1 2 3 4 5	JOHN F. DAUM (SB #52313) FRAMROZE M. VIRJEE (SB #120401) DAVID L. HERRON (SB #158881) O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP Embarcadero Center West 275 Battery Street San Francisco, California 94111-3305 Telephone: 415.984.8700
6 7	Attorneys for Defendant State of California
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
10	
11	ELIEZER WILLIAMS, et al.,) Case No. 312 236
12) Plaintiffs,) Hearing Date: September 13, 2001
13) vs.) Time: 8:30 a.m.
14) STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DELAINE) Department: 16
15 16 17	EASTIN, State Superintendent) Of Public Instruction, STATE) Judge: Hon. Peter J. Busch DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, STATE) BOARD OF EDUCATION,)
18	Defendants.)
19	
20	AND RELATED CROSS-ACTION.
21)
22	
23	DECLARATION OF CAROL SHELLENBERGER IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT STATE OF CALIFORNIA'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR CLASS
24	CERTIFICATION
25 26	
20	
28	
	DECLARATION OF CAROL SHELLENBERGER IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT STATE OF CALIFORNIA'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION

1 I, Carol Shellenberger, declare as follows: 2 1. I am currently employed by the Office of Public 3 School Construction ("OPSC") of the State of California. I make 4 this declaration in support of the opposition of defendant State 5 of California to Plaintiffs' motion for class certification. A11 6 the facts set forth in this declaration are known to me 7 personally and, if called as a witness, I could testify 8 competently thereto. 9 10 2. I am currently employed as the Special Assistant 11 to the Interim Executive Officer of the OPSC. I have worked for 12 the OPSC in various capacities for more than sixteen years. The 13 OPSC, as staff to the State Allocation Board ("SAB"), implements 14 and administers the School Facility Program and other programs of 15 the SAB. The OPSC's mission is to facilitate the processing of 16 school applications for facility-related funding and to make 17 funding for construction available to qualifying school 18 districts. These actions enable school districts to build safe 19 and adequate school facilities for their children in an 20 expeditious and cost-effective manner. 21 22 3. The School Facility Program ("SFP") provides State 23

assistance for two major facilities construction programs: new
construction and modernization. The process for accessing the
State assistance for these programs is divided into two steps:
an application for eligibility and an application for funding. A
school district first must apply for eligibility to the SAB. SAB
LA2:576370.1

DECLARATION OF CAROL SHELLENBERGER IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT STATE OF CALIFORNIA'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION approval of an application for eligibility establishes that the school district or county office of education meets the criteria under law to receive assistance for modernization and new construction. Next, in order to receive funding for an eligible project, the district representative must file a funding application with the OPSC for approval by the SAB. The SAB action establishes that the district has met the criteria set forth in law and regulation to receive State funding assistance for the construction of new facilities or the modernization of existing facilities.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

25

26

LA2:576370.1

12 In order to establish eligibility for new 4. 13 construction funding, a district must demonstrate that existing 14 seating capacity is insufficient to house pupils existing and 15 anticipated in the district using a five-year projection of 16 enrollment. Districts may file on a district-wide basis or, 17 under certain circumstances, using a high school attendance area. 18 The district is required to submit certain information regarding 19 enrollment projections and existing school building capacity. 20 Existing school building capacity is subtracted from the 21 enrollment projection and the number of pupils left, if any, are 22 considered "unhoused" for purposes of the SFP. The number of 23 "unhoused" pupils represents the district's eligibility for new 24 construction grant entitlement.

5. Once the district has submitted the required eligibility information to the OPSC, the OPSC conducts a 28

> DECLARATION OF CAROL SHELLENBERGER IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT STATE OF CALIFORNIA'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION

-2-

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

19

LA2:576370.1

preliminary review of the package to ensure that it is complete prior to adding the application to the workload lists. A more detailed review is completed prior to presentation to the SAB that may include an on-site visit. When the review is complete and the OPSC has validated the eligibility calculations, an item is presented to the SAB for consideration of approval.

8 The SFP was implemented in 1998 and changed the 6. 9 way schools are built and modernized in California. Before 1998, 10 new construction and modernization was administered under the 11 Leroy F. Greene State School Building Lease-Purchase Law of 1976, 12 also called the Lease-Purchase Program ("LPP"), which provided 13 State funds for public school capital facility projects in 14 accordance with statute and SAB policy. Under the LPP, as under 15 the SFP, eligibility for State funds was based upon a district's 16 need to house current, as well as projected, enrollment and was 17 determined by comparing the SAB space standards to the total 18 space available in the district.

20 7. I am familiar with the Williams v. State of 21 California case, and I have read the Plaintiffs' proposed class 22 I understand that the proposed class includes, among definition. 23 others, all students that attend "overcrowded" schools and that 24 the Plaintiffs assert that a school is "overcrowded" if it does 25 not comply with various building requirements (e.g., classroom 26 size requirements) that did not go into effect until 27 approximately 1994. Thus, it would appear that all students that 28 -3-

> DECLARATION OF CAROL SHELLENBERGER IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT STATE OF CALIFORNIA'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION

attend classes in classrooms built before 1994 would fall within the Plaintiffs' proposed class. This would include the vast majority of students throughout the entire state.

5 Based upon data maintained by the OPSC, a total of 8. 6 approximately 411,443 students presently are housed in classrooms 7 built between 1994 and the present.¹ This figure represents the 8 total number of new construction pupils housed under the SFP 9 $(165, 629)^2$ (which went into effect in 1998) plus the total number 10 of new construction pupils housed under the LPP between 1994 and 11 1998 (245,814). The current total student population in 12 California public schools is approximately 6,050,895. 13 Accordingly, the 411,443 students that have been housed in 14 classrooms built since 1994 constitute approximately 6.7% of all 15 public school students in California.

16

23

24

25

LA2:576370.1

1

2

3

4

9. In addition, OPSC data further reflects that approximately 15,239 classrooms have been built to house these 411,433 students. According to information published by the California Department of Education, currently there are 270,000 California public school classrooms. Therefore, the 15,239 classrooms built under SFP and LPP since 1994 constitute

¹ The present includes new construction projects approved by the SAB through the June 27, 2001 SAB meeting.

² The total number of new construction pupils housed under the SFP includes 81,605 pupils in kindergarten through grade 6; 28,790 pupils in grades 7 through 8; and 55,234 pupils in grades 9 through 12. Similar data is not available for new construction pupils housed under the LPP.

-4-

DECLARATION OF CAROL SHELLENBERGER IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT STATE OF CALIFORNIA'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION approximately 5.6% of all classrooms in California public schools.

1

2

3

4 10. The OPSC maintains records that show the number of 5 state relocatable classrooms (also known as "portables") on 6 public K-12 school campuses throughout California. These records 7 indicate that there are 5,566 state portables currently leased by 8 school districts. Assuming that each portable houses 26 9 students, we can estimate that approximately 144,716 public 10 school students attend classes in state-leased portables. This 11 number does not include the additional students that attend 12 classes in portables leased or purchased from someone other than 13 the state. 14 15 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing 16 is true and correct. 17 Executed this 22 day of July, at Sacramento, 18 California. 19 20 21 Carol Shellenberger 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 LA2:576370.1 -5-DECLARATION OF CAROL SHELLENBERGER IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT STATE OF CALIFORNIA'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION