

SixTen and Associates

Keith B. Petersen, President
5252 Balboa Avenue, Suite 807
San Diego, CA 92117

Telephone: (858) 514-8605
Fax: (858) 514-8645
E-Mail: Kbpsixten@aol.com



FAX TRANSMITTAL

3

Pages this memo
Pages attachment

Date: January 14, 2002

To: Paula Higashi, Executive Director,
Commission on State Mandates
916-445-0278

C: Carol Berg, EMCN

From: Keith Petersen

RE: My July 19, 2001 Memo

Please favor me with a written response to my memo to you dated July 19, 2001, (copy attached). I need to know what action the EMCN has to take to protect the eligibility of K-14 education agencies for these city and county claims.

I am concerned about getting a clear policy guide on this matter. I was surprised by a new policy showing up at the parameters and guidelines stage of the LECJA test claim, (copy attached) in which case the cities and counties have been excluded from a school claim.

Thank-you.

SixTen and Associates

Mandate Reimbursement Services

KEITH B. PETERSEN, MPA, JD, President
5252 Balboa Avenue, Suite 807
San Diego, CA 92117

Telephone: (858) 514-8605
Fax: (858) 514-8645
E-Mail: Kbpsixten@aol.com

July 19, 2001



Paula Higashi, Executive Director
Commission on State Mandates
U.S. Bank Plaza Building
980 Ninth Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Test Claim of County of Los Angeles, Claimant
00-TC-19
Mandatory On-The-Job Training for Peace Officers Working Alone

Test Claim of County of Los Angeles, Claimant
00-TC-22
Interagency Child Abuse and Neglect (ICAN) Investigation Reports

Test Claim of City of Hayward, Claimant
00-TC-24
Unfounded Complaints Against Peace Officers

Test Claim of County of San Mateo, Claimant
00-TC-25
Discovery of Peace Officer Personnel Records

Test Claim of County of San Bernardino, Claimant
00-TC-26
False Reports of Police Misconduct

Dear Ms. Higashi:

Ms. Paula Higashi, Executive Director
Commission on State Mandates
July 20, 2001

I would request that school districts (K-14) be included in the above described test claims. Please advise me what needs to be done to assure that inclusion.

Thank you.

Sincerely,



Keith B. Petersen

C: Leonard Kaye, Esq.
County of Los Angeles
Auditor-Controller's Office
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 525
Los Angeles, California 90012-2766

Ms. Pamela A. Stone
DMG-MAXIMUS, INC.
4320 Auburn Boulevard, Suite 2000
Sacramento, California 95841

Mr. John Logger, SB-90 Coordinator
Ms. Marsha Faulkner
County of San Bernardino
222 West Hospitality Lane, 4th Floor
San Bernardino, California 92415-0018

Dr. Carol Berg, Education Mandate Cost Network

Date: January 24, 2002
dates\1998\lc\98tc20\psgs\pgstfan

ITEM

CLAIMANT'S PROPOSED PARAMETERS AND GUIDELINES, AS MODIFIED BY STAFF

Education Code Section 67381
Statutes of 1998, Chapter 284

Law Enforcement College Jurisdiction Agreements

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Education Code section 67381 requires law enforcement agencies of all public colleges and universities and some independent postsecondary institutions to enter into written agreements with local law enforcement agencies delineating their respective geographical boundaries for investigating certain violent crimes on campuses. The section further requires the agreements to be posted for public viewing and a copy to be transmitted to the Legislative Analyst.

On April 26, 2001, the Commission on State Mandates adopted the Statement of Decision for *Law Enforcement College Jurisdiction Agreements* (98-TC-20, formerly *Campus Safety Plans*). The Commission found that Education Code section 67381 constitutes a new program or higher level of service and imposes costs mandated by the state within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution and Government Code section 17514.

Staff Analysis

The claimant submitted the proposed parameters and guidelines on May 7, 2001. Staff received comments on the claimant's proposed parameters and guidelines from the State Controller's Office (SCO), dated June 28, 2001, and the Department of Finance (DOF), dated July 27, 2001. On October 26, 2001, the Commission conducted a workshop for the claimant and representatives from the SCO and DOF to meet and discuss parameters and guidelines boilerplate language, which includes sections V through IX and the preamble to section IV.

Staff reviewed the claimant's proposal and the comments received. Non-substantive, technical changes were made to all sections for purposes of clarity and conformity to the Statement of Decision and the statute.

The claimant's proposal included joint powers authorities, cities, counties and special districts as eligible claimants. The SCO and DOF requested removal of joint powers authorities and special districts from this section. Staff limited reimbursement to community colleges, which includes joint powers authorities between community colleges, because the claimant did not respond to this issue nor did another claimant file on behalf of cities, counties, or special districts.

