 YES 0 - NO 15
9	29, 141 and 1	29 141 1	November 12, 1940 November 19, 1940 November 12, 1940	YES 17 - NO 21 YES 0 - NO 8 YES 3 - NO 16
10	71, 46 and 82	71 46 82	(No election) (No election) November 26, 1940	YES 9 - NO 7
11	2 and 162	2 162	November 12, 1940 (No election)	YES 0 - NO 22

12	40, 42, 63, and 178	40	December 19, 1940	YES	3 - NO 15
		42	December 3, 1940	YES	2 - NO 5
		63	(No election)		
		178	(No election)		
13	26, 41, 80, and 191	26	December 3, 1940	YES	1 - NO 14
		41	December 3, 1940	YES	0 - NO 6
		80	November 26, 1940	YES	7 - NO 22
		191	November 19, 1940	YES	1 - NO 20
14	93, 84, and 177	93	November 26, 1940	YES	0 - NO 15
		84	(No election)		
		177	December 3, 1940	YES	0 - NO 12
15	16, 22, 78, 98 and 125	16	November 19, 1940	YES	0 - NO 13
		22	December 19, 1940	YES	5 - NO 2
		78	November 26, 1940	YES	2 - NO 9
		98	December 19, 1940	YES	1 - NO 7
		125	December 19, 1940	YES	0 - NO 3
16	8 and 51	8	(No election)		
		51	December 3, 1940	YES	0 - NO 6
17	21, 23, 86, and 138	21	November 19, 1940	YES	0 - NO 21
		23	November 19, 1940	YES	0 - NO 20
		86	(No election)		
		138	(No election)		
18	118, 120, 89, and 113J	118	(No election)		
		120	November 12, 1940	YES	9 - NO 10
		89	November 26, 1940	YES	0 - NO 12
		113J	November 12, 1940	YES	0 - NO 6
19	99, 173, 97, 53, 101 and 179J	99	(No election)		
		173	December 3, 1940	YES	0 - NO 5
		97	(No election)		
		53	November 12, 1940	YES	1 - NO 28
		101	November 19, 1940	YES	1 - NO 26
		179J	December 19, 1940	YES	0 - NO 9
20	6 and 87	6	November 26, 1940	YES	23 - NO 18
		87	(No election)		
21	24, 31, 119, and 128	24	(No election)		
		31	November 12, 1940	YES	2 - NO 22
		119	November 19, 1940	YES	1 - NO 7
		128	December 19, 1940	YES	6 - NO 14
22	17, 27, 111, and 134	17	(No election)		
		27	December 3, 1940	YES	0 - NO 7
		111	December 18, 1940	YES	0 - NO 10
		134	(No election)		

23	10, 77, 108, 110 and 136	10	November 26, 1940	YES	0 - NO	6
		77	November 12, 1940	YES	0 - NO	0
		108	November 19, 1940	YES	0 - NO	22
		110	(No election)			
		136	November 19, 1940	YES	0 - NO	9

24	90 and 192	90	(No election)			
		192	(No election)			
=====						
1-R	34 and 48	34	November 19, 1940	YES	0 - NO	16
		48	November 19, 1940	YES	2 - NO	24

2-R	14, 30 and 47	14	November 12, 1940	YES	0 - NO	17
		30	(No election)			
		47	November 12, 1940	YES	0 - NO	6

3-R	28, 35, 44, 58, 59, 66, 72, 88, 94, 105, 121, 139, and 145	28	December 19, 1940	YES	6 - NO	1
		35	November 19, 1940	YES	0 - NO	17
		44	November 12, 1940	YES	7 - NO	41
		58	November 19, 1940	YES	0 - NO	20
		59	November 19, 1940	YES	0 - NO	9
		66	December 3, 1940	YES	0 - NO	5
		72	December 19, 1940	YES	1 - NO	13
		88	(No election)			
		94	November 12, 1940	YES	2 - NO	23
		105	November 19, 1940	YES	0 - NO	13
		121	November 19, 1940	YES	2 - NO	11
139	December 3, 1940	YES	9 - NO	18		
145	November 19, 1940	YES	1 - NO	16		

4-R	32 and 102	32	(No election)			
		102	November 12, 1940	YES	4 - NO	7
=====						

From the above results, the proposition did not carry in the following combinations: Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 1-R, 2-R, 3-R, and 4-R. The chairman was instructed to notify the school districts included in the above combinations of the final result of each combination.

Also, from the above results, the proposition carried in the following combinations: Nos. 10, 20 and 24. The chairman was instructed to notify the school districts included in the above combinations of the final result of each combination.

In Combination No. 10, District No. 82 petitioned and voted 9 in favor and 7 opposed, but neither District No. 46 or District No. 71 petitioned. Therefore the Combination was declared carried.

In Combination No. 20, School District No. 6 voted 20 in favor and 18 opposed, and District No. 87 did not petition to vote. Therefore, the Combination was declared carried.

In Combination No. 24, neither School District No. 90 or School District No. 192 petitioned for an election. Therefore, the Combination was declared carried.

In Combination No. 12, the following motion was passed: "That School District No. 63 and School District No. 78 be combined as a Reorganized district, to become effective February 28th". However, the chairman of the Board was instructed to write to School Districts Nos. 40, 63 and 178, asking them to vote on the proposition of consolidating said three districts in order to benefit from the extra school funds available through a consolidation.

In Combination No. 22, a motion was passed not to combine School District No. 17 and School District No. 134, as School District No. 134 desires to continue sending their pupils to Junction City on a suspended district basis.

In Combination No. 3-R, a motion was made, seconded and carried, that School Districts No. 28 and 88, which were the only two not voting out, not be combined.

The following bills were allowed:

L. W. Newcomb	-----(Transportation)	-----	\$1.19
F. W. Beaver	----- (Transportation)	-----	1.19
F. W. Beaver	----- (Meals)	-----	1.50

It was reported that a total of \$300.00 was spent by the Reorganization Committee, which includes the above bills.

Meeting adjourned.

REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE,

Co. Supt. and Chairman

Secretary

Eugene, Oregon,
Aug. 28, 1940.

A meeting of the Reorganization Board was held in the County School Office with all members present.

The following plan of Reorganization was adopted by the Reorganization Committee:

Districts not effected by Reorganization

<u>Dist. No.</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Dist. No.</u>	<u>Name</u>
3	Trent	109	Herman
4	Eugene	112	Central on Deadwood
7	Bailey Hill	114J	Alsea
12	Santa Clara	117	Westfir
15	Lancaster	129	Willagillespie
18	Mt. Vernon	133	Danebo
25J	Latham	143	Ten Mile
36	Lorane	144	Donna
38	River View	150	Glenwood
45	Cottage Grove	154J	Monroe
52	Bethel	155J	Noraton
54	Harmony	159	Lone Pine
55	Ward	160	Chase Gardens
56	Dunn	163	Wendling
62	Jasper	165	Ryan
67	Fall Creek	170	Ada
68	McKenzie	181	Stella Magladry
69	Junction City	185	River Road
75	London	186	Alvadore
76	Oakridge	187	Idlewyld
104	Spencer Butte	190	Big Creek
106	Thurston		

Reorganized Districts

1. Dist. No. 5 - Upper Camp Creek, and Dist. No. 70 - Lower Camp Creek
2. Dist. No. 11 - Stafford, and Dist. No. 174 - Hayden Bridge
3. Dist. No. 64, Mabel, and Dist. No. 79 - Marcola
4. Dist. No. 43 - Coburg, and Dist. No. 49 - Deadmond's Ferry
5. Dist. No. 65 - Deerhorn, and Dist. No. 126 - Leaburg
6. Dist. No. 57 - Walterville, and Dist. No. 95 - Cedar Flat
7. Dist. No. 19 - Springfield, and Dist. No. 85 - Maple

8. Dist. No. 13 - Goshen, Dist. No. 9 - Scharen, and Dist. No. 103 - Coast Fork.
9. Dist. No. 29 - Edenvale, Dist. No. 141 - Enterprise, and Dist. No. 1 - Pleasant Hill.
- ✓ 10. Dist. No. 71 - Lowell, Dist. No. 46 - Dexter, and Dist. No. 82 - Zion
11. Dist. No. 2 - Cloverdale, and Dist. No. 162 - Bear Creek
12. Dist. No. 40 - Creswell, Dist. No. 42 - Howe, Dist. No. 63 - Upper Camas Swale, and, Dist. No. 178 - Camas Swale
13. Dist. No. 26 - Saginaw, Dist. No. 41 - Walker, Dist. No. 80 - Lynx Hollow, and, Dist. No. 191 - Delight Valley
14. Dist. No. 93 - Dorena, Dist. No. 84 - Wildwood, and Dist. No. 177 - Disston
15. Dist. No. 16 - Twin Oaks, Dist. No. 22 - Spencer Creek, Dist. No. 78 - Pine Grove, Dist. No. 98 - Fox Hollow, and, Dist. No. 125 - LeBleu
16. Dist. No. 8 - Oak Hill, and Dist. No. 51 - Fir Butte
17. Dist. No. 21 - Meadowview, Dist. No. 23 - Clear Lake, Dist. No. 86 - Irving, and Dist. No. 138 - Malabon
18. Dist. No. 118 - Shannon, Dist. No. 120 - Chickahominy, Dist. No. 89 - Globe, and Dist. No. 113J - Alma.
19. Dist. No. 99 - Canary, Dist. No. 173 - Siltcoos, Dist. No. 97 - Florence, Dist. No. 53 - Portage, Dist. No. 101 - Cushman, and Dist. No. 179J - Westlake.
- ✓ 20. Dist. No. 6 - Willakenzie, and Dist. No. 87 - Norkenzie.
21. Dist. No. 24 - Walden, Dist. No. 31 - Blue Mt., Dist. No. 119 - Fairview, and Dist. No. 128 - Mount View.
22. Dist. No. 17 - Union, Dist. No. 27 - Liberty, Dist. No. 111 - Laurel Home, and Dist. No. 134 - Pioneer.
23. Dist. No. 10 - Franklin, Dist. No. 77 - Goldson, Dist. No. 108 - Swamp, Dist. No. 110 - Crown Point, and Dist. No. 136 - Mt. Carmel.
- ✓ 24. Dist. No. 90 - Blachly, and Dist. No. 192 - Nelson Creek.

Reorganization of Districts with Recommendations

1. Dist. No. 34 - The Cedars, and Dist. No. 48 - Silk Creek --- It is

recommended by the Committee that these districts be combined but allowing the eastern part of the reorganized district to withdraw and unite with Cottage Grove.

2. Dist. No. 14 - Oak Grove, Dist. No. 30 - Harpole, and Dist. No. 47 - Lower Fern Ridge --- As Districts No. 30 and 47 are already transporting to Junction City and as District No. 14 is near Junction City, it is recommended that the reorganized district transport to Junction City.
3. Dist. No. 28 - Veneta, Dist. No. 35 - Crow, Dist. No. 44 - Central, Dist. No. 58 - Hadleyville, Dist. No. 59 - Fir Grove, Dist. No. 66 - Vaughn, Dist. No. 72 - Jeans, Dist. No. 88 - Noti, Dist. No. 94 - Fair View, Dist. No. 105 - Wolf Creek, Dist. No. 121 - Red Oak, Dist. No. 139 - Elmira, and Dist. No. 145 - Evers. --- It is suggested that a grade school be held at Dist. No. 66, Vaughn; Dist. No. 88, Noti; Dist. No. 139, Elmira; Dist. No. 28, Veneta; and, Dist. No. 44, Central, and as this reorganization includes all of two Union High School Districts, Union High School Dist. No. 3, Crow, and Union High School District No. 4, Elmira, it is suggested that Union High School Districts be dissolved and one new building be erected in some central location as soon as a new building is needed - High School to be held in both buildings, however, until a new building is needed.
4. Dist. No. 32 - Mapleton, and Dist. No. 102 - Linslaw --- It is recommended that a Grade School be held at Dist. No. 102, Linslaw, only until Route "F" is completed.

The following bills were approved:

F. W. Beaver	----- (transportation)	-----	\$1.60
A. R. Beebe	-----	"	.30
E. R. Lemley	-----	"	2.20
L. C. Moffitt	----- (meals)	-----	2.00
L. W. Newcomb	----- (transportation)	-----	8.70

It was reported that \$296.12 had been spent by the Reorganization Committee, which included the bills listed above.

Meeting adjourned.

REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE,

Chairman

Secretary

Eugene, Oregon,
August 17, 1940.

A meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held on Saturday, August 17th, at 10:00 o'clock a.m. with all members present except Mr. Lemley.

Mr. Lester Wilcox of the State Department of Education was present to confer with the Committee. No definite decisions were reached as to possible changes in the tentative plan of Reorganization but the Committee seemed to favor the combination of districts where there was a possibility of them remaining together. With this in view it was suggested that the plans be reconsidered at a meeting to be held August 28th and possible revisions made.

The following bills for expense were allowed:

F. W. Beaver	-----	\$2.60
L. W. Newcomb	-----	8.70
A. R. Beebe	-----	.30
L. C. Moffitt	-----	9.30.

Meeting adjourned.

REORGANIZATION BOARD,

Chairman

Secretary

Eugene, Oregon,
June 6, 1940.

Meeting of the Reorganization Board was held in the County Court room with Mr. Newcomb, Mr. Stevens, Mr. Beebe, Mr. Hurd, and Mr. Moffitt present - Mr Lemley and Mr. Beaver absent.

In the absence of the Secretary, Mr. Newcomb acted as Secretary.

A petition was filed with the Committee from Fall Creek district signed by approximately seventy-four (74) legal voters, requesting the Board to send their district in as a separate unit. There were visitors present from Fall Creek that were in favor of sending it in separately and others present in favor of combining Fall Creek and Lowell in a reorganized district.

The question of combining Fall Creek and Lowell districts was discussed but no final action was taken.

The following bills for transportation were approved:

L. W. Newcomb -----	\$8.70
A. R. Beebe -----	.30

Meeting adjourned.

REORGANIZATION BOARD,

Chairman

Secretary

Eugene, Oregon,
April 23, 1940.

The Reorganization Committee convened again on April 23rd, at 9:00 o'clock a.m. with F. W. Beaver, A. R. Beebe, L. W. Newcomb, E. R. Lemley, Judge Clinton Hurd, County Assessor Welby Stevens, and L. C. Moffitt, County Superintendent, present.

A motion was made and seconded that the Reorganization Committee consider Districts No. 67 and 71 as a reorganized district unless the district voted on consolidating before the plan is sent in, and the proposed consolidation does not carry; if it does not carry Districts No. 67 and 71 to be sent in as separate districts. If the election on consolidation carries the plan would include only that consolidated district. Motion carried.

The following is a list of tentative reorganized districts as made up by the Reorganization Committee:

57, 95, 106, 126, and 65

76

117

6, 87, 129, and 160

64 and 79

163

32 and 102

109

112

18, 19 and 85

150

17, 134, 136, 110, 108, 10, 47, 14, 69,
27, 111, 30, 54, 77, 15, and 155J

12

38

24, 31, 119, and 128

28, 72, 44, 35, 58, 66, 105, 88, 94, 145, 139, 59,
and 121

25, 50, 75, and 124J

8, 51, 133, 138, and 186

177, 84, and 93

89, 113J, 118, and 120

45

4

165

90 and 192

21, 23, 86, and 159

67 and 71

34 and 48

26, 41, 80, and 191

40, 42, 63, and 178

9, 13, 104, and 103

43, 49, and 55

1, 3, 29, 46, 62, 82, and 141

53, 97, 99, 127, 143, 170, 101, 173, 187,
179J, and 190

174, 70, 5, 11, and 144

2 and 162

56 and 181

36 and 184

16, 22, 78, 98, and 125

52

185

7

68, 123, and 137

The following bills were presented and ordered paid:

F. W. Beaver	----- (Transportation)	-----	\$3.20
A. R. Beebe	----- (")	-----	.60
L. W. Newcomb	----- (")	-----	9.95
E. R. Lemley	----- (")	-----	3.40
L. C. Moffitt	----- (" and Meals)	-----	6.60

Meeting adjourned.

REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

Co. School Supt. and Chm.

Secretary

Eugene, Oregon,
April 22, 1940.

A meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held April 22nd at 2:00 o'clock p.m., with F. W. Beaver, A. R. Beebe, L. W. Newcomb, Judge Clinton Hurd, County Assessor Welby Stevens, and L. C. Moffitt, County Superintendent, present.

The minutes of the meeting of April 16th were read and approved.

Mr. Raymond Grube and Mr. Geo. Brewer were present from the Fall Creek district. Mr. Grube and Mr. Brewer requested the Reorganization Committee to not include the Fall Creek district with the Lowell consolidated district. After some discussion a motion was made, seconded and carried, that action on the reorganization of Districts No. 67 and 71 be postponed.

Mr. Gustaf Swanson and Mrs. Jeans, Mr. Lennie Haldorson and Mr. Carl Petzold, were present from the Jeans and Central districts to discuss possible reorganizations in their area, and after considerable discussion a recommendation was made to include the districts that make up the Crow Union High School District and the Elmira Union High School district, and also the Central district, into a reorganized district; and, at sometime in the near future, a meeting be held with the school officers and patrons of those districts concerned to discuss the proposed plan.

Meeting adjourned.

REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE,

Co. School Supt. and Chm.

Secretary

Eugene, Oregon,
April 16, 1940.

A meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held April 16th at 2:00 o'clock p.m., with F. W. Beaver, A. R. Beebe, L. W. Newcomb, Judge Clinton Hurd, County Assessor Welby Stevens, and L. C. Moffitt, County Superintendent, present.

The minutes of the meeting of April 3rd were read and approved.

The Board spent most of the afternoon meeting looking over the materials and discussing the proposed reorganization of the districts making up the Pleasant Hill, not including, however, that part of Cloverdale in the Pleasant Hill Union High School District. (Nos. 1, 3, 29, 46, 62, 82, 103 and 141).

The County School Superintendent was authorized to have a map made of the tentative reorganizations already discussed and to have the valuation, tax levy, census and enrollment, compiled for each of these reorganizations for the meeting to be held on Monday, April 29th.

The following bills were ordered paid:

A. R. Beebe -----	\$.30	Transportation
L. W. Newcomb -----	8.70	"
F. W. Beaver -----	1.60	"
L. C. Moffitt -----	4.20	" & Meals

The proposal to be made to the Pleasant Hill group is as follows: "That districts Nos. 1, 3, 29, 46, 62, 82, 103 and 141 be considered a reorganized district". The Board recommended, as first choice, a site across the road North from the Pleasant Hill Union High School, and as second choice a tract across the road from the Trent school or just East of the Trent school.

Before the evening meeting the Board visited the school buildings and covered most of the roads in the Pleasant Hill Union High School district, to get more familiar with their set-up.

Meeting adjourned.

REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE,

L. C. Moffitt
Co. School Supt. and Chm.

Secretary

Eugene, Oregon,
April 3, 1940.

A meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held at 2:00 o'clock p.m. with County Judge Clinton Hurd, County Assessor Welby Stevens, F. W. Beaver, L. W. Newcomb, A. R. Beebe, and Superintendent Moffitt. In the absence of Mr. Lemley, Mr. Newcomb acted as Secretary.

The minutes of the meeting of March 25th were read and approved.

Visitors were present from the Dexter district and requested the Committee to hold a meeting in the Pleasant Hill Union High School sometime in the near future to discuss the reorganization of the districts that now make up the Pleasant Hill Union High School District, into one district.


No definite action was taken on considering Districts No. 1, 3, 29, 46, 62, 82, 103 and 141 into a reorganized district, however, it was the sentiment of the committee that these district would make a more suitable reorganized district than combining a fewer number in that locality. A tentative meeting date was set for April 16th at Pleasant Hill.

The following bills were approved:

A. R. Beebe	-----	Transportation	-----	\$.30
L. W. Newcomb	-----	"	-----	8.70
F. W. Beaver	-----	"	-----	1.60
L. C. Moffitt	-----	"	-----	1.65

Meeting adjourned.

REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE,



Co. Supt. and Chairman

Secretary

Eugene, Oregon,
March 25, 1940.

A meeting of the Reorganization Committee was held March 25th at 2:00 o'clock p.m. with F. W. Beaver, A. R. Beebe, L. W. Newcomb, E. R. Lemley, Judge Clinton Hurd, County Assessor Welby Stevens, and L. C. Moffitt, County Superintendent, present.

The minutes of the meeting of January 18th were read and approved.

The following visitors were present: Carl Boehringer of Crow; Lennie Haldorson of Central; Frank Marshik and Mr. Hunter of Veneta.

The visitors present were interested in what the Reorganization Committee was going to do with the districts around Crow and Veneta, and after getting the facts together in regard to the various districts in that area, the following motion was made by Mr. Beebe:

"That Districts No. 28, 44, and 72, be considered as a tentative reorganized district, and that the school boards of the districts be notified; also, that a meeting would be held in the Veneta district to discuss the proposed reorganized district with the school officers on Wednesday, April 3rd, at 8:00 o'clock p.m." --- Motion was seconded and carried.

54
95. A motion was made by Mr. Newcomb "that School Districts Nos. 35, 95, and 105 be considered as a tentative reorganized district, and that the school officers of the districts be notified; and, in case they wished a meeting to be held in their district one would be called later". Motion seconded and carried.

A motion was made by Mr. Beaver and seconded by Mr. Beebe, "that School Districts No. 36 and 184, be considered a tentative reorganized district". Motion carried.

A motion was made by Mr. Stevens and seconded by Mr. Newcomb, "that School Districts Nos. 16, 22, 78, 98 and 125, be considered as a tentative reorganized district". Motion carried.

Another Reorganization that was discussed briefly was School Districts Nos. 8, 51, 133, and 138.

The Reorganization Committee decided to make the following recommendation at a meeting to be held at Blue River on the evening of March 25th:


"That School Districts Nos. 68, 123, and 137, be combined as a reorganized district, with a Grade School at Vida and a Grade School at Blue River, and that a new High School be erected, recommending the site North of the highway and east of Elk Creek".

The following bills were approved:

F. W. Beaver	-----	Transportation	-----	\$3.00
E. R. Lemley	-----	"	-----	6.70
L. C. Moffitt	-----	"	-----	6.30
L. W. Newcomb	-----	"	-----	19.70
Quackenbush & Son	-	(Material)	-----	6.42
F. W. Beaver	-----	Transportation	-----	1.60
L. C. Moffitt	-----	"	-----	4.90
F. W. Beaver	-----	"	-----	1.60
L. W. Newcomb	-----	"	-----	8.70
E. R. Lemley	-----	"	-----	2.20
F. W. Beaver	-----	"	-----	3.20
A. R. Beebe	-----	"	-----	.30
L. C. Moffitt	-----	" & meals	-----	9.35

Meeting adjourned.

REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE,



Co. Supt. and Chairman

Secretary

Eugene, Oregon,
January 18, 1940.

A meeting of the Reorganization Board was held in the County Court House with the following present: F. W. Beaver, A. R. Beebe, L. W. Newcomb, Judge Clinton Hurd, County Assessor Welby Stevens, Supt. L. C. Moffitt, and E. R. Lemley, Secretary.

Minutes of the meeting of January 4th was read and approved.

There were representatives present from School Districts No. 12, 21, 23, 86 and 159. The representatives present were desiring information regarding the reorganization, which was explained to them, and they requested a meeting to be held in the Santa Clara Grade School to which the school officers of the above mentioned districts were invited, to be held January 22nd at 8:00 o'clock p.m.

In addition to the meeting at Santa Clara, a meeting of the Reorganization committee for the districts around Cottage Grove was set for January 29th.

A motion was made and seconded that the following bills be allowed. Motion carried.

E. R. Lemley	-----	(travel)	-----	\$8.10
L. W. Newcomb	----	(travel)	-----	9.85
F. W. Beaver	----	(travel)	-----	5.45
A. R. Beebe	-----	(travel)	-----	1.70
Clinton Hurd	----	(travel)	-----	1.50
L. C. Moffitt	----	(travel)	-----	4.40

Meeting adjourned.

REORGANIZATION BOARD,



Chairman

Secretary

Eugene, Oregon,
January 4, 1940.

Regular meeting of the Reorganization Board was held in the County Court House with the following present: Chairman L. C. Moffitt, County Judge Clinton Hurd, County Assessor Welby Stevens, L. W. Newcomb, A. R. Beebe, and F. W. Beaver *E. P. Lemley*

The minutes of the meeting of November 9th were read and approved.

A report of the community meeting held at Elmira was given by Mr. Beaver and Mr. Beebe, the two board members that attended the meeting. They stated that about fifty (50) school officers were present and the Reorganization Law was explained in detail.

The communities of Crow, Creswell, Junction City and Cottage Grove were discussed with possible reorganizations and districts making up the reorganized district in these various communities considered. The board was informed that a meeting would be held at Lowell January 8th to discuss consolidating the districts that now make up the Lowell Union High School District. The board decided to hold meetings in the above districts as follows: Crow, January 15th; Junction City, January 16th; Cottage Grove, January 22nd (tentative); and Creswell, January 23rd (tentative).

The Board requested information to be gotten together for many of the other attendance centers within the County.

The next meeting of the Board was set for Tuesday, January 16th, at 10:00 o'clock a.m.

The following bills for expenses were ordered paid:

F. W. Beaver -----	\$3.50
A. R. Beebe -----	1.80
L. W. Newcomb -----	8.70
L. C. Moffitt -----	1.00
E. R. Lemley -----	2.20

Meeting adjourned.

REORGANIZATION BOARD,

L. C. Moffitt
Chairman
E. P. Lemley
Secretary

Eugene, Oregon,
November 9, 1939.

Meeting of the Reorganization Board was held in the County Court House with the following members present: Chairman L. C. Moffitt, Judge Clinton Hurd, County Assessor Welby Stevens, L. W. Newcomb, E. R. Lemley, and F. W. Beaver. *F. W. Beaver*.

The minutes of the meeting of July 14th were read and approved.

The Chairman reported that maps of the County had been received, as were authorized at the last meeting, and also that an NYA project had been approved and that Wesley Maxwell was appointed through the NYA to carry on some of the work in connection with it. He had drawn in the present district boundaries on a map for each board member and had compiled the information for all school districts as shown on the attached sheet.

In beginning the study of the Reorganization the board decided to use Florence, Lowell, and Elmira, to begin with and work out what they considered logical districts in these vicinities. For the Florence school district they tentatively included School Districts Nos. 53, 97, 99, 101, 127, 143, 146, 149, 170, 173, 179J, 187, and 190. For Lowell, they tentatively included School Districts Nos. 67, 71, 74, 81, 83 and 132. For Elmira, they tentatively included School Districts Nos. 28, possibly 44, 59, 72, 121, 139, 145, 151, 164, and a part of 51 - if more adjacent to Elmira after the dam is completed.

The Chairman reported that a meeting was held in Fall Creek on November 6th to discuss the Reorganization law and most of those present were in favor of including the districts making up the Lowell Union High School in the proposed reorganized district. It was also reported that meetings would be held in Lowell on November 13th, and in Florence on November 15th, to discuss the Reorganization with those present.

It was the opinion of the board that as many of the members as could would attend each of the community meetings where the Reorganization law was discussed and that the expenses of the members would be paid from the amount allowed the Reorganization committee.

The following bills were presented and ordered paid by the board:

Valley Printing Co. (for making maps)	-----	\$21.00
F. W. Beaver (transportation)	-----	5.20
A. R. Beebe (")	-----	.30
E. R. Lemley (")	-----	2.20
L. W. Newcomb (")	-----	9.70
L. C. Moffitt (")	-----	15.00

Meeting adjourned.

REORGANIZATION BOARD,

L. C. Moffitt

 Chairman

E. R. Lemley

 Secretary

Eugene, Oregon,
July 14, 1939.

Meeting of the Reorganization Board was held in the County Court House with the following members present: Chairman L. C. Moffitt, Judge Clinton Hurd, County Assessor Welby Stevens, L. W. Newcomb, E. R. Lemley, and F. W. Beaver.

Minutes of the meeting of July 10th were read and approved.

Mr. E. R. Lemley was nominated as Secretary of the Board, and a unaminious ballot was cast in his favor.

It was moved and seconded that Board Members be allowed 5¢ per mile traveling expense plus any other necessary expense. Motion carried. The following bills were allowed at this meeting:



E. R. Lemley -----	\$2.20
A. R. Beebe -----	.30
L. W. Newcomb -----	8.70
F. W. Beaver -----	1.60

The chairman of the Board, Mr. Moffitt, proceeded to analyze House bill No. 321 to determine duties of new board and to formulate logical plan to accomplish desired result.

Moved and seconded that Chairman be authorized to make application for a project to compile information on school districts, and to secure suitable maps for use of this Board.

Meeting adjourned subject to call of Chairman.

REORGANIZATION BOARD,



Chairman

Secretary

Eugene, Oregon,
July 10, 1939.

The first meeting of the members who were automatically on the Reorganization Board, according to the new law, Co. Judge Clinton Hurd, Co. Assessor Welby Stevens, A. R. Beebe, Chairman of the Non-High School Board, and L. C. Moffitt, Co. School Supt., was held in the County Court room on July 10th, to consider the appointment of three additional members to the board. The following men were selected.

1. Mr. L. W. Newcomb, Gardiner, Rt. #1
2. E. R. Lemley, Cottage Grove
3. F. W. Beaver, Creswell, Rt. #1

The next regular meeting of the board will be held on Friday, July 14th at 1:30 o'clock p.m.


Chairman


Secretary

COMMUNITY
MEETINGS

CRESWELL - August 26, 1940

Present: A. R. Beebe, F. W. Beaver, Welby Stevens, and L. C. Moffitt,
County School Superintendent.

Approximately fourteen (14) representatives were present from
Bear Creek, Creswell, Howe and Upper Camas Swale.

The complete reorganization law was explained in detail to
those present. A comparison of the apportionment of school funds under
the reorganization law and the consolidation law and other points of
school law as to qualifications of voters, etc., were explained in de-
tail.

- ***** -

HARMONY - April 22, 1940

Present: L. W. Newcomb, A. R. Beebe, F. W. Beaver, and L. C. Moffitt,
County School Superintendent:

At a meeting held at the Harmony Grade School, there were approximately forty (40) present from the Harmony district.

The Reorganization Law, apportionment of School funds, and qualifications of voters, were explained in detail.

- ***** -

IDLEWYLD - July 25, 1940

Present: A. R. Beebe, F. W. Beaver, Welby Stevens and L. W. Newcomb,
and L. C. Moffitt, County School Superintendent.

At a meeting held at the Idlewyld School, there were approximately forty (40) present from Idlewyld, Canary and Westlake district.

The complete reorganization law was explained in detail to those present. A comparison of the apportionment of school funds under the reorganization law and the consolidation law and other points of school law as to qualifications of voters, etc., were explained in detail.

It was the opinion of the people present that they should circulate petitions to vote on consolidation of Canary, Idlewyld and Florence.

The Board members present met with Mr. Newcomb at Mr. and Mrs. Newcomb's residence for supper and later visited in the southwestern part of the county before the meeting in the evening.

- ***** -

DANEBO - August 5, 1940

Present: L. C. Moffitt, County School Superintendent.

A meeting was held August 5 in the Danebo District to explain to the residents of Danebo the comparative figures in consolidation with other districts and in reorganizing with other districts. There were about forty (40) people present, mainly from the Danebo district, and the expression by vote was that the people in the Danebo district would prefer to remain as an individual district - not be included in a reorganization.

VENETA - April 3, 1940

Present: F. W. Beaver, L. W. Newcomb, and L. C. Moffitt, County School Superintendent.

At a meeting held at the Veneta school, there were approximately twenty-five (25) patrons and school board members present from School Districts No. 28, 44, and 72.

The Reorganization Law, apportionment of School funds, qualifications of voters, and the proposed plan of the Reorganization Committee were explained in detail.

The plan was to combine the districts mentioned, into a reorganized district, recommending that the Veneta school be used - finishing the two rooms and adding the fifth room, the district employ five teachers and provide transportation for the pupils from the Jeans and Central districts to Veneta, with an estimated tax levy of approximately eight (8) mills.

The majority of the people from the Central district were very much opposed to having their pupils moved to any other school district, wishing that the Reorganization Committee would reorganize other districts with them.

- ***** -

PLEASANT HILL - April 16, 1940

Present: A. R. Beebe, F. W. Beaver, L. W. Newcomb, County Assessor Welby Stevens, and L. C. Moffitt, County School Superintendent.

At a meeting held at the Pleasant Hill Union High School, there were approximately seventy-five (75) patrons and school board members present from School Districts Nos. 1, 3, 29, 46, 62, 82, 103 and 141.

After a thorough discussion of the Reorganization Law, apportionment of school funds to regular and consolidated districts, qualifications of voters, the following plan was presented: That School Districts Nos. 1, 3, 29, 46, 62, 82, 103 and 141, be combined, with the recommendation that one school be erected, either across from the Pleasant Hill Union High School or near the Trent Grade School, which would need to be about an eight-teacher school, and also arrange providing transportation for all grade pupils.

Based on a consolidation of the districts mentioned, the tax levy would be from 10 to 11 mills.

There was considerable interest among those present. However, not all were in favor of the plan presented by the committee, although it was difficult to tell the approximate number as many made no comment.

- ***** -

SHANNON - February 27, 1940

Present: F. W. Beaver, A. R. Beebe, and L. C. Moffitt, County School Superintendent.

At a meeting held at the Shannon school, there were approximately twenty-five (25) patrons and school board members present from School Districts No. 118, 89, 120, 102 and 113J.

The apportionment of school funds, the procedure for consolidation and the Reorganization law was explained in detail, and those present thought it might be advisable to consider consolidating in order to get the benefit of the school funds. The Linslaw district, however, was more interested in going in with the Mapleton district than with the districts mentioned. They plan to meet with the Mapleton School Board within the next week or so to find out just what plans will be made in case they consolidate with Mapleton.

- ***** -

BLUE RIVER - March 25, 1940

Present: E. R. Lemley, Welby Stevens, County Assessor, A. R. Beebe, F. W. Beaver, and L. C. Moffitt, County School Superintendent.

At a meeting held at the Blue River school, there were approximately twenty-five (25) patrons and school board members present from School Districts No. 68, 123, and 137.

The Reorganization Law was explained in detail; the apportionment of school funds to regular districts and consolidated districts; the qualifications of voters; and, the plan of reorganizing the three districts into one district and recommending a Grade School to be held at Vida and a Grade School at Blue River, using their present buildings, and a new High School to be erected near Elk Creek.

Representatives present from the various districts started circulating petitions for consolidating the three district and the majority were in favor of adopting the recommendation of the Reorganization Committee, but taking care of the plan by consolidation rather than waiting until reorganization becomes effective.

- ***** -

LOWER CAMP CREEK - February 9, 1940

Present: L. C. Moffitt, County School Superintendent.

The Reorganization Law was explained in detail.

- ***** -

FRANKLIN - February 15, 1940

Present: A. R. Beebe, E. R. Lemley, and L. C. Moffitt, County School Superintendent.

At the meeting held at the Franklin Grade school, there were approximately thirty (30) patrons and school board members present from School Districts No. 10, 108, 110, and 136.

The main part of the evening was spent in discussing the proposition of consolidating School Districts Nos. 10, 108, 110, and 136.

- ***** -

DONNA - February 26, 1940

Present: Welby Stevens, County Assessor, A. R. Beebe, F. W. Beaver, and L. C. Moffitt, County School Superintendent.

At a meeting held at the Donna Grade School, there were approximately thirty (30) patrons and school board members present from School Districts No. 64, 144, 79, 11, and 174.

The reorganization law was explained in detail, and a presentation of the apportionment of school funds mentioned, especially how they would be apportioned in the Donna and Marcola district if they consolidated, as an election was pending for consolidation.

The people from the Donna district did not seem to favor going in with the Marcola district but mentioned to the board if they were included in a reorganized district they would prefer to be included with Stafford, District No. 11, and other districts.

- ***** -

SANTA CLARA - January 22, 1940

Present: F. W. Beaver, A. R. Beebe, L. W. Newcomb, County Assessor Welby Stevens, E. R. Lemley, and Superintendent L. C. Moffitt.

At the meeting held at Santa Clara, there were approximately seventy (70) patrons and school board members present from School Districts Nos. 12, 21, 23, 86, and 159, 185.

The Reorganization law was explained in detail and also the effect if the above districts did consolidate for grade and high school purposes, omitting District No. 185. Also, the proposition of forming a Union High School district was discussed, but it seemed that most of the districts were not in favor of either combining for grade or high school purposes.

- ***** -

COTTAGE GROVE - January 29, 1940

Present: F. W. Beaver, L. W. Newcomb, County Assessor Welby Stevens, E. R. Lemley, and Superintendent L. C. Moffitt.

At the meeting held at the Cottage Grove high school, there were approximately fifty (50) patrons and school board members present from School Districts surrounding Cottage Grove.

The Reorganization law was explained in detail, also the apportionment of school funds, qualifications of voters, and the procedure for consolidation.

- ***** -

FRANKLIN - February 5, 1940

Present: A. R. Beebe and E. R. Lemley

At the meeting held at the Franklin Grade School, there were approximately thirty (30) patrons and school board members present from School Districts No. 10, 108, 110, and 136.

As a result of the meeting held, petitions were filed with the Boundary Board from Districts No. 10, 108, 110, and 136, to vote on the proposition of consolidating said districts.

- ***** -

present stated they were holding a meeting of the four boards, or three not including Crow, to discuss further the proposition of discussing the consolidation of the three or four districts.

- ***** -

JUNCTION CITY - January 16, 1940.

Present: F. W. Beaver, A. R. Beebe, L. W. Newcomb, Judge Clinton Hurd, County Assessor Welby Stevens, E. R. Lemley, and Superintendent L. C. Moffitt.

At the meeting held at the Junction City grade school, there were approximately thirty-five (35) patrons and school board members present from School Districts No. 69, 14, 15, 10, 47, 54, 110, 111, 108, 136 and 155J.

A presentation was made of the apportionment of school funds, the consolidation law and the reorganization law, and tentative reorganizations presented - one being the reorganization of all the districts making up the Junction City Union High School district, which was not favored by a majority of the group present.

Representatives from the districts surrounding Franklin and West of Franklin, favored a reorganization of five districts, Nos. 10, 108, 77, 110, 121 and 136, and they requested a meeting to be held at Franklin as soon as convenient and a tentative date of February 5th was decided upon.

Many of the people present were not in favor of combining in any reorganized district because they were satisfied with a one-room school but mainly because their individual district had no tax levy this year.

- ***** -

LOWELL - January 8, 1940

Present: F. W. Beaver, A. R. Beebe, Welby Stevens, and L. C. Moffitt.

The Reorganization committee was invited to meet with the school officers from the districts now making up the Lowell Union High School district, to present definite information, especially to make a comparison of the reorganization with the consolidation law. The majority of those present were in favor of voting on consolidation of the six (6) districts and circulated petitions after a thorough discussion of the consolidation and reorganization laws. A sheet is attached showing the information presented to the group at Lowell.

There were approximately sixty (60) patrons and school officers present at this meeting.

- ***** -

CROW - January 15, 1940

Present: L. W. Newcomb, F. W. Beaver, A. R. Beebe, Welby Stevens, W. J. Holland, and L. C. Moffitt.

A meeting was held at the Crow Union High School District with representatives present from School Districts No. 35, 44, 66, 92, 105, 58 and 184.

A thorough discussion was presented pertaining to the apportionment of school funds to regular district, how the school funds would be apportioned to a reorganized district and to a consolidated district, the qualifications of voters were explained, and a thorough presentation of the consolidation and reorganization laws. During the meeting there wasn't much comment except a suggestion made that the districts making up the Crow Union High School district consolidate and use the present Union High School building for grade school purposes, and consolidate the Crow Union High School with the Elmira Union High School district, allowing that part of the Crow Union High School district that is in School District No. 184 to withdraw from the consolidated Union High School district, if formed, so it could join with the Lorane Union High School district. The majority of those present, so it seemed at least, did not favor such action at the present time.

After the meeting representatives from School Districts No. 58, 92 and 35, discussed a consolidation composed of the before-mentioned districts and also included School District No. 130. The board members

ELMIRA - November 29, 1939

A meeting was held in Elmira with about fifty (50) representatives from the following districts present to discuss the Reorganization Law: Districts No. 10, 28, 44, 59, 72, 88, 94, 121, 139, 145, 151, 164 and 51.

The meeting was attended by Reorganization Committee members Mr. Beaver and Mr. Beebe and the law was explained by them. In addition to explaining the Reorganization Law many questions were asked and a discussion held about the present consolidation law. It was pointed out to those present that it was up to the district after formation to hold schools where they wishes -- the board recommending a school at Noti, Elmira, and Veneta, and also that the consolidated district would get additional funds from the Elementary School fund by consolidating rather than waiting until the Reorganization became effective.

- ***** -

FLORENCE - November 15, 1939

Present: A. R. Beebe, L. W. Newcomb, F. W. Beaver, L. H. Brooks, L. C. Moffitt, and L. A. Wilcox of the State Department of Education.

Representatives were present from School Districts No. 53, 97, 99, 101, 127, 146, 149, 170, 173, 179J, and 187.

Through arrangements made by Mr. L. W. Newcomb, the coast representative on the Reorganization Board, the meeting was arranged for and Mr. Earl Hill, chairman of their local committee to study school districts in Western Lane, acted as chairman of the meeting. A short discussion concerning the main points of the bill itself and the problem of consolidating the coast districts, with the school funds that would be apportioned after reorganization was made. Mr. Hill called on representatives from various districts to give their reaction as to uniting the coast districts to benefit from the school funds and of those present most of the representatives were in favor of considering a consolidation.

Mr. Wilcox emphasized the point that no school was discontinued except by a vote of the consolidated or reorganized district. The representatives asked to have definite information mailed them regarding the apportionment of school funds under our present district plan, also the apportionment in case a consolidation is voted and as far as possible to mention how the funds would be apportioned after reorganization. They also wished to get definite information as to the valuation, tax levy, census, attendance, and other information pertaining to the districts concerned so they could use that as a basis of further study.

FALL CREEK - November 6, 1939

Present: L. C. Moffitt, Co. Supt.

A meeting was held in the Fall Creek school to discuss the Reorganization law with the patrons of that district and others interested, at which time the Reorganization law itself was explained, and a tentative plan of Reorganization presented of including all the districts now making up the Lowell Union High School district into one district.

A comparison of school funds based on consolidation and Reorganization was also given and it was shown that by consolidating the six districts the consolidated district would receive a larger amount from the school funds than by waiting until the Reorganization became effective. It was the opinion of those in attendance that the districts should take action to consolidate and work out their own problem rather than waiting for the Reorganization board.

The Fall Creek and Unity districts were represented in this meeting.

- ***** -

LOWELL - November 13, 1939

Present: A. R. Beebe, F. W. Beaver, and L. C. Moffitt.

A meeting was held in the Lowell school to discuss the Reorganization law with the patrons of School Districts No. 67, 71, 83, and 132, at which time the Reorganization law itself was explained, and a tentative plan of Reorganization presented of including all the districts now making up the Lowell Union High School district into one district.

A comparison of school funds based on consolidation and Reorganization was also given and it was shown that by consolidating the six districts the consolidated district would receive a larger amount from the school funds than by waiting until the Reorganization became effective. It was the opinion of those in attendance that the districts should take action to consolidate and work out their own problem rather than waiting for the Reorganization Board.

- ***** -