Petition to Transfer Territory from Glendale USD to La Canada USD

The following are additional materials received prior to the November 6, 2019, County Committee Regular Meeting:

1- 18-page submission by Chief Petitioners (Election Area arguments received 10-24-19)

2- 1-page submission by Glendale USD (Notice of Appeal received 10-31-19)

3- 1-page submission by Los Angeles County Registrar Recorder - County Clerk (proposed alternative map scenarios as requested by the County Committee, received 11-01-19)
18-page submission by Chief Petitioners
(Election Area arguments received 10-24-19)
Memorandum

To: Allison Deegan, Ed.D.
Regionalized Business Services Coordinator
Business Advisory Services
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242

From: Chief Petitioner, Nick Karapetian

Re: Election Area Determination

Date: October 23, 2019

Dear Allison,

We ask that you forward this correspondence to the County Committee members for their review.

Now that the County Committee has approved the GUSD/LCUSD Territory transfer petition, we strongly encourage the Committee to follow the decades-long practice in determining an election area based on the 1992 Local Agency Formation Commission (“LAFCO”) court decision. **LAFCO holds that elections may be confined to within the boundaries of the territory proposed for transfer (the “default election area”) provided there is a rational basis for doing so.**

Petitioners believe that this County Committee adopted this view, in full accordance with the LAFCO decision, when it determined on September 7, 2016 that the election area for the Wiseburn territory transfer petition (”Wiseburn”) be limited to the “default election area”. Petitioners address the relevance of that decision to ours at EXHIBIT 1.

Similarly, Petitioners note that the California Department of Education and the California State Board of Education have uniformly followed the LAFCO decision in their election area recommendations and determinations for decades. Petitioners address this history of state-level election area decisions more fully at EXHIBIT 2.

Finally, Petitioners have attached information regarding a 20-year old petition heard by the State Board that addressed the appropriate area for a territory transfer election at EXHIBIT 3. This petition was the earliest we could find that adopted the findings of the 1992 LAFCO court decision, which established the rational basis of and preference for an election area limited to the transfer territory itself.

In summary, similar to Wiseburn, Petitioners respectfully request that the Committee establish the Territory as the election area based on the rationale that follows with emphasis on 1) voters outside the Territory would not be significantly affected, 2) no discrimination, segregation or racial impacts have been identified and 3) Territory taxpayers will be the most-burdened with an approved transfer.

Thank you,

Chief Petitioner

Nick Karapetian
EXHIBIT 1
COUNTY COMMITTEE ELECTION AREA DETERMINATION FOR WISEBURN
AND RELEVANCE TO THE GUSD/LCUSD PETITION

• In its April 21, 2016 Supplemental Report on the Wiseburn petition, LACOE staff cited three justifications for recommending “that the County Committee limit the election area to the transfer area, to assure that a majority of residents do indeed consent to be transferred.” [emphasis added], namely:

  1. “the low student census that may potentially be shifted”
  2. “the understanding on the petitioners’ part that they will inherit an additional tax obligation if their property is transferred into the Wiseburn USD” and;
  3. “the willingness of the Wiseburn USD to accept the transfer territory has been unwavering”.

• Staff concluded that “the impact of the transfer on the wider region is limited.” The County Committee concurred and voted 7-2 to limit the Wiseburn election area to the transfer Territory itself.

• Petitioners believe the justifications cited by staff in Wiseburn apply equally to the GUSD/LCUSD petition, which supports the rationale for a similar recommendation.

• Comparisons between the two petitions demonstrate that there is no significant difference between them.

  1. Low Student Census: Using comparable figures cited by TAHA, the CEQA consultant for both the Wiseburn and the GUSD/LCUSD petitions, the following table compares the student census residing in the district(s) that students would transfer from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lawndale ESD/Centinela Valley HSD</th>
<th>GUSD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Year</td>
<td>2014 – 15</td>
<td>2016 – 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Potential Transfer Students</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Student Enrollment</td>
<td>14,178</td>
<td>26,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Potential Transfers to Total Enrollment</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of potential transferring students is actually lower in the GUSD/LCUSD petition. Therefore, the Wiseburn rationale applies even more so here.
2. **Inherited Additional Tax:** Territory respondents to the 2014 GUSD-commissioned survey indicated nearly 80% positive support for the proposed transfer even though they would be newly subject to the $450 annual LCUSD parcel tax.

As in Wiseburn, Petitioners have "the understanding on the petitioners’ part that they will inherit an additional tax obligation if their property is transferred." **Furthermore, limiting the election area to the Territory itself would avoid the situation where one voter can impose a new tax on another without being subject to it themselves.**

3. **Unwavering Support of LCUSD:** The Superintendent and Governing Board members of La Cañada USD have steadfastly supported the transfer Petition since 2013 - at public hearings, before this Committee and through the adoption of numerous resolutions.

- Lastly, by approving the Petition, the Committee acknowledged that the impact of the transfer on GUSD and the wider region, the greater Glendale community, is limited as evidenced by:
  - No property or facilities being transferred or otherwise impacted
  - No significant financial impacts to GUSD or its bonding capacity
  - No impact on GUSD's ability to maintain enrollment at its nearest elementary school (in fact, Mountain Avenue Elementary is at its highest enrollment since 2006) or significant disruption to its educational programs
  - The taxpaying residents of the Territory are the only ones who will see a tax increase of any significance
  - There has been little interest or concern expressed by the residents of the greater Glendale community regarding this transfer Petition.

**Recommendation:** Based on EXHIBIT 1, Petitioners respectfully request the Committee to recognize the similar justifications found in this petition, as in Wiseburn, and determine the election area to be limited to the transfer Territory itself.
EXHIBIT 2
TERRITORY TRANSFER APPEALS HEARD BY THE CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION [SBE] FROM 2010 – 2019

- SBE heard 14 TT appeals in the last 10 years – only 2 were overturned.

- The losing school district was the appellant in just 3 of these 14 appeals to the SBE – all three appeals failed.

- The remaining 11 appeals to the SBE were submitted by petitioners after being rejected by the local CC – only 2 were overturned.

- Since most of the appeals were rejected thereby denying the territory transfer, the SBE rarely determined the election area.

- Still, CDE staff expressly affirmed in each appeal to the SBE that the “LAFCO” decision provides legal precedent that elections may be confined to within the boundaries of the territory proposed for transfer (the “default” area).

- Furthermore, CDE always indicated that, should the SBE approve the transfer, its reasons to expand the election area are limited to the following concerns:
  - Present or future racial composition
  - Concern of encouraging future piecemeal transfers
  - Significant effect on voters
  - Significant fiscal effect on affected districts.

- Of the 14 appeals heard by the SBE, CDE staff identified possible reasons to consider expansion of the election area on 4 appeals due to:
  - Present or future racial composition – 1 appeal, deemed not significant by CDE staff
  - Concern of encouraging piecemeal transfers – 3 appeals
  - Significant effect on voters – 0 appeals
  - Significant fiscal effect on affected districts – 0 appeals

All 4 appeals failed so no election areas were expanded.
IS THERE A CONCERN THAT THE GUSD/LCUSD TERRITORY TRANSFER WOULD JUSTIFY EXPANSION OF THE ELECTION AREA BEYOND THE “DEFAULT” AREA?

- Present or future racial composition
  - LACOE staff’s conclusions and recommendations related to Condition 4 (re: racial/ethnic discrimination or segregation) included the following:
    - “there are so few students”
    - “the districts have similar ethnic/racial makeups”
    - “it is recommended that the County Committee deem this condition to be substantially met”

- Concern of encouraging future piecemeal transfers
  - If finalized, GUSD would continue to serve 100% of the residents of the City of Glendale and 100% of the residents of unincorporated Montrose/La Crescenta while LCUSD would serve 100% of the residents of the City of La Cañada Flintridge
  - The Territory is fully within the boundaries of the City of La Cañada Flintridge and the only section of the City not currently assigned to its hometown school district
  - The Territory has relatively unique characteristics (fully within city limits, no school facilities, low student count, hometown school district willing to absorb them) that don’t encourage future transfers

- Significant effect on voters
  - The only voters with a significant effect related to this petition are the Territory voters who will incur a $450 parcel tax, the same as existing LCUSD voters
  - To expand the election area could result in voters not subject to the tax imposing a tax on others.

- Significant fiscal effect on affected districts
  - Approval of this petition by the local county committee is predicated on the belief that no affected districts would incur a significant fiscal effect

Recommendation: Based on EXHIBIT 2, Petitioners strongly encourage the County Committee to determine the election area to be the Territory, as none of the concerns noted above relate to our petition.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROPOSED REORGANIZATION</th>
<th>LOCAL CC</th>
<th>LOCAL DECISION</th>
<th>APPELLANT</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION/DECISION</th>
<th>ELECTION AREA DETERMINATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDE REC</td>
<td>SBE DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11/2019</td>
<td>TT from Denair USD to</td>
<td>Stanislaus CC</td>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>Petitioner (Developer)</td>
<td>Affirm</td>
<td>NA due to disapprove rec; if SBE approved=expanded election area due to future TT proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turlock USD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9/2019</td>
<td>TT from Campbell Union</td>
<td>Santa Clara CC</td>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>Petitioners [Alta Vista neighborhood]</td>
<td>Affirm</td>
<td>NA due to disapprove rec; if SBE approved=Territory (a) may consider expanded election area due to future TT proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#04</td>
<td>SD and Campbell Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USD to Saratoga Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Los Gatos-Saratoga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Union HSD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9/2019</td>
<td>TT from Campbell Union</td>
<td>Santa Clara CC</td>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>Petitioners [Carmen Barco neighborhood]</td>
<td>Affirm</td>
<td>NA due to disapprove rec; if SBE approved=Territory (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#05</td>
<td>SD and Campbell Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USD to Saratoga Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Los Gatos-Saratoga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Union HSD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9/2019</td>
<td>TT from Moreland SD and</td>
<td>Santa Clara CC</td>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>Petitioners</td>
<td>Affirm</td>
<td>NA due to disapprove rec; if SBE approved=Territory (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#06</td>
<td>Campbell Union USD to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cupertino Union SD and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fremont Union HSD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/6/2018</td>
<td>TT from Ravenswood City ESD</td>
<td>San Mateo CC</td>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>Petitioners</td>
<td>Affirm</td>
<td>NA due to disapprove rec; if SBE approved=Territory (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>to Menlo Park City ESD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/6/2018</td>
<td>TT from La Honda-Pescadero USD to Portola Valley ESD and Sequoia Union HSD</td>
<td>San Mateo CC</td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>La Honda-Pescadero USD [&lt;900 students]</td>
<td>Affirm</td>
<td>La Honda-Pescadero USD withdrew its opposition to avoid the cost of election</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#05&amp;06</td>
<td>USD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9/2016</td>
<td>TT from Santa Clara USD to</td>
<td>Santa Clara CC</td>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>Petitioners [two homes]</td>
<td>Reverse</td>
<td>Reverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cupertino Union SD and Fremont Union HSD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/12/2016</td>
<td>TT from Campbell Union SD and Campbell Union HSD to Santa Clara USD</td>
<td>Santa Clara CC</td>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>Petitioners [P Pioneer]</td>
<td>Affirm</td>
<td>NA due to disapprove rec; if SBE approved=Territory (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/9/2013</td>
<td>TT from Orange USD to</td>
<td>Orange CC</td>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>Petitioners [Silverado]</td>
<td>Affirm</td>
<td>NA due to disapprove rec; if SBE approved=Territory (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saddleback Valley USD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/19/2012</td>
<td>TT from Lakeside Joint ESD</td>
<td>Santa Clara CC</td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>Lakeside ESD [17 parcels]</td>
<td>Either delay to consider alternatives or affirm CC decision</td>
<td>Territory unless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to Loma Prieta Joint Union ESD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EdCode 35756.5 applies [Basic Aid District] then entire Lakeside ESD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** SBE heard this appeal on May 7, 2010 but failed to make a decision at that meeting.
EXHIBIT 3

CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD DECISION IN 2000

RE: LAFCO CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT DECISION IN 1992
“First Impressions” Territory Transfer

I, Anthony Valente, declare:

Twenty years ago I lived with my wife and son in a 190-unit townhouse development in Riverside County called “First Impressions.” We were on the border between two school districts, with our district’s schools and bus stops much farther from us than the schools and bus stops in the adjacent district.

I petitioned the county Committee on School District Organization to transfer First Impressions to the adjacent school district. Both districts opposed the transfer, and committee staff recommended denial. The county committee approved the transfer, but set the area of election for the entire district losing territory. One committee member noted they had first approved the transfer, but then denied it by their choice of election area.

I appealed the committee’s election area decision to the state Board of Education, and attended the board’s hearing in Sacramento in June 2000. Both school districts opposed my appeal, and board staff recommended denial. The state board granted my appeal and set the area of election for the petitioning area only. Board members criticized the school districts and staffs for their focus on the districts rather than doing what is best for the students. Once a committee has determined the territory transfer is for a good reason, and determined that both districts can accommodate the transfer, then the decision whether to make the transfer is to be made by those in the petitioning territory, and no one else.

Attached are 1) the state board’s letter to the county notifying it of the board’s decision, and 2) my petition to the state board.

Declaration

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Signed on the 1st day of October, 2019, at El Centro, California.

ANTHONY VALENTE
Exhibit 1

Letter from the State Board of Education Notifying the County Superintendent of Schools that the Board Reversed the County Committee on School District Organization and Set the Area of Election to Be the Petitioning Area Only
June 9, 2000

David Long  
County Superintendent of Schools  
Riverside County Office of Education  
3939 13th Street, P.O. Box 868  
Riverside, CA 92502

RE: Alvord Unified School District

Dear Mr. Long:

This is to provide you with formal notification that the State Board of Education approved the following resolution pertaining to the appeal by the chief petitioners from action of the Riverside County Committee on School District Reorganization.

> Appeal of the action of the Riverside County Committee on School District Organization setting the area of election as the entire Alvord Unified School District for the proposed transfer of specified territory from the Alvord Unified School District to the Corona-Norco Unified School District

WHEREAS, in accordance with Education Code Section 35710.5, the chief petitioners submitted an appeal to the State Board of Education regarding the action of the Riverside County Committee on School District Organization on August 26, 1999 in setting the area of election as the entire Alvord Unified School District for the proposed transfer of territory from the Alvord Unified School District to the Corona-Norco Unified District;

WHEREAS, the affected territory, located in Riverside County, is described as:

> City of Corona, Tract 23096, McKinley Street and Mount Humphries Street, Northeast Quadrant, commonly referred to as First Impressions at Corona Hills;

WHEREAS, the State Board of Education considered and took action on the appeal in accordance with all relevant provisions of law at its June 2000 regular meeting;

WHEREAS, pursuant to Education Code Section 35710.5, the State Board of Education finds that the Riverside County Committee on School District Organization acted improperly in determining the area of election regarding the proposed transfer of territory; and, therefore, be it
RESOLVED, that the State Board of Education, pursuant to Education Code Section 35710.5 approves the appeal and reverses the action of the Riverside County Committee on School District Organization in determining the area of election; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the State Board of Education determines that the territory in which the election regarding the proposed transfer is to be held shall be the petition area only of the Alvord Unified School District; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the Secretary of the State Board of Education, on the Board's behalf, shall notify the Riverside County Committee on School District Organization, the Riverside County Superintendent of Schools, the superintendents of the affected school districts, and the chief petitioners of the State Board's action.

Sincerely,

John B. Mockler
Executive Director

Cc:  Dr. Ronald Bennett, Superintendent, Alvord U.S.D.
     Pedro E. Garcias, Superintendent, Corona-Norco U.S.D.
     Anthony Valente, Chief Petitioner
     Kerrie Laskowski, Chief Petitioner
     Debbie Meier, Chief Petitioner
     District Organization Office
Exhibit 2

Petition to the State Board of Education Seeking Reversal of the Decision of the County Committee on School District Organization Setting the Area of Election as the Entire School District Losing Territory, and to Instead Set the Area of Election to Be the Petitioning Area Only
ANTHONY VALENTE
DEBBIE MEIER
KERRIE LAWSKOWSKI
2257 Arabian Way
Corona, CA 91719
Telephone: (909) 736-0257

Appellants in Pro Per

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

IN THE MATTER OF THE REORGANIZATION OF
THE BOUNDARIES OF THE ALVORD UNIFIED
SCHOOL DISTRICT AND THE CORONA-NORCO
UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

No. ____________________________

APPEAL PURSUANT TO
CALIFORNIA EDUCATION
CODE SECTION 35710.5.(a)

1. Appellants Anthony Valente, Debbie Meier, and Kerrie
Laskowski reside in the City of Corona, County of Riverside, in
an area designated as the Alvord Unified School District
(Alvord). Appellants live in a housing development known as
First Impressions at Corona Hills (First Impressions), comprised
of one hundred mixed 1, 2, and 3 bedroom town homes.

2. First Impressions is located on the border dividing
Alvord and the Corona-Norco Unified School District (Corona-
Norco). Appellants have been informed that the boundary between
Alvord and Corona-Norco may be more than 100 years old.

3. There are approximately 23 students who live at First
Impressions. Twenty of these students attend Alvord schools.
Three of these students attend Corona-Norco schools on inter-
district transfers. Other students have been denied transfers to
Corona-Norco schools.

4. On April 26, 1999, Appellants submitted a petition to the Riverside County Office of Education ("the Office of Education") requesting that First Impressions be transferred from Alvord to Corona-Norco.

5. The petition, and other information provided to the Committee, was submitted for the following reasons:

A. Corona-Norco schools are geographically closer than Alvord Schools.

B. Corona-Norco bus stops are at the corner and along the street of First Impressions. Alvord bus stops are approximately 1 mile away from First Impressions.

C. Residents of First Impressions pay special assessment taxes that provide for the infrastructure and public services at Corona-Norco Schools.

D. Residents of First Impressions have no voice in Riverside City Politics, the City Containing all but one of the Alvord Schools.

E. The cost of the transfer will not be substantial due to the small area and population of First Impressions.

F. Students residing in First Impressions play sports and do other activities creating ties to Corona.

G. Alvord refused to meet and confer on the above issues.

6. On August 26, 1999, the Riverside County Committee on School District Reorganization ("the Committee") granted the appellants petition to transfer First Impressions from Alvord to
Corona-Norco. Prior to granting the petition, both governing boards informed the Committee that they did not consent to the transfer.

7. The Committee granted the petition on the basis that all conditions set-forth in Education Code (EC) Sections 35707, 35709, and 35753, were substantially met.

8. Following the granting of the petition, the Committee was advised by Acting Secretary Elliott Duchon, of the Riverside County, Office of Education ("the Office of Education"), that there is no precedence or guidelines to follow, when determining the area of election. Mr. Duchon told the Committee about a case that had been de-published that involved a County Committee deciding an area of election in only the school district losing the area to be transferred. Mr. Duchon told the Committee that if it decided to hold the election in only the territory to be transferred, there would most assuredly be an appeal on that decision.

9. The Committee was then advised by legal counsel, Mr. Bud Miller, that at this point, the area of election must be decided, and an election held, even if the governing boards of both districts consented to the transfer, after the Committee concluded the petition met the requirements of the EC. (In this case, both governing boards informed their lack of consent to the Riverside County of Education, prior to the Committee deciding that all conditions of the EC were substantially met).

10. The Committee then voted to hold an election in both Alvord and Corona-Norco. The Committee deadlocked 4-4. The
Committee then voted to hold the election in only Alvord. The vote passed 5-3.

11. This appeal alleges the following procedural errors and non-compliance with EC Section 35710:

A. The Office of Education improperly advised the Committee by informing them there is no precedence or guidelines to follow when determining an area of election. The Office of Education did not inform the Committee regarding EC 35756.5, that discusses guidelines for establishing an area of election that involves non-consenting boards with districts that have attendance of 900 or less. Although in this case, this section does not apply because both non-consenting districts have more than 900, this section still provides a guideline for fairness when deciding the area of election, and may have swayed the Committee to decide to hold the election in only the territory to be transferred.

B. The Office of Education improperly advised the Committee about a de-published case, and failed to properly advise the Committee about prior decisions made by their own Committee, other committees, and the State Board of Education. Appellants are aware of one prior similar case that the Committee decided to hold an election in only the territory to be transferred. This case may have involved the Desert Sands Unified School District.

C. The Office of Education improperly advised the Committee that if they decided to hold the election in only the area to be transferred, their decision would most assuredly be
appealed. Appellants believe that the Committee's decision should have been based on the totality of the circumstances, not on the basis of a potential appeal.

D. The Committee had 120 days from the first public hearing to approve the appellant's petition and decide the area of election (EC 35706). The first public hearing was held on June 29, 1999. The petition for the transfer was approved on August 26, 1999. The Committee, with help from the Office of Education, had approximately 62 days to adequately prepare for, and hold a vote regarding the area of election.

E. Instructions by Committee Counsel were that the Committee had to decide the area of election, immediately after they ruled in favor of the transfer of territory. This question came up when one of the Committee members asked if it was too late for the issue to be re-addressed by both non-consenting boards, after the Committee ruled in favor of the transfer. The question was asked for the purpose of determining if an election had to be held. Committee Counsel, Mr. Bud Miller stated there was no turning back once the Committee approved the transfer. Although Appellants believe that Alvord will not change their minds and consent to the transfer, the statement by Mr. Miller was contrary to EC 35709. Appellants believe that both governing boards should have the opportunity to review the decision by the Committee, and decide whether or not they should consent to the transfer, considering the cost to the taxpayers, and the size of the area to be transferred.

12. Prior to their decision, the Committee did not fully
address legal issues relating to voting rights. The Committee’s subsequent decision to hold the election in only Alvord, is adverse to the process outlined in the education code. The spirit of this process is to allow ordinary citizens to change a boundary, that in this case, has been in existence for possibly more than 100 years. As one member of the Committee stated, we approved their transfer, and then denied it by calling for an election in only Alvord.

13. The cost of this election should be viewed with the utmost scrutiny. Estimates by the Committee range from $40,000 to over $100,000, depending on when and where this election is held, unless held in only the territory to be transferred. If held in only the territory to be transferred (100 homes, 23 students), the expense of the election would be minimal.

14. For the above reasons, appellants ask that the State Board of Education overrule the Commission’s decision regarding the area of election and order that the election be held in only the territory to be transferred.

DATED: September 8, 1999

ANTHONY VALENTE DEBBIE MEIER KERRIE LASKOWSKI
1-page submission by Glendale USD (Notice of Appeal received 10-31-19)
October 31, 2019

VIA EMAIL (CRAFTON KEITH@LACOE.EDU>; DUARIO DEBRA@LACOE.EDU) & FEDERAL EXPRESS

Keith D. Crafton
Director, Business Advisory Services Secretary
Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242

Debra Duardo, M.S.W., Ed.D.
Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242

Re: Glendale Unified School District’s Notice of Appeal

Dear Mr. Crafton and Ms. Duardo:

Our firm represents the Glendale Unified School District (“GUSD”). On behalf of GUSD, we hereby submit to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization this Notice of Appeal, pursuant to Education Code section 35710.5, of the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization’s decision of October 2, 2019 approving the 25% Petition seeking to transfer a portion of the GUSD’s territory located in the City of La Cañada Flintridge (“LCF”), also known as the Sagebrush area, to La Cañada Unified School District (“LCUSD”).

GUSD will file its Statement of Reasons and Factual Evidence for Appeal within 15 days of this letter.

Sincerely,

Stan M. Barankiewicz II, Esq.
Attorney for Glendale Unified School District

cc: Allison Deegan, Ed.D., Regionalized Business Coordinator
Vivian Echeland, Ed.D., Superintendent of Schools, Glendale Unified School District
1-page submission by Los Angeles County Registrar Recorder - County Clerk (proposed alternative map scenarios as requested by the County Committee, received 11-01-19)