April 24, 2019

TO: Members of the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee)

FROM: Keith D. Crafton, Secretary

SUBJECT: Cancellation of the May 1, 2019, Meeting of the County Committee

The regular meeting of the County Committee scheduled for Wednesday, May 1, 2019, has been CANCELLED. The next regular meeting of the County Committee is scheduled for Wednesday, June 5, 2019, at 9:30 a.m.

The following is an update of information and activities as of April 23, 2019.

Staff Activities

Staff is guiding districts who are in the early stages of their trustee area and trustee area voting proposals related to the CVRA.

Staff has continued to post articles on the website, many of which include recent developments related to CVRA.

Staff is assisting districts who are preparing to submit petitions related to school district organization.

Legislative Updates (Attachment 1)

Staff is monitoring recent proposals as discussed at the March meeting.

School District Organizational Proposals

- “Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Re-organization Proposals.” (Attachment 2)

- “Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Re-organization Proposals.” (excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District) (Attachment 3)

If you have questions, please call me at (562) 922-6131.

KDC/AD/EH:ah

Attachments
LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT
ORGANIZATION (COUNTY COMMITTEE)
LEGISLATIVE REVIEW – MAY 2019

BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR:
Senate Bill 47 / Allen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTRODUCTION DATE:</th>
<th>LAST ACTIVITY/DATE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/03/18</td>
<td>04/05/19 – Hearing scheduled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DESCRIPTION OF BILL

This bill would require, for a state or local initiative, referendum, or recall petition that requires voter signatures and for which the circulation is paid for by a committee, as specified, that an Official Top Funders disclosure be made, either on the petition or on a separate sheet, that identifies the name of the committee, any top contributors, as defined, and the month and year during which the Official Top Funders disclosure is valid, among other things.

POTENTIAL IMPACT OF BILL ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE,
SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION PROCESS AND/OR LOS ANGELES
COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

This bill would likely not have a significant impact on school board recalls nor County Committee petitions, as external funders are usually not involved.

RECOMMENDED POSITION
Staff recommends the following position:

- **Watch**
  Bill should be monitored by County Committee staff, but no action taken at this time.

- **Approve**
  County Committee supports the bill’s concept, but will not actively work for passage.

- **Support**
  County Committee actively supports the bill.

- **Oppose**
  County Committee actively opposes the bill.

- **Disapprove**
  County Committee disapproves of the bill’s concept, but will not actively oppose passage.
Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals

April 2019

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District (USD) that were at various stages in the school district organization process as of April 16, 2019.

RECENT INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last two years)

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Inner City USD / January 2016

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None
Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals
(Excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District)

May 2019

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals [exclusive of those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District (USD)] that are at various stages in the school district reorganization process as of April 16, 2019.

PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORIES BETWEEN THE SULPHUR SPRINGS UNION SD AND THE SAUGUS UNION SD

On March 6, 2019, the Sulphur Springs Union School District (SD) submitted their final board resolution as part of a series of resolutions spanning the past eleven years, culminating in the formal introduction of a petition to transfer (exchange) certain parcels between Sulphur Springs Union SD and Saugus Union SD. Public hearings have been scheduled in each district for May 2, 2019, both of which are within the William S. Hart Union High School District (HSD), and staff will commence a feasibility study on the petition.

Status: Public hearings to be conducted
*Status Date: April 16, 2019

WHITTIER UNIOn HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT (HSD) PETITION TO IMPLEMENT TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING

On February 20, 2019, the Whittier Union HSD submitted a petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting within the district. The petition, in the form of a board resolution and an adopted trustee area map, was presented to the County Committee at its March 6, 2019 regular meeting. A public hearing was scheduled for April 24, 2019, in the district and staff will commence a feasibility study on the petition.

Status: Public hearing was scheduled
*Status Date: April 16, 2019
ATTACHMENT 1

LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION (COUNTY COMMITTEE)
LEGISLATIVE REVIEW – MAY 2019

BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR:
Senate Bill 47 / Allen

INTRODUCTION DATE:
12/03/18

LAST ACTIVITY/DATE:
04/05/19 – Hearing scheduled

DESCRIPTION OF BILL

This bill would require, for a state or local initiative, referendum, or recall petition that requires voter signatures and for which the circulation is paid for by a committee, as specified, that an Official Top Funders disclosure be made, either on the petition or on a separate sheet, that identifies the name of the committee, any top contributors, as defined, and the month and year during which the Official Top Funders disclosure is valid, among other things.

POTENTIAL IMPACT OF BILL ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE, SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION PROCESS AND/OR LOS ANGELES COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

This bill would likely not have a significant impact on school board recalls nor County Committee petitions, as external funders are usually not involved.

RECOMMENDED POSITION

Staff recommends the following position:

☑ Watch  Bill should be monitored by County Committee staff, but no action taken at this time.
☐ Approve  County Committee supports the bill’s concept, but will not actively work for passage.
☐ Support  County Committee actively supports the bill.
☐ Oppose  County Committee actively opposes the bill.
☐ Disapprove  County Committee disapproves of the bill’s concept, but will not actively oppose passage.
BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR:  
Assembly Bill 212 / Allen

INTRODUCTION DATE:  
02/04/19

LAST ACTIVITY/DATE:  
04/08/19 – Referred back to Committee

DESCRIPTION OF BILL

This bill would authorize a city, county, or local educational agency to conduct an election using ranked choice voting, in which voters rank the candidates for office in order of preference, as specified.

POTENTIAL IMPACT OF BILL ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE, SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION PROCESS AND/OR LOS ANGELES COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

This bill could possibly have a large impact on Los Angeles County school districts who receive a demand letter to implement trustee area voting.

RECOMMENDED POSITION

Staff recommends the following position:

☐ Watch  Bill should be monitored by County Committee staff, but no action taken at this time.
☐ Approve  County Committee supports the bill’s concept, but will not actively work for passage.
☐ Support  County Committee actively supports the bill.
☐ Oppose  County Committee actively opposes the bill.
☐ Disapprove  County Committee disapproves of the bill’s concept, but will not actively oppose passage.
BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR:  
Senate Bill 585 / Wieckowski

INTRODUCTION DATE:  
02/22/19

LAST ACTIVITY/DATE:  
04/04/19 – Hearing scheduled

DESCRIPTION OF BILL

This bill would prohibit any school district organization action from converting any portion of any territory of a unified school district into territory of any other type of school district.

POTENTIAL IMPACT OF BILL ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE, SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION PROCESS AND/OR LOS ANGELES COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

RECOMMENDED POSITION

Staff recommends the following position:

☐ Watch Bill should be monitored by County Committee staff, but no action taken at this time.
☐ Approve County Committee supports the bill’s concept, but will not actively work for passage.
☐ Support County Committee actively supports the bill.
☐ Oppose County Committee actively opposes the bill.
☐ Disapprove County Committee disapproves of the bill’s concept, but will not actively oppose passage.

AMENDMENTS REQUIRED

If staff’s recommended position is based on the need for amendments to the bill language, suggested alternative language is attached.

CORRESPONDENCE REQUIRED

If staff’s recommended position is based on the need for correspondence to the bill’s author, the Governor or other governmental officials, a draft of suggested language is attached.

Please direct all comments to Mr. Keith D. Crafton, Secretary to the County Committee at (562) 922-6131
Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals

April 2019

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District (USD) that were at various stages in the school district organization process as of April 16, 2019.

RECENT INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last two years)

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Inner City USD / January 2016

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None
Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals
(Excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District)

May 2019

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals [exclusive of those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District (USD)] that are at various stages in the school district reorganization process as of April 16, 2019.

PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORIES BETWEEN THE SULPHUR SPRINGS UNION SD AND THE SAUGUS UNION SD

On March 6, 2019, the Sulphur Springs Union School District (SD) submitted their final board resolution as part of a series of resolutions spanning the past eleven years, culminating in the formal introduction of a petition to transfer (exchange) certain parcels between Sulphur Springs Union SD and Saugus Union SD. Public hearings have been scheduled in each district for May 2, 2019, both of which are within the William S. Hart Union High School District (HSD), and staff will commence a feasibility study on the petition.

Status: Public hearings to be conducted
*Status Date: April 16, 2019

WHITTIER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT (HSD) PETITION TO IMPLEMENT TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING

On February 20, 2019, the Whittier Union HSD submitted a petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting within the district. The petition, in the form of a board resolution and an adopted trustee area map, was presented to the County Committee at its March 6, 2019 regular meeting. A public hearing was scheduled for April 24, 2019, in the district and staff will commence a feasibility study on the petition.

Status: Public hearing was scheduled
*Status Date: April 16, 2019
FORMATION—MALIBU USD (CURRENTLY LIES WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE SANTA MONICA-MALIBU USD)

On September 1, 2017, LACOE received a petition in the form of a 2015 resolution from the City of Malibu to form a separate Malibu USD from territory within the boundaries of the existing Santa Monica-Malibu USD. The petition was introduced at the November 1, 2017 regular County Committee meeting, and at least one public hearing will be scheduled. After this local agency petition was introduced, however, the City of Malibu sent a letter requesting that the County Committee postpone the scheduling of its preliminary hearing to allow the stakeholders more time to discuss further options and details regarding the petition. On February 28, 2018, however, the City of Malibu apprised the committee of their interest in pursuing the preliminary public hearing. Then, in April 2018, the City resolved to further investigate options before asking the County Committee to proceed. At its May 2, 2018 regular meeting, the County Committee voted to delay scheduling the preliminary public hearing until after getting an update on negotiations at its regularly scheduled meeting on September 5, 2018. On September 5, 2018, representatives from the City of Malibu and the Santa Monica-Malibu USD apprised the County Committee of their negotiations, and again at the March 6, 2019 meeting.

Status: Preliminary public hearing to be scheduled, pending negotiations
*Status Date: March 20, 2019

PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORY FROM THE GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (USD) TO THE LA CANADA USD

On November 23, 2015, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §35700, to transfer certain territory from the Glendale USD to the La Canada USD. The request was submitted by chief petitioners Ms. Nalini Lasiewicz, Mr. Thomas G. Smith, and Mr. Nick P. Karapetian. The petition was forwarded to County Counsel to determine its legal compliance regarding format and content. On January 13, 2016, County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient. Staff returned the petition to the chief petitioners on January 15, 2016.

On June 29, 2016, the chief petitioners submitted signed petitions for review. On June 30, 2016, staff conveyed the signed petitions to the Registrar-Recorder for signature verification. On July 18, 2016, staff received notice from the Registrar-Recorder that there were sufficient signatures to move the petition forward. Chief Petitioner Smith subsequently resigned from his role.

The petition was presented to the County Committee on September 7, 2016. The County Committee held two public hearings (October 26, 2016, in the La Canada USD, and November 2, 2016, in the Glendale USD). In mid-February, 2017, the two districts resumed negotiations in an attempt to find amicable solutions, but as of mid-April, were not able to resolve issues.
Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals  
(Excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District)  

May 2019

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals [exclusive of those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District (USD)] that are at various stages in the school district reorganization process as of April 16, 2019.

PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORIES BETWEEN THE SULPHUR SPRINGS UNION SD AND THE SAUGUS UNION SD

On March 6, 2019, the Sulphur Springs Union School District (SD) submitted their final board resolution as part of a series of resolutions spanning the past eleven years, culminating in the formal introduction of a petition to transfer (exchange) certain parcels between Sulphur Springs Union SD and Saugus Union SD. Public hearings have been scheduled in each district for May 2, 2019, both of which are within the William S. Hart Union High School District (HSD), and staff will commence a feasibility study on the petition.

Status: Public hearings to be conducted  
*Status Date: April 16, 2019

WHITTIER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT (HSD) PETITION TO IMPLEMENT TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING

On February 20, 2019, the Whittier Union HSD submitted a petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting within the district. The petition, in the form of a board resolution and an adopted trustee area map, was presented to the County Committee at its March 6, 2019 regular meeting. A public hearing was scheduled for April 24, 2019, in the district and staff will commence a feasibility study on the petition.

Status: Public hearing was scheduled  
*Status Date: April 16, 2019
FORMATION—MALIBU USD (CURRENTLY LIES WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE SANTA MONICA-MALIBU USD)

On September 1, 2017, LACOE received a petition in the form of a 2015 resolution from the City of Malibu to form a separate Malibu USD from territory within the boundaries of the existing Santa Monica-Malibu USD. The petition was introduced at the November 1, 2017 regular County Committee meeting, and at least one public hearing will be scheduled. After this local agency petition was introduced, however, the City of Malibu sent a letter requesting that the County Committee postpone the scheduling of its preliminary hearing to allow the stakeholders more time to discuss further options and details regarding the petition. On February 28, 2018, however, the City of Malibu apprised the committee of their interest in pursuing the preliminary public hearing. Then, in April 2018, the City resolved to further investigate options before asking the County Committee to proceed. At its May 2, 2018 regular meeting, the County Committee voted to delay scheduling the preliminary public hearing until after getting an update on negotiations at its regularly scheduled meeting on September 5, 2018. On September 5, 2018, representatives from the City of Malibu and the Santa Monica-Malibu USD apprised the County Committee of their negotiations, and again at the March 6, 2019 meeting.

Status: Preliminary public hearing to be scheduled, pending negotiations

*Status Date: March 20, 2019

PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORY FROM THE GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (USD) TO THE LA CANADA USD

On November 23, 2015, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §35700, to transfer certain territory from the Glendale USD to the La Canada USD. The request was submitted by chief petitioners Ms. Nalini Lasiewicz, Mr. Thomas G. Smith, and Mr. Nick P. Karapetian. The petition was forwarded to County Counsel to determine its legal compliance regarding format and content. On January 13, 2016, County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient. Staff returned the petition to the chief petitioners on January 15, 2016.

On June 29, 2016, the chief petitioners submitted signed petitions for review. On June 30, 2016, staff conveyed the signed petitions to the Registrar-Recorder for signature verification. On July 18, 2016, staff received notice from the Registrar-Recorder that there were sufficient signatures to move the petition forward. Chief Petitioner Smith subsequently resigned from his role.

The petition was presented to the County Committee on September 7, 2016. The County Committee held two public hearings (October 26, 2016, in the La Canada USD, and November 2, 2016, in the Glendale USD). In mid-February, 2017, the two districts resumed negotiations in an attempt to find amicable solutions, but as of mid-April, were not able to resolve issues.
A feasibility study was presented to the County Committee at the May 3, 2017 meeting, after which the Committee gave a preliminary approval to the proposal.

In the fall 2017, staff concluded the Request For Proposal (RFP) process, evaluated vendors, and selected an environmental consultant, for whom a contract was agreed upon. The environmental analysis concluded with the report’s comment period spanning August 30 – September 18, 2018. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Public Hearing convened on October 3, 2018, at the County Committee’s regular scheduled meeting.

The County Committee continued to review the petition. On February 20, 2019, they received a request from Dr. Kelly King, Interim Superintendent of the Glendale USD, to delay final review so that she may become familiar with the relevant issues following her recent appointment. In February 2019, staff received a request from the chief petitioners that the final review of the petition not take place at the April 3, 2019 meeting because that date falls during spring break and may impact participation by the public. Staff provided an update at the March 6, 2019 regular meeting of the County Committee, and has since then continued to receive additional materials and correspondence on the petition, which must be reviewed by staff and the Committee prior to any action.

*Status: County Committee conducting further review of petition and materials, may adopt CEQA findings and vote on petition at a future meeting, unless it deems more time needed and/or requests additional information from petitioners, districts, or staff.

Status Date: April 16, 2019

PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORY FROM THE CENTINELA VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT (HSD) AND LAWNDALE SD TO THE WISEBURN USD

On May 15, 2014, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §35700, to transfer territory from the Centinela Valley Union HSD and the Lawndale SD to the Wiseburn USD. The request was submitted by chief petitioners Ms. Shavonda Webber-Christinas and Mr. Bill Magoon. The petition was forwarded to County Counsel to determine its legal compliance regarding format and content. On June 20, 2014, County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient. Staff returned the petition to the chief petitioners on June 23, 2014.

On October 15, 2014, the chief petitioners submitted signed petitions for review. On October 15, 2014, staff conveyed the signed petitions to the Registrar-Recorder for signature verification. On November 6, 2014, staff received notice from the Registrar-Recorder there were insufficient signatures to move the petition forward. Staff notified the chief petitioners, who elected to gather additional signatures. On December 4, 2014, the chief petitioners submitted additional signatures, which were submitted to the Registrar-Recorder on December 5, 2014 for signature verification. On December 22, 2014, the Registrar Recorder notified
staff that the additional signatures were validated, and the petition had sufficient signatures to move forward.

The petition was presented to the County Committee on January 7, 2015. Two public hearings were held March 2, 2015, one in each of the affected districts. A feasibility study was presented on July 8, 2015, at which time the County Committee preliminarily approved the transfer, pending further collection and review of additional fiscal data, and an environmental review. Supplemental requests for information were sent to the affected districts and to the chief petitioners, with replies received from all parties. The supplemental information, and the results of a CEQA consultant’s review of the petition’s environmental impact was presented to the County Committee on May 4, 2016. Additional information brought forward on May 4, 2016, resulted in additional questions and further information gathering, after which the proposal was reexamined at the County Committee meeting on September 7, 2016. At that meeting, the proposal’s preliminary approval was affirmed, and the petition area was selected to be the voting area.

On October 5, 2016, the Lawndale SD filed a Notice of Appeal with the County Committee, and on October 18, 2016, submitted their rationale and evidence for the appeal of the County Committee’s decision. Staff has forwarded the administrative record and oral recordings of the proceedings to the California Department of Education, who will prepare the matter to go before the California State Board of Education at a future meeting.

Status: Future ballot measure preparations suspended until appeal process concludes
Status Date: November 18, 2016

FORMATION—MALIBU USD (CURRENTLY LIES WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE SANTA MONICA-MALIBU USD)

On July 23, 2015, LACOE received a request for a petition from chief petitioner Mr. Seth Jacobson, a community member who is a Malibu resident. Mr. Jacobson, along with two other chief petitioners, wants to form a separate Malibu USD from territory within the boundaries of the existing Santa Monica-Malibu USD. Prior to the submission of any signed petitions related to this request, the City of Malibu submitted its own petition to form a Malibu USD, which was discussed earlier in this update document.

Staff reviewed the request and forwarded a draft petition to County Counsel on July 27, 2015, for a legal compliance review regarding format and content. We received notification on July 30, 2015, from County Counsel informing us that the draft petition was legally acceptable. The petition was mailed to the chief petitioners on July 31, 2015, for circulation within the petition area. Staff is informed that signatures have been gathered, but not yet presented for signature verification, as the petitioners negotiate with the district. A joint committee
appointed by both the district and the City of Malibu has released a study addressing the implications of this petition. Staff is reviewing this study.

Status: Petitioners in negotiation.
Status Date: March 18, 2016

PETITION TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN WITHIN THE POMONA USD

On April 8, 2015, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §5020 to increase the number of trustees from five to seven within the Pomona USD. The request was submitted by chief petitioner Mr. John Mendoza. The petition was forwarded to County Counsel to determine its legal compliance regarding format and content. On April 27, 2015, County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient. Staff returned the petition to the chief petitioner on April 29, 2015, for circulation.

This is a separate petition, distinct from the other petitions requested by Mr. Mendoza, and requests some of the same changes within the Pomona Unified School District (the addition of two governing board members). It was submitted under EC §5020(c) and, based on the number of registered voters in the Pomona USD, requires valid signatures from at least 10% of the registered voters within the petition area. If valid and certified by the County Committee, this petition would trigger a vote within the district, before which the County Committee may hold one or more public hearings on the proposal.

Status: Petitioner is gathering signatures.
Status Date: May 26, 2015

FORMATION—ALTADENA USD (CURRENTLY LIES WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE PASADENA USD)

On January 17, 2006, LACOE received a request for a petition from chief petitioners Ms. Maurice Morse, Ms. Shirlee Smith, and Mr. Bruce Wasson, three community members who are residents of the area known as Altadena. The chief petitioners want to form an Altadena USD from territory within the boundaries of the Pasadena USD. The petition request was returned to the chief petitioners on January 20, 2006, because it lacked an adequate description of the area pursuant to EC §35700.3.

On February 10, 2006, LACOE received a revised request for a petition. Staff reviewed the request and forwarded a draft petition to County Counsel on February 22, 2006, for a legal compliance review regarding format and content. We received notification on
March 6, 2006, from County Counsel informing us that the draft petition was legally acceptable.

On March 7, 2006, staff forwarded the draft petition to the Registrar-Recorder for verification that the description of the proposed boundaries of the Altadena USD was sufficiently clear (so registered voters residing within the proposed petition area could be identified with specificity). The Registrar-Recorder confirmed that the description was sufficient on March 10, 2006.

The petition was mailed to the chief petitioners on March 14, 2006, for circulation within the petition area. The Registrar-Recorder estimated the chief petitioners must collect approximately 7,000 valid signatures to meet the criteria set forth in EC §35700(a).

On September 23, 2010, chief petitioners delivered signed petitions to LACOE. Staff submitted the petitions to the Registrar-Recorder on September 27, 2010, for signature verification. On October 22, 2010, the Registrar-Recorder notified staff there were insufficient valid signatures (less than the required 25 percent of the registered voters within the petition area). Staff notified the chief petitioners of the insufficiency, and at Mr. Wasson’s request, returned the petitions to the Registrar-Recorder for a signature audit. Staff also advised the chief petitioner regarding the collection of additional signatures. Upon notification by the Registrar-Recorder of a sufficient number of valid signatures, staff will present the petition to the County Committee at the next regular meeting.

On January 4, 2011, staff conferred with a representative from the Registrar-Recorder’s office, who informed us that no audit of petition signatures had been done yet, and they clarified the cost of signature verification. On February 15 and March 1, 2011, staff contacted the Registrar-Recorder and were informed that the signature audit had still not been done. On May 12, 2011, staff from the Registrar-Recorder’s office advised LACOE that an audit of the petition’s signatures was underway. On November 28, 2011, the chief petitioner Mr. Wasson notified LACOE of the death of one of the co-chief petitioners, Ms. Morse. Mr. Wasson stated that another chief petitioner would not be named.

In August of 2014, staff confirmed that petitioner is still interested in collecting additional signatures.

Status: Petition insufficient; chief petitioners may gather additional signatures.
Status Date: December 5, 2011

FORMATION—MALIBU USD (CURRENTLY LIES WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE SANTA MONICA-MALIBU USD)

Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: February 21, 2008

FORMATION—LA MIRADA USD (CURRENTLY LIES WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE NORWALK – LA MIRADA USD)

Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: March 20, 2007

Unification Proposals/Last Activity Date

• None

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

• Azusa USD to Glendora USD/October 2016

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

• Malibu USD (Santa Monica-Malibu USD)/April 2018

Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

• East Whittier City SD / March 2019
• El Monte City SD / August 2017
• El Monte Union HSD / March 2016
• Little Lake City SD / March 2019
• Los Nietos SD / March 2019
• *South Whittier SD / April 2019
• Torrance USD / July 2018
• Walnut USD / May 2016

* = indicates activity since last meeting.

This document was prepared by staff to the County Committee.
The following correspondence was received from Glendale USD's interim superintendent on 03-27-19
From: Kelly King <kking@gusd.net>
Sent: Wednesday, March 27, 2019 5:24 PM
To: Deegan_Allison <Deegan_Allison@lacoed.edu>
Subject: Fwd: Fw: LCUSD Permit Process (Sagebrush) 2019-20

Just a FYI, sharing what we receive

Begin forwarded message:

On Sunday, March 3, 2019, 6:35 PM, Nick Karapetian <nick@krpartnergroup.com> wrote:

Good Evening:

REMEMBER - Tomorrow, Monday March 4th is the first day for submitting permit applications to LCUSD for the 2019-20 School Year! The permit applications are available NOW (online). Deadline is Friday, April 26, 2019.

If you are a LCF/Sagebrush neighborhood resident whose children currently attend GUSD schools and are interested in transferring to LCUSD, or if you have just moved into the neighborhood, or have a first time school age child and want your child to attend LCUSD, please be sure to not miss this short window to apply for a permit. As in prior years, LCUSD attendance permits will be approved based on availability of space in the various grade levels.

Attached is a School Information flyer, including FAQs, and a Korean translation.

LCUSD link for permit instructions and the application form: LCUSD Website LINK

Unless there is a Territory Transfer, Sagebrush children will not have the legal right to attend La Cañada Unified Schools (LCUSD) as residents. Through the Petition process with the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization, we have been actively working to make that a reality and you have been receiving updates on that process. For now and going into the 2019-20 school year, Sagebrush students can only attend LCUSD through a permit application process. Today, with a permit, there are 215 Sagebrush students at LCUSD schools (101 at Palm Crest Elementary). According to Glendale Unified School District (GUSD), there are 189 Sagebrush students attending their 3 local schools (Mtn. Ave, Rosemont & CVHS).
Please help spread the word to new residents and neighbors in Sagebrush who may not know that this window is the only time of the year Sagebrush families can apply to LCUSD.

Have a wonderful weekend and please let me know if you have any questions.

Nick Karapetian

Sagebrush Resident and Parent – We have lived in Sagebrush since 2004, the year our twins were born. They attended GUSD’s Mountain Avenue K-4th and permitted into LCUSD in 5th grade. They are currently in LCUSD’s 7/8 school.

Additional information can be found at the UniteLCF! website.

Web Site: www.UniteLCF.wordpress.com

Facebook page: www.facebook.com/UniteLCF
La Cañada Flintridge Parents
Living in SAGEBRUSH (Blue Area On Map)

School Information – February 2019

Residents of the Sagebrush neighborhood of La Cañada Flintridge (LCF) reside within the Glendale Unified School District (GUSD) boundaries and only have the right to attend GUSD schools.

If you would like your child to attend La Cañada Unified schools (LCUSD) in 2019-20 and are currently not attending LCUSD schools, You MUST Submit an Application to LCUSD for a Permit Between March 4 & April 26, 2019

IT’S EASY TO APPLY WHILE MAINTAINING YOUR CHILD’S PLACE AT GUSD

215 Students From Sagebrush Currently Attend LCUSD

STEP 1 - Submit an “Inter-District Permit Application” to LCUSD – Applications are available (online) NOW and will be accepted starting March 4, 2019. Deadline is April 26, 2019. Acceptance by LCUSD is Not Guaranteed, however Sagebrush is given priority based on availability. Click Here for instructions and form; or visit www.lcusd.net then select “Enroll” (on bottom right), then select “Non-Resident Enrollment - Permits” (in middle) then select “Sagebrush” (in middle).

STEP 2 – Submit an “Inter-District Release” to GUSD – ONLY DO THIS AFTER you get an Official Permit Acceptance for your child from LCUSD. GUSD in prior years has represented that they will continue to approve all releases from Sagebrush students. Write “Sagebrush” on the top of the release form to help with processing. As of Feb 4, 2019, GUSD had not yet posted the 2019-20 Release Forms. Click Here for the 2018-19 form or visit www.gusd.net then select “Enrollment” (on top / right) then select “Inter-District Releases” (on left) then select “Inter-District Release Form (2018-2019)” (on bottom).
WHEN WILL I KNOW IF MY CHILD GOT INTO LCUSD? – June – Aug 2019

Families will be notified as soon as possible, but notifications could be delivered as late as the first week of August.

CAN I CHOOSE WHICH LCUSD ELEMENTARY MY CHILD GOES TO? – NO

While LCUSD would make every effort to place Sagebrush students at Palm Crest, which currently has 101 Sagebrush students attending, acceptance will be based on where the additional capacity lies within the LCUSD schools.

WILL MY CHILD NEED FUTURE RELEASES FROM GUSD? - MAYBE

GUSD has represented that currently they do not require annual releases, but a new release from GUSD will be needed for transitional grades, i.e. entering 7th and 9th grades.

SHOULD I ALSO ENROLL MY CHILD AT THE GUSD SCHOOL? – YES

Since enrollment at LCUSD is not guaranteed, to secure your child’s place for 2019-20 at their current GUSD school or if enrolling for the first time at GUSD, you need to complete all necessary GUSD forms.

CAN MY CHILD STILL ATTEND THEIR CURRENT GUSD SCHOOLS, IF ACCEPTED INTO LCUSD BUT THEN CHANGE MY MIND? – YES

Your child keeps their right to attend the GUSD school they are currently enrolled in until you ask for a Inter-District Release from GUSD.

WHO CAN I CALL IF I HAVE QUESTIONS?

LCUSD: Kris Mueller (818) 952-8395 kmueller@lcusd.net

GUSD: Hilma Shahnazari (818) 241-3111 Ext 1236. hshahnazari@gusd.net

UniteLCF!: Nick Karapetian (310) 266-7088 nick@krpartnergroupp.com

This information was compiled by UniteLCF!

We make no claims to represent either district. Please contact them directly to confirm enrollment deadlines, applications and permit requests.

To receive future email updates from UniteLCF!, please join our mailing list at https://unitelcf.wordpress.com/join/
라카나다 플린트릿지 (LCF), 세이지브러쉬 (SAGEBRUSH) 지역에 (지도에 파란색) 거주하는 부모님들을 위한

학교정보 - 2019 년 2 월

세이지브러쉬 지역에 거주하는 라카나다 플린트릿지의 주민들은 글렌데일 교육구 (GUSD)의 학교에 입학/등교할 권리만 있습니다.

당신의 자녀가 해당년도 2019 - 20 에 라카나다 교육구 (LCUSD) 의 학교에 입학/전학을 원하시면 2019 년 3 월 4 일 ~ 4 월 26 일까지 “허가 신청서 (Enrollment Permit)” 를 제출하시야 합니다.

신청절차는 간단하며, 글렌데일 교육구의 자리 또한 보장받을 수 있습니다.

현재 215 명의 세이지브러쉬 지역의 학생들이 라카나다 교육구의 학교들에 다니고 있습니다.

1 단계 - 라카나다 교육구 (LCUSD)에 "Inter-District Permit Application 허가 신청서"를 접수합니다.

이곳을 클릭하시거나 www.lcusd.net 에 접속한 후 페이지 맨 아랫부분에 위치한 "Enroll" 을 선택합니다.
"Enrollment Portal" 이동 후, "Non-Resident Enrollment – Permits" > "Sagebrush" 를 선택하면 필요한 서류들과 정보가 있습니다.

2 단계 - 라카나다 교육구로부터 공식입학 허가서를 받은 후에 "교육구 이전 허가서 (Inter-District Release)" 를 글렌데일 교육부에 제출합니다.

이곳을 누르거나 www.gusd.net 에 접속하면 신청서 및 필요한 정보가 있습니다.
("Enrollment" > "Intra-/Inter-District Permits" > "Inter-District Releases" 를 선택하면 한국어도 적혀있습니다.
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언제 LCUSD 에 등교허가 여부를 확인할 수 있나요? - 2019 년 6 월부터 8 월 사이
가능한 한 빠리 통보되지만, 늦음 경우에는 8 월 첫주 동안 통보받는 경우도 있습니다.

LCUSD 중에 어느 초등학교로 갈수있는지 선택권이 있으나요? - 아니오
현재 101 명의 세이지브리쉬 지역의 학생들이 다니고 있는 Palm Crest Elementary 로 배치하기 위해 노력은 하고 있지만 LCUSD 전체 초등학교의 수용력/균형비를 감안해야 하므로 최종 결과는 장담드릴 수 없습니다.

항후에도 계속 GUSD 로부터 “교육지구간 이전 허가 District Release” 가 필요합니까? - 어쩌면 그렇 수도 있습니다.
현재는 매년 허가서를 요구하지 않으나, 항후에는 학교급이 바뀌는 (초등학교 → 중학교, 중학교 → 고등학교) 시기에 추가의 허가를 요구할 가능성이 있습니다.

LCUSD 등록신청 동시에 GUSD 의 학교에도 등록해야합니까? - 예
LCUSD 에 등록이 보장 되지 않기 때문에 동시에 GUSD 의 등록에 필요한 서류를 작성/신청 하셔야 합니다. 만약 LCUSD 로 부터 허가가 나오지 않을경우 GUSD 학교에 자리확보가 필요하기 때문입니다.

LCUSD 에 입학허가가 나더라도 마음이 바뀌면 GUSD 의 학교에 등교할수 있습니까? - 예
당신의 아이는 당신이 GUSD “교육지구간 이전허가” 를 요청할 때까지 현재에 등록되어 있는 GUSD의 학교에 다닐 권리가 유지됩니다.

추가 질문이 있음경우 어디로 문의할수 있나요?

LCUSD: Kris Mueller (818) 952-8395 kmueller@lcusd.net
GUSD: Hilma Shahnazari (818) 241-3111 Ext 1236. hshahnazari@gusd.net
UniteLCF: Nick Karapetian (310) 266-7088 nick@krpartnergroup.com

이 정보는 UniteLCF! 이 편집하였습니다.
저희는 어느 교육구도 공식 대표하지 않습니다. 등록 마감/신청 및 허가 요청에 관한 확인은 해당 교육구 공식 연락처에 직접 문의하시기 바랍니다.
저희의 메일링 리스트 https://unitelcf.wordpress.com/join/ 에 가입하시면 Sagebrush 에 관한 최신정보를 계속 받아보실 수 있습니다.
Petition to transfer territory from Glendale USD to La Canada USD

The following Glendale USD Board Resolution was received from the district on 04-04-19
TO:        Board of Education
FROM:     Dr. Kelly King, Interim Superintendent
PREPARED IN:  Office of the Superintendent

SUBJECT:  Resolution #21- Opposing the Proposed Transfer of Territory to the La Cañada Unified School District

The Interim Superintendent recommends that the Board of Education adopt Resolution No. 21 – Reaffirming its commitment to oppose the proposed transfer of territory to the La Cañada Unified School District.

On May 1, 2019, the Los Angeles Country Committee on School Districts Organization will be voting on the petition to transfer territory from the Glendale Unified School District to the La Cañada Unified School District. The accompanying Resolution, which was originally adopted on November 1, 2016, is being presented to the Board of Education to reaffirm the District’s commitment to “Keep Glendale Whole.”

Background
On September 7, 2016, the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization officially accepted a petition requesting transfer of the “Sagebrush” territory from Glendale Unified School District to the La Cañada Unified School District. The petition was submitted by UniteLCF.

The County Committee conducted two public hearings for the primary purpose of receiving testimony from the parties affected by the petition and to request public input. The first public hearing was held on October 26, 2016 at the La Cañada Unified School District. The second public hearing was held on November 2, 2016 at Crescenta Valley High School Auditorium.

On August 31, 2018, the County Committee notified the District that the CEQA study for the territory transfer was completed. On October 3, 2018, a CEQA hearing on the petition to transfer territory from GUSD to LCUSD was held to receive public comment and to consider adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

On March 6, 2019, the County Committee voted to schedule the hearing to vote on the petition to transfer territory from Glendale Unified School District to La Cañada Unified School District on May 1, 2019.
This territory has been an integral and significant part of the Glendale Unified School District community. The homes that sit on approximately 950 parcels of land house hundreds of past, current and future Glendale Unified students, and families. The loss of these students would be felt throughout the school district now and far into the future.

There are no educational reasons for this territory transfer. The petitioners agree that Glendale Schools are of the highest quality. The diversity of our students and our teachers are a strength of which we are incredibly proud. Three of our schools that would be directly and negatively impacted by this territory transfer were just named as 2019 California Distinguished Schools: Rosemont Middle School, Clark Magnet High School, and Crescenta Valley High School. Achieving this recognition with the new State accountability system is truly exceptional and was unique to Glendale Unified School District in comparison to our surrounding school districts.

The Glendale Unified School District opposes the petitioners’ action to separate from this District.
GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

RESOLUTION NO. 21

REAFFIRM OPPOSITION TO THE PROPOSED TRANSFER OF TERRITORY TO THE LA CAÑADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

WHEREAS, a group of residents in our District and the City of La Cañada Flintridge have proposed the transfer to the La Cañada Unified School District of that portion of the Glendale Unified School District located within the western city limits of La Cañada Flintridge; and

WHEREAS, the attendance boundaries have existed since the inception of the two districts in the late 1800’s; and

WHEREAS, approximately 235 students now attending Glendale public schools reside in the affected area, including 84 at Mountain Avenue Elementary, 37 at Rosemont Middle School, and 68 at Crescenta Valley High School, and 46 at other campuses in the District; and

WHEREAS, in matters of proposed transfer of territory, the Board of Education not only considers the potential impact on those students affected directly but on all current and future students within the District; and

WHEREAS, if approved, the transfer would create a number of negative and permanent impacts for the District including: (1) A loss of student population at Mountain Avenue Elementary School, Rosemont Middle School, and Crescenta Valley High School and the resulting loss of Average Daily Attendance revenue generated by the loss of student population; (2) Negative fiscal impact on the District as a whole; (3) Unfair bonded indebtedness increase of $11.6 million to be shouldered by the remaining District residents; and (4) Decreased tax capacity and bonding capacity due to the loss of parcels.

WHEREAS, if the transfer of the above-mentioned territory were to occur, the Glendale Unified School District could face a potential net financial loss in per-student income of approximately $2.7 million annually at a time when GUSD is working to resolve its current budget deficit and at a time when projected school funding under the LCFF will experience certain slow down, based upon economic predictors; and

WHEREAS, the District’s diversity and strength of parent and student leadership are invaluable resources and should the transfer of the above-mentioned territory occur, the Glendale Unified School District would permanently lose an important portion of the District’s community that has previously provided GUSD school board members, Council and school site Parent-Teacher Association leaders, student board members, and student leaders to the benefit of the District as a whole.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Education of the Glendale Unified School District goes on public record as opposing the proposed transfer of territory
to the La Cañada Unified School District, as having significant negative impacts upon the current and future students of the Glendale Unified Schools and the School District; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that there is no educational reason for the territory transfer. The Board is justly proud of the achievements of Mountain Avenue Elementary School, Rosemont Middle School, and Crescenta Valley High School—all recognized as National Blue Ribbon Schools, California Distinguished Schools, and California Gold Ribbon Schools—and believes strongly that the quality of education, student services, and community involvement supporting these three campuses are among the finest quality anywhere in California.

Adopted this 2nd day of April 2019 by the Governing Board of the Glendale Unified School District.

Signature
Gregory S. Krikorian, President

Jennifer Freeman, Vice President

Dr. Armin Gharpian, Clerk

Shant Sahakian, Member

Nayir Nahabedian, Member
Petition to transfer territory from Glendale USD to La Canada USD

The following letter, addressed to County Committee Member, Mr. Frank Ogaz, with six pages attached, was received 04-04-19
April 4, 2019

TO: Frank Ogaz, Member, County Committee (LACOE)

FROM: Nalini Lasiewicz, resident, La Cañada Flintridge

I wanted to thank you for comments that you made during the March 2019 meeting of the County Committee. I was unable to attend that meeting in person, but our local newspaper did make a mention of it in a recent article (attached.)

I would like to add my voice to the concerns you raised about form letters or unidentified or anonymous correspondence or form letters being forwarded to the Committee for their review.

Most of the correspondence from supporters and opponents that we have received during the Territory Transfer process have had a name/address/city, often even the email address, included with their note.

However, in the packet for the March meeting, we received three letters that seemed to have been date stamped as a group, but identifying information was either absent or illegible, something I don’t recall in previous dispatches of form letters. (attached) At every public hearing I attend, it is expected I state my name either in writing or verbally. I think a similar standard should be applied to all comments sent to all the parties, written or sent via email.

Many thanks,
Nalini Lasiewicz
La Cañada Flintridge
Co Chief Petitioner
818 249-9691
Petition to transfer territory from Glendale USD to La Canada USD

The following three pages are correspondence received from residents in February 2019
Members of Los Angeles County
Committee on School District Organization
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242-2890
Crafton Keith@lacoe.edu

25 Jan, 2019

Dear County Committee Members,

I am a resident of the City of La Crescenta, and I am submitting formal comments in opposition to the proposed transfer of the Territory from Glendale Unified School District to the La Canada Unified School District.

I oppose the Territory Transfer because it is clear that the primary motivation behind the transfer is money. There is a lot of information out there about how the property owners in La Canada will benefit the most from this transfer because their property values are going to skyrocket. Who wouldn’t sign a petition for that type of windfall?

Not only will the property owners enjoy a windfall from their increased property values, but they also will not be required to pay the property taxes associated with the Glendale Unified bond debt that we all voted for. Their burden will be unfairly shifted to us, the remaining Glendale Unified residents. This transfer will undoubtedly cause our property taxes to increase.

I also oppose the Territory Transfer because there has been no demonstrated academic need for this to occur. I personally know many people who have been through the Glendale Unified School District and have come out very successful. The Glendale Unified School District does a terrific job of preparing students for college, for the military, and for other fields and careers. The Glendale Unified School District exemplifies excellence.

Further, it is also known that if the transfer takes place, the Glendale Unified School District and its residents will be left to pick up the costs of the transfer. This would be inherently unfair since it is not Glendale or its residents who initiated or supported this transfer. For this reason, and all of the above, I oppose this transfer.

Keep GUSD whole!

Sincerely,

Kalpana David
Members of Los Angeles County
Committee on School District Organization
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242-2890
Crafton.Keith@lacoe.edu

28th Jan, 2019

Dear County Committee Members,

I am a resident of the City of Glendale, and I am submitting formal comments in opposition to the proposed transfer of the Territory from Glendale Unified School District to the La Canada Unified School District.

I oppose the Territory Transfer because it is clear that the primary motivation behind the transfer is money. There is a lot of information out there about how the property owners in La Canada will benefit the most from this transfer because their property values are going to skyrocket. Who wouldn’t sign a petition for that type of windfall?

Not only will the property owners enjoy a windfall from their increased property values, but they also will not be required to pay the property taxes associated with the Glendale Unified bond debt that we all voted for. Their burden will be unfairly shifted to us, the remaining Glendale Unified residents. This transfer will undoubtedly cause our property taxes to increase.

I also oppose the Territory Transfer because there has been no demonstrated academic need for this to occur. I personally know many people who have been through the Glendale Unified School District and have come out very successful. The Glendale Unified School District does a terrific job of preparing students for college, for the military, and for other fields and careers. The Glendale Unified School District exemplifies excellence.

Further, it is also known that if the transfer takes place, the Glendale Unified School District and its residents will be left to pick up the costs of the transfer. This would be inherently unfair since it is not Glendale or its residents who initiated or supported this transfer. For this reason, and all of the above, I oppose this transfer.

Keep GUSD whole!

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]
Members of Los Angeles County
Committee on School District Organization
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242-2890
Crafton.Keith@lacoe.edu

23rd Jan, 2019

Dear County Committee Members,

We are aware of the Committee’s preliminary decision to remove children from their local schools and transfer them across town to an LCF school. A decision that appears to be made at the request of a very small group of individuals, most of whom don’t even have children that attend the local schools in the immediate area being impacted.

To be crystal clear, if we had wanted to send our children to a school out of the area, we would simply have applied for enrollment to a different school. As residents, we chose where we live and hopefully where our children could attend a school close by. Now that choice has been ripped from us with what appears to be no consideration of the effect on and disruption to our daily lives. We are certain you are aware that coordinating school attendance, afterschool activities and other events, along with work schedules can be difficult under the best of circumstances. Now it’s more of a nightmare.

The biggest burden will be on the young teens from our area, who will need to get up even earlier to travel to the Middle and High Schools. Was the debate over school start times and their impact on school performance, depression, physical health, and the like, even addressed? The CDC, American Academy of Pediatrics and American Academy of Sleep Medicine have all weighed in on the topic, so do you expect our children to be the LCF experimental subjects?

Please don’t forget the cost of the new $149 million LCF bond measure to pay for all the upgrades of the schools our children will be forced to go to. The schools aren’t even ready to properly take care of their current student population and will be further burdened by the influx of even more students. Among those new students are a significant number of minority children who will no longer have the available ESL dual language programs provided under the Glendale Unified schools. Across the board the change in schools does far more harm than good for the students being relocated. Where is the fair treatment for the students impacted in all of this?

You have placed the burden on the wrong individuals. The people that live in the Territory knew the identity of the schools when they chose to move there. If they are no longer happy with the situation, then they should move --- not our children.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Date]
Sagebrush transfer decision postponed until May

By Andrew J. Campa
La Cañada Valley Sun
Mar 07, 2019

Some Mountain Avenue Elementary School students may switch districts if the Sagebrush transfer is approved. (Raul Roa / Staff Photographer)

A decision on the potential territory transfer of the 380-acre Sagebrush area of La Cañada Flintridge from the Glendale public school system to La Cañada Unified will be postponed another two months.

Officials with both school districts requested the delay during Wednesday morning’s meeting of the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization and was approved on a 5-1 vote.

Glendale asked for a one-month postponement so its interim superintendent, Kelly King, can become more familiar with the matter.

King took over her current post after Glendale Unified’s board voted Jan. 29 to dismiss Winfred B. Roberson Jr. from the superintendent’s position.

La Cañada petitioners asked the committee to hold off from making any decision during its April 3 meeting because the district would be on spring break.

After hearing the requests, the committee voted to postpone any decision until a May 1 meeting.

The 56-day delay comes after committee member AJ Willmer said he suspected a decision “60 days from now” when the group reviewed a transfer California Environmental Quality Act, or CEQA, study in October.

The formal petition process began in June 2016 when the Los Angeles County Office of Education received a transfer petition from Sagebrush area property owner Tom Smith, who has since been replaced on the group of petitioners by Nick Karapetian and Nalini Lasiewicz.

The county committee gave preliminary approval to the petition in May of 2017, but only, according to committee secretary Keith Crafton, as a means to conduct a CEQA study.

As for the 66-page CEQA report, it noted a few issues should the territory transfer be approved.

One item was the matter of the many students who would be transferred from Glendale Unified’s Mountain Avenue Elementary School, Rosemont Middle School and Crescenta Valley High School to La Cañada Unified’s Palm Crest Elementary and La Cañada High.

Glendale’s interim superintendent King pointed to a potentially negative impact for some of those students.

She noted Rosemont and Crescenta Valley were honored under the 2019 California Distinguished Program on Feb. 25, La Cañada Unified had no schools lauded this year.

“Achieving this recognition with the new state accountability system is truly exceptional and was unique to Glendale Unified School District in comparison to our surrounding school districts,” King said.
The CEQA study utilized a figure of 356 students, as provided by Glendale Unified, which equals a loss of roughly $2.7 million in state funding.

La Cañada has argued the total is closer to 151 students.

“It must be said that Glendale’s assertion of $2.7 million revenue loss is grossly exaggerated since it ignores the fact that 215 territory students are already enrolled in La Cañada schools,” former La Cañada school board president Scott Tracy said on Wednesday.

A couple of committee members spoke of delays to the process, including Frank Ogaz, who indicated he may not consider “boilerplate letters” or form letters submitted that did not include names, signatures or addresses.

“You can sit down in front of a liquor store and say, ‘hey, sign this thing’ and send … a bunch of letters,” Ogaz said. “You don’t even know where they live.”

Allison Deegan, LACOE’s regionalized business services coordinator, said her staff has received “maybe hundreds of these types of letters” and has forwarded them to the committee.

Committee member Frank Bostrom said the constant influx of new material from both sides has been overwhelming.

“We’ve never received this much volume of information on any board item,” he said. “We’re all drowning.”

Bostrom added the committee couldn’t make a decision until the information spigot was turned off.

“Everybody wants to ‘hear the matter, hear the matter,’ but we can’t hear the matter because they keep submitting information,” he said. “So if you stop submitting information, we can make a decision.”

andrew.campa@latimes.com
The following memorandum with accompanying newspaper attachment was received from the Chief Petitioners on 04-15-19
Memorandum

To: Allison Deegan, Ed.D.
Regionalized Business Services Coordinator
Business Advisory Services
Los Angeles County Office of Education

From: Chief Petitioners, Nalini Lasiewicz & Nick Karapetian

Re: Response to GUSD’s Letter to County Committee – Date stamped March 6, 2019

Date: April 15, 2019

We would appreciate you forwarding this to the County Committee members for their review.

This memorandum is our response to the letter submitted to LACOE by GUSD Interim Superintendent Dr. Kelly King.

As Chief Petitioners and volunteers with the community group known as UniteLCFI, we want to address Dr. King’s accusatory and inaccurate assertions made in her 12-page document included in the April 2019 County Committee meeting packet. It is vitally important that the Committee have unbiased facts, and not rhetoric, in conducting their review and making a decision on the merits of our Petition for a Territory Transfer.

In her letter, Dr. King criticizes our efforts to educate the Territory residents about the transfer permit process during the brief period LCUSD establishes for permit applications each year. She has labeled our informational community outreach as “efforts to improperly skew Territory Transfer impacts to GUSD” and characterizes our efforts as “a multi-year campaign to aggressively get parents to transfer their children to LCUSD.” These criticisms are unfounded and a mischaracterization of the facts.

The genesis of the expanding parental awareness of the permit transfer process began in 2014 when a number of notable events occurred.

1. The first occurred on March 25, 2014, when GUSD and LCUSD hosted a community forum to make public the terms of a negotiated student transfer framework that had been formulated by the two districts and which included a six-year phased-in transfer of students as preferred by both districts.

2. A second highly-impactful event occurred on May 20, 2014 when GUSD gave its "blessing" for students to transfer to LCUSD which prompted parents to do so. At that time, GUSD then-Board President Mary Boger openly declared during a GUSD Board meeting:

“The Glendale Unified School District has already made the offer behind which I feel sure this board is prepared to stand – if you live in the La Cañada area of Sagebrush, you may enroll your children in the La Cañada Unified School District. You need not even ask for an exit permit. Go with our blessings, go.” *(1)*

GUSD Board President Mary Boger, May 20, 2014
3. A third occurred on November 4, 2014 when the GUSD Board unanimously approved [4-0, with one abstention] a resolution to authorize its staff to finalize an agreement to transfer the Territory to LCUSD subject only to a number of parameters including a student phase-in, certain monetary terms and final Board approval. The envisioned "student phase-in" was similar to what has been occurring organically during the past several years.

Over time, UniteLCF! became recognized as the spearhead for the transfer petition so it was natural for parents to reach out to us for information/status on the petition and the permit process. We provide this information via a variety of communication tools including e-mail updates, a website, flyers and neighborhood forums. We also publish contact information and links to both district websites and encourage parents to utilize those resources as well.

We do not encourage parents to transfer their children to LCUSD but provide information that allows them to make a more-informed decision on whether they choose to. You can review the information we provide at [https://tinyurl.com/y37g2mwy](https://tinyurl.com/y37g2mwy)

For reference, attached is an article which appeared in the local La Cañada Outlook newspaper which provided similar information to our community.

We take issue with the biased accusations that Dr. King noted in her letter and we will continue to exercise our legitimate right to petition for a school district boundary change.

We are happy to answer any questions that you or Committee members may have on this matter.

Chief Petitioners

Nalini Lasiewicz & Nick Karapetian

---

(1) GUSD May 20, 2014 Board Meeting Video Archives; Glendale Unified La Cañada Unified Potential Territory Transfer; 2:59:55; GUSD Board President Mary Boger's Remarks

(2) GUSD Board Meeting, November 4, 2014; Action Report No. 1; Authorize GUSD Administration to Finalize a Territory Transfer Agreement with La Cañada Unified School District and Return for Final Board Approval
LCUSD Taking Sagebrush Transfer Applications

La Cañada Unified School District will be considering interdistrict permits for the 2018-19 school year for residents of La Cañada Flintridge whose school district of residence is Glendale Unified School District — those in the area known as Sagebrush.

Submission requirements for transfer include the following:
1. Filled-out application
2. A copy of your student’s most recent report card/transcript
3. Proof of residency, including a grant deed, Los Angeles County property tax statement showing fiscal year and location of property, or a fully executed rental/lease agreement along with at least three additional documents produced within the prior 30 days: a Southern California Gas bill; Southern California Edison bill; trash company bill; water company bill; Internet or cable company bill; current bank or credit card statement with current imprinted name and address (figures may be blocked out); or voter registration.

Upon approval of the LCUSD permit, parents will be required to obtain a release from GUSD and proof of residency. Students will be considered for placement only if there is room within their grade level after registration of students who are residents of LCUSD.

Parents are reminded that the district reserves the right to rescind permits at any time for unacceptable behavior or irregular attendance. Permits may be revoked or canceled during the school year if false information is used as a basis for securing a permit or if the parent fails to report to the district circumstances that might affect the child’s continued eligibility to attend under the permit.

Permits will be accepted through Friday, April 26, without exception, at the LCUSD offices located at 4490 Cornishon Ave. All required supporting documents need to be submitted with the permit at the time of submission. Applications will be put into a lottery to be ranked in accordance with priorities established in the District Policies and Administrative Regulations.

Those priority categories are as follows:
1. Full-time LCUSD employees
2. Siblings of continuing permit students already enrolled in LCUSD
3. Students of part-time LCUSD employees
4. Sagebrush families
5. Students whose parents physically work full-time within the LCUSD school boundaries

An email regarding your student’s ranking will be sent to you Friday, June 7. This is a ranking only and not a guarantee of enrollment. LCUSD cannot predict, based on the ranking, how many students we will accept. All residents of LCUSD get priority for placement.

LCUSD will begin placing students based on space availability at each grade level and does not create additional classrooms based on permits, only residents. You could be notified as late as Aug. 2 of acceptance. Please do not make multiple calls to the district office or call the school, as this will only slow the process. Once you receive approval of your permit, you can proceed with the enrollment process.

More information on the Sagebrush process can be found on the district website, LCUSD.net.
Petition to transfer territory from Glendale USD to La Canada USD

The following memorandum was received from the Chief Petitioners on
04-22-19
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 Petitioners, Nalini Lasiewicz & Nick Karapetian

Re: Petitioners’ Election Area Recommendation

Date: April 22, 2019

Dear Allison,

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

Should there be a favorable ruling to approve the GUSD/LCUSD Territory transfer, Petitioners believe that Staff should recommend and the Committee should follow the legal precedent known as the LAFCO decision (Local Agency Formation Commission) This precedent is consistent with the Committee’s decision regarding the “Wiseburn” transfer petition and CDE’s history of recommending to SBE that it follow the LAFCO decision on appeals. **LAFCO holds that elections may be confined to within the boundaries of the territory proposed for transfer (the “default” area) provided there is a rational basis for doing so.**

The Territory represents less than 2% of GUSD by all measures and the residents of the City of Glendale will be largely unaffected by the proposed Transfer. Therefore, GUSD residents do not have a greater than incidental interest in the Transfer. Any impact to GUSD remaining taxpayers or to its bonding capacity would be insignificant as evidenced by 1) its highly successful $50+ million bond sale in September 2018 and upgraded credit rating that included a “Stable Outlook”, and 2) a 24% increase in its tax base since 2014-2015 due largely to the City of Glendale’s massive and continuing commercial and residential development. In fact, last year alone GUSD’s tax base grew by more than 2.5 times the total assessed value of the entire Territory.

In several recent appeals (2016–2018), CDE demonstrates a preference for limiting the election area to the proposed transfer area, when no genuinely different interests exist between the affected areas, as is the case here.² In fact, our Petition was crafted to make the Transfer smoother and less disruptive by specifically excluding any property or school facilities.

---


Also, Chief Petitioner Appeal from an Action of the San Mateo County Committee on School District Organization to Disapprove a Petition to Transfer Territory from the Ravenswood City Elementary School District to the Menlo Park City Elementary School District in San Mateo County; California State Board of Education, September 2018 Agenda, Item #04, §8.2 Area of Election Principles, pp 29-30 of 31; [https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ap/yr18/agenda201809.asp](https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ap/yr18/agenda201809.asp).
Furthermore, CDE has opined that “[a] reduced voting area has a fair relationship to a legitimate public purpose.” These individuals have a greater than incidental interest in the well-being, safety and education of their children, enhanced social and community capital and in strengthening overall community cohesion in their hometown, which would inure to the best interests and educational experience of their children. Plus, only Territory residents would incur significantly higher taxes related to an approved transfer as they would assume the same $450 parcel tax currently paid by LCUSD taxpayers. GUSD does not have a parcel tax and following a transfer, at today’s tax rate, the annual increase to the average GUSD homeowner would be $4.00–$5.00......hardly a significant impact.

Importantly, GUSD will retain its existing responsibility and authority for the communities that comprise 99% of its existing enrollment and its population served. This will result in little or no impact on residents within GUSD after the transfer. Both the city of Glendale and the unincorporated Crescenta Valley communities (La Crescenta and Montrose) will remain undivided and fully intact, since the Territory is part of neither.

Since the transfer would not significantly affect voters outside the Territory and no discrimination, segregation or racial impacts have been identified, similar to the Wiseburn decision, Petitioners respectfully request that Staff recommend to the Committee and that the Committee establish the Territory as the election area.

Thank you,

Nalini Lasiewicz & Nick Karapetian
La Cañada Flintridge
Chief Petitioners
Petition to transfer territory from Glendale USD to La Canada USD

The following are correspondence received from residents between 03-21-19 and 04-23-19
-----Original Message-----
From: CeCe <cece.chin@earthlink.net>
Sent: Friday, April 5, 2019 11:51 PM
To: Deegan_Allison <Deegan_Allison@lacoe.edu>
Subject: SUPPORT for GUSD/LCUSD Territory Transfer

Dear Ms. Deegan,

I am a strong supporter of the GUSD/LCUSD Territory Transfer. As a mother of 3 young children, my responsibility to them is to provide the best formal and informal education possible within my means. I believe that La Canada schools are well equipped to provide the formal part and just being a member of the school-community will provide the informal part. It warms my heart to think that my children will be able to grow up with other neighborhood children all the way up to high school. I genuinely hope that you will support this transfer. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dr. CeCe Chin
Dear Ms. Deegan and other Business Advisory Services & Los Angeles Country Office of Education members,

As a longtime resident of the Sagebrush Territory of La Canada Flintridge, I support and am in favor of the Sagebrush Territory Transfer for the reasons stated in the Petition for a Territory Transfer.

The ultimate and foremost determining factor regarding this matter must be, what is in the best interest of the student's education, growth and development. Everything else is secondary, and to that end, the evidence is clear and undisputable. Smaller class sizes and a lower student to teacher ratio are paramount in providing the absolutely necessary and critical interaction, guidance and mentoring for the best student development and growth opportunity. There exists significant supporting research and information on this matter, and I have included below only a very small portion of it for your review, reference and consideration.

The bottom line, please imagine and place yourselves as residents of the sagebrush community with one or more school age children; Then ask yourself, where would you wish your own child/children to go to attend school, LCUSD or GUSD? The answer is glaringly clear and why you must, in the best interest of the students, to move forward and approve the Sagebrush Territory Transfer and UniteLCFI

Thank You

Learning and Instruction. An observational study involving nearly 700 students in 49 schools finds that in both the early and later grades, smaller classes leads to students receiving more individual attention from their teachers and having more positive interactions with them. Classroom engagement decreases in larger classes, and this is particularly marked for struggling students at the secondary level. Students are engaged in active interactions with their teachers two to three times more often in a class of 15 compared to class of 30, and for low achievers at secondary level there is more than twice as much off task behavior in classes of 30 compared to 15.

California Teachers Association. “An ongoing evaluation of the Quality Education Investment Act (QEIA) .... This report includes a comparative analysis of Academic Performance Index data for QEIA schools and non-QEIA schools as well as findings from an action research project in 22 QEIA schools statewide... most common goal noted by schools was class size reduction: at least one interviewee at all but one of the regular program schools cited class size reduction as a key goal of QEIA at their school...higher API growth schools cited class size reduction as one of the key factors that contributed to changes in teaching practices at their schools...spend more time with the “neediest, at-risk" students, differentiate instruction, and spend less time on classroom management issue.”
American Journal of Education. *Multilevel analysis of National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) mathematics data for over 270,000 fourth and eighth graders in over 10,000 schools finds that smaller class size is significantly correlated with higher achievement.*

NCES 303, by Donald McLaughlin and Gili Drori. Project Officer: Michael Ross. Washington DC. The most authoritative study showing the importance of class size is in all grades, analyzing the achievement levels of students in 2,561 schools, as measured by performance on the NAEP (national) exams. After controlling for student background, the only objective factor found to be positively correlated with student performance was class size, not school size, not teacher qualifications, nor any other variable that the researchers could identify.

Los Angeles Unified School District, Publication No. 120. “*The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of class size reduction (CSR) on achievement among 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students with different numbers of years of participation in CSR.... We believe that CSR will help to increase student achievement.*

Public Agenda. Superintendents and Principals Talk About What’s Needed to Fix Schools.
“Superintendents and Principals agree that reducing class size would significantly improve quality of teaching, with principals saying it would be the best way (at 36%), over higher salaries (35%) or merit pay (25%).”
Center for Public Education, overwhelmingly indicate that a low student-to-teacher ratio can increase student achievement, enhance a child’s test scores and provide lasting academic benefits. The Center for Public Education states that classes of no more than 15 to 18 students seem to provide students with the best benefits in terms of achievement in reading and math.

Individualized Attention
Of course, the primary reason behind these benefits seems to be that teachers who have fewer students are able to provide each student with more individual attention. Fewer students means that teachers have more manageable workloads and more time to work one-on-one with students; they can engage them more, try out different activities and lessons that might not be feasible in a larger class size, and, because they have fewer students to monitor, they tend to spend less time on classroom management issues, such as discipline.

Student Accountability
A lower student-to-teacher can also encourage greater participation in class. In a class of 30-plus students, it is easier for a shy or unprepared student to "hide." Conversely, in a class of 15 students, students may feel more accountable or more comfortable participating in class discussions -- and this greater degree of accountability can certainly lead to better grades and higher achievement.

Respectfully yours,

Rick Fry
Supply Chain
Transportation and Quality Manager

XPO Logistics
9400 Santa Fe Springs Road
Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670 USA
O: +1 562-324-2300 M: +1 562-237-1061
From: Cindy Bengtson Budzyn <cleighbb@gmail.com>  
Sent: Saturday, April 6, 2019 8:47 PM  
To: Deegan_Allison <Deegan_Allison@lacoe.edu>  
Cc: nick@attorney-network.com; nalini@lasiewicz.com  
Subject: SUPPORT for GUSD/LCUSD Territory Transfer

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

Dear Ms. Deegan,

I was one of the leaders of the 1998 effort to unite with our city of La Canada. My reasons for supporting the transfer of property to LCUSD have not changed in 20 years.

We chose to move from the Westside of LA to La Canada to live in a small town environment convenient to DTLA where we both worked. We were not thinking about children so school boundaries were not an issue for us. But we quickly learned in a small town, city and school go hand in hand. We soon learned we did not have a "home" town after all. We are not connected to the large city of Glendale and we were totally out of sync with La Canada as eligibility for community events, sporting leagues, Scouts and more were based upon school district residency. And as a result, the social community was also connected by not just similar small town values but school identification and activities. This is logical and understandable.

We truly live in "no man's land". Much has changed since 1998 as we intentionally ran candidates for City Council and city commissions to make the city, literally, aware we were part of La Canada. Many people thought we were part of La Crescenta or Glendale, not La Canada. But, despite our progress on these fronts, we are still the "guest" invited to dinner, not part of the family.

Once we had our first child, we tried Mountain Avenue for one year. The toxic environment created by GUSD's propaganda make it too difficult for me as a leader in the transfer movement to have my child remain so we move to private, faith based schools where we remained through high school. As you no doubt know from the state attorney records, the families who lead the transfer effort in the early 90's had all their children mandatorily transferred out of GUSD to LCUSD due to how their children were treated by staff and parents at Mountain Avenue back then. I was not going to let that happen to my daughter.

When I first got involved with this effort, I thought everyone would have the children and families' interests at heart. I was shocked by what I was told in private meetings
with GUSD leaders about never letting go of the money. I have immense gratitude and respect for the group of individuals leading the effort now. My heart aches to see the same tactics used against them as were used against both prior efforts. I hope the County will see the realities of the transfer effort and not be "confused" by the continued GUSD efforts to twist the narrative and the facts.

It has been incredibly hard for a band of parents to fight the GUSD powerhouse. I ask you to logically look at the families' arguments; objectively and thoroughly look at the claims made by GUSD about the loss of students, school closures and severe financial losses; and professionally evaluate the financial proposal from LCUSD to compensate GUSD for any actual financial loss.

Thank you for considering my point of view.

Cynthia Bengtson Budzyn
2250 Richey Drive
La Canada Flintridge, CA 91011
C: 818-606-5809
From: Jaimie Yun <jaimieyun@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Sunday, April 7, 2019 5:53 PM  
To: Deegan_Allison <Deegan_Allison@lacoe.edu>  
Cc: nalini@lasiewicz.com; nick@attorney-network.com  
Subject: SUPPORT for GUSD/LCUSD Territory Transfer

Dear Ms. Deegan:

I'm writing to you to express my support for the Sagebrush territory transfer from GUSD to LCUSD. As a Sagebrush resident, our kids have been attending LCUSD schools (LCE and LCHS) for almost 3 years now through applying for a permit each year. The impact of attending LCUSD schools on our lives have exceeded all expectations. My kids are extremely happy to be in the same school and classes as their friends in our community and nearby neighborhoods as well as various community programs (e.g. YMCA, team sports). Our involvement and sense of belonging to the community have all been solidified because of this. We no longer feel like people "in limbo" in our community. Even the simple change in driving direction for our commute to school has impacted where we run our errands, therefore enabling us to frequent our local community stores, small businesses, and even the library and post office all the more - locations and businesses in our own city of La Canada versus La Crescenta or Glendale as before. The administration, staff, teachers, parents, and student body of LCUSD are some of the most caring and dedicated educators and community supporters I have ever met. I think all Sagebrush residents should have access to this excellence that is part of LCUSD without having to apply for (and renew on an annual basis) a special permit process. Therefore, I urge you to approve the transfer of Sagebrush to LCUSD.

Thank you for your time in consideration of my letter to you.

Sincerely,
Jaimie Yun
2137 Cross St.
La Canada, CA 91011
Dear Members of the Committee:

I am writing to express my strong support for the territory transfer of the Sagebrush area from the GUSD to the LCUSD.

I am a Sagebrush parent with 2 kids attending LCUSD in grades 6 and 9. Over the last 4 years, I spent a great deal of time volunteering at various capacities in LCUSD. While most LCUSD staff are excellent in including every family in their constituency, there are occasions when I am unable to participate as I would like.

The Sagebrush area demographics and socioeconomic base are somewhat different than the rest of the La Canada Flintridge. Formal representation of Sagebrush area in the Local Education Agency (LEA), i.e. the governing board of LCUSD, is not currently possible despite the large number of students (I'm told more than 200) attending LCUSD. Sagebrush residents are not eligible to participate in LEA elections as they are not formally residents within LCUSD.

This situation frequently leads to under-representation in key critical educational issues that are left to the LEA by law. Furthermore, Sagebrush families with LCUSD students cannot participate actively in the GUSD. Thus, the Sagebrush permit mechanism comes with a cost of accepting limited representation in either LEA.

I would like to ask the committee to consider this delicate matter and its impact on Sagebrush residents in forming your final decision about the territory transfer; hopefully in approving it.

Thank you,

Alphan Altinok, Ph.D.
Machine Learning and Instrument Autonomy
NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology
MS: 158-242
4800 Oak Grove Dr. Pasadena, CA 91109
(626) 716 2867
From: itsawrapclothing@aol.com <itsawrapclothing@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, April 8, 2019 9:53 AM
To: Deegan_Allison <Deegan_Allison@lacoe.edu>
Cc: nick@attorney-network.com; nalini@lasiewicz.com
Subject: SUPPORT for GUSD/LCUSD Territory Transfer

Dear Ms. Deegan,

Thank you for taking the time out of your busy schedule to read my email. As a parent of 3 children enrolled in La Canada schools and a homeowner of the Sagebrush territory, I cannot tell you how important this decision to support the territory transfer is for the well being of our children.

My 3 daughters have THRIVED since attending schools in our neighborhood of La Canada. All 3 have improved their grades, and they are more involved in the community. Because they are going to school in La Canada, they feel a sense of connection that they did not feel when forced to go to a school in another school district. My oldest daughter was even bullied by girls in her class while attending Mountain Avenue, making specific comments that she was from “La Canada” and not from the area.

I ask that you please support the transfer. If you have any questions or would like more information about our positive experience since our move to La Canada schools, please feel free to call me at (818) 395-7909.

Thank you,

Tiara Nappi
From: Ellwood, Martin <Martin.Ellwood@wsp.com>
Sent: Monday, April 8, 2019 12:53 PM
To: Deegan_Allison <Deegan_Allison@lacoe.edu>
Cc: nick@attorney-network.com; nalini@lasiewicz.com; Tarlan Ellwood <tarlanellwood@gmail.com>
Subject: SUPPORT for GUSD/LCUSD Territory Transfer

Dear Allison

We are Sagebrush residents who have children aged 5 and 3. Our eldest will be eligible to start school this year and as part of the La Canada-Flintridge community we sincerely hope that she will be accepted into the LCF school system, and preferably into the school closest to us. The process for us Sagebrush residents is stressful since we are not guaranteed a place in the school. Since myself and my wife both work full time, we need to arrange other out of school activities but this is difficult when we don’t find out until the summer whether we are accepted or not.

We very much hope the transfer of the Sagebrush district into the LCF School system can be finalized soon so that ourselves and other families in our position can have peace of mind when applying for their children’s school. We love our community and feel a close and important association with La Canada-Flintridge. We attend many events in the neighborhood and our children attend the La Canada-Flintridge Montessori school. The children and ourselves have formed close relationships with many other families in the neighborhood and we hope our kids can attend the same schools together.

We thank you for your attention to this matter and look forward to seeing progression towards the territory transfer soon.

Best Regards

Martin Ellwood, PE, CEng
Assistant Vice President

777 South Figueroa Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, California CA 90017
213 312 3245 (office)
Martin.ellwood@wsp.com

e-mail: Deegan_Allison@lacoe.edu
cc: (Chief Petitioners) nick@attorney-network.com; nalini@lasiewicz.com
Dr. Ms. Deegan,

I am in strong support of the territory transfer. After nearly 6 years of petitions, studies and waiting, I hope that this decision will come to a positive conclusion soon.

I feel strongly that the children of Sagebrush La Canada will be better served in the long run by being part of the La Canada school district. Many of the children impacted have already transferred to the La Canada school district. It makes sense now to put the official seal on what is already occurring rather than keeping our children's future in a state of uncertainty.

Best regards,

David Ting
Sagebrush Homeowner
Hello,

I invite you to please consider the passionate side to our story, which in this case I believe is just as pertinent (albeit a bit harder to convey and thus understand) as the facts and figures.

My three children attend school in LCUSD and have been thriving since we made the switch to the La Canada district. However, my family, as well as many others in the Sagebrush area, remain on the periphery of our own town. As the only residents in La Canada who require permits to attend La Canada schools, it is quite impossible to gain a true sense of belonging - we need to renew our permits each year, we are continually nervous they could be revoked at some point, we are not allowed to vote for school board members, we feel compelled to repeatedly explaining why we “are technically assigned to GUSD but live in La Canada”, etc.

The fact is if this transfer is not approved, it will be heartbreaking for us - our town will remain fractured and we shall remain tangential citizens of it. Plus, inevitably, within a year, two years, or even ten years from now, the issue will resurface and be fought for yet again.

If it is approved, however, GUSD will grumble about the money for a bit, it will be figured out, the dust will settle. It will be the new normal and GUSD will be fine and will move on.

Arbitrary lines were drawn half a century ago. You have the chance to finally make it right and let us be fully and legitimately part of our neighborhood.

Year after year studies prove that the happiest people in the world feel a strong sense of identity and community spirit. It makes sense that people yearn for this kinship.

Please vote YES on the transfer. It’s a vote for happiness. :)

Thank you!

Stephanie Hosford
April 11, 2019

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

Subject: SUPPORT for GUSD/LCUSD Territory Transfer

Dear Allison;

I'm writing in support of the "Sagebrush" transfer from Glendale Unified School District (GUSD) to La Cañada Unified School District (LCUSD) on behalf of Sophia (age 3 ½) and Briana (age 1 ½). As their father, I'm tasked with looking out for their well-being now and into the future.

Today, my daughters attend a private pre-K here in La Cañada. They enjoy school and especially the time spent with friends they've made there. Many of our weekends are spent at their classmate's birthday parties. That sense of community, belonging, confidence, and fellowship are so important to a developing child; today more than ever it seems.

Almost all of their classmates are non-Sagebrush residents, and as such, most have a "right" or are guaranteed a place at the nearby LCUSD school; a guarantee my two daughters don't have. Yes, I could petition the district each year to get them admitted along with their friends at LCUSD; but it's no guarantee. I realize that a supermajority of Sagebrush children already attend LCUSD schools and some would argue that the Sagebrush transfer is a mere formality. But, how do I guard against the possibility, however remote, of having to explain to my daughters that they aren't able to go to a LCUSD school because their permit wasn't granted or it's been revoked?

Parental involvement and commitment are vitally important to our local schools. How, if our daughters are permitted to attend LCUSD schools, do my wife and I give our time and commit ourselves completely to their school when it can be gone in an instant if the permit isn't granted? This sort of uncertainty is the last thing any family needs when trying to create a stable, safe, and nurturing community.

One thing I can do is appeal to the good nature of people like you, Allison. My plea is this; please allow the Sagebrush transfer to occur and give the "right" to my daughters, Sophia and Briana, to attend LCUSD schools.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely,

Lars Bergmann
2237 San Gorgonio Rd.
La Cañada, CA 91011
Dear Ms. Deegan

I am writing this letter as support for the GUSD/LCUSD Territory Transfer that is petitioned and under consideration. As a parent in the community I am very concerned with this topic and the risks it poses on our community.

The current configuration where sagebrush area is under Glendale school district is quite antiquated and does not fit the current community structure and involvement. There are so many community activities divided along city lines where the kids participate together but for school they are divided differently. This segregation and division has a great impact. From our perspective as adults and parents, it appears benign because our boundaries socially are must fuzzier. But for children this is the only concern, socially with friends and classmates in school and after school. There are several others in the community who have older children who suffered through this real impactful division.

In addition, there are tangible safety issues with the elementary school and the access roads. This also appears antiquated and unsafe. In emergencies, which this area experiences, the access is dependent on a single point foot bridge. This poses a tremendous risk to the children and the parents in a crowded school.

The unification of sagebrush with La Canada school district will alleviate these concern plus many others, with benefits for both GUSD and LCUSD. I urge you to approve the transfer.

Sincerely,
Magdy Bareh

cc: (Chief Petitioners)
From: Eric Horne <ekhorne@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 12, 2019 6:38 AM
To: Deegan_Allison <Deegan_Allison@lacoe.edu>
Cc: nick@attorney-network.com; nalini@lasiewicz.com
Subject: SUPPORT for GUSD/LCUSD Territory Transfer

Allison,

I am writing you to express my full support for the territory transfer. We live in the Sagebrush (La Canada) area. Both of my children have transferred into La Canada Elementary from the Glendale district. This transfer has been a positive experience and made us realize that we are happier being included in a part of the community we live in. We purchased our house 14 years ago and didn't realize this would be such a big problem for my kids and our Sagebrush community. I also didn't realize that the Sagebrush territory has been working to resolve this problem for generations. We are the third generation that has lived in my house that has pushed for a Sagebrush territory transfer. Please help us settle this once and for all so future generations don't have to continue this fight. There is clear evidence from the survey that Sagebrush residents are overwhelmingly in favor of the Territory transfer, please listen to the voices of the residents. Also, a large portion of students have already made the transfer to La Canada and the local Glendale schools continue to be overcrowded. Glendale does not have the best interest of our community in mind. Thank you for taking time to read this email and looking into the final territory transfer.

Eric Horne
2261 Laughlin Street.
La Canada Ca 91011

From: Eric Horne <ekhorne@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 12, 2019 6:33 AM
To: Deegan_Allison <Deegan_Allison@lacoe.edu>
Subject: SUPPORT for GUSD/LCUSD Territory Transfer

Allison,

I am writing you to express my full support for the territory transfer. We live in the Sagebrush (La Canada) area. Both of my children have transferred into La Canada Elementary from the Glendale district. This transfer has been a positive experience and made us realize that we are happier being included in a part of the community we live in. We purchased our house 15 years ago and didn't realize this would be such a big problem for my kids and our Sagebrush community. I also didn't realize that the Sagebrush territory has been working to resolve this problem for generations. We are the third generation that has lived in my house that has pushed for a Sagebrush territory transfer. Please help us settle this once and for all so future generations don't have to continue this fight. There is clear evidence from the survey that Sagebrush residents are overwhelmingly in favor of the Territory transfer, please listen to the voices of the residents. Also, a large portion of students have already made the transfer to La Canada and the local Glendale schools continue to be overcrowded. Glendale does not have the best interest of our community in mind. Thank you for taking time to read this email and looking into the final territory transfer.

Eric Horne
2261 Laughlin Street.
La Canada Ca 91011
April 12, 2019

Dear Dr. Deegan,

I am writing to you to express support for the Sagebrush area territory transfer from Glendale Unified School District (GUSD) to La Cañada Unified School District (LCUSD). As a resident and parent of a young child in the Sagebrush area of La Cañada, I feel that this is of great importance, not only for the educational experience, but also for the community and social experiences within our small city of La Cañada.

Although GUSD has stated that they already provide transfer releases for those accepted into LCUSD, there is no guarantee that this will continue indefinitely. This is the year-to-year uncertainty that we hope to end and to ensure the stability of our child’s educational and social stability throughout her primary and secondary school years.

I urge you to please support the transfer of the Sagebrush area to La Cañada Unified School District. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Andy Wong, MD
Dear Dr. Deegan,

My husband, preschool daughter, and I moved to La Canada Flintridge 2 years ago from the Hollywood area.

We chose La Canada for its tight-knit small-town, children-oriented community, which was missing in Hollywood and we felt was necessary for our young daughter.

We also chose La Canada for its first-rate school district with its smaller class size and more counselors. We entered escrow on our home in Sagebrush precisely because the major newspapers and sellers' agent commented at the time in summer 2017 that the County Committee had given preliminary approval to the Petition for the Sagebrush Territory Transfer from GUSD to LCUSD. Those were the very words reported in May 2017.

Ever since we've moved to our new hometown of La Canada, we've identified strongly with the La Canada community. Our daughter attends La Canada Preschool. We do most of our shopping, eating, errands, hiking, and other daily activities in La Canada. It is the businesses in La Canada which we primarily support. We also support and attend the La Canada neighborhood events in Memorial Park, the La Canada Gelson's seasonal children's events, the La Canada Public Library's community events, the weekly La Canada Farmers Market, and La Canada Presbyterian Church.

Given our strongly-felt DNA as La Canada Flintridge residents and civic participants, we urge the County Committee to vote YES on the Sagebrush Transfer because it will cement our family's sense of community which is pivotal to our daughter's emerging sense of identity.

Equally important is the sense of stability we and our daughter need re: where she's going to school the following year. The current permit process disrupts our school planning because we may not find out until August whether our daughter's transfer permit to LCUSD for September has been granted. As a result we cannot plan her after-school activities, certain playgroups, and other educational extracurriculars with reasonable certainty.

Please unite the La Canada Flintridge community and help its youngest Sagebrush residents preserve their sense of civic identity, feeling of belonging, tight network of friendships, and stability in their educational planning.

Very truly yours,

Catherine Chang, Esq.

Email: Vermeeress@Gmail.com
Mobile: 213.308.0428
4816 Castle Rd.
La Canada Flintridge, CA. 91011
Good day Allison Deegan, Ed.D.,

My name is Jay Janho Kim. I have been living in the sagebrush area since 2012. My address is 2260 Los Amigos Street, La Canada, CA 91011.

I moved here from S.Korea for my job back in 2007 and happened to get a US citizenship and I have two boys here. Old one attends Palm crest and younger one is just 3 years old now.

Here I am writing to give my support for the territory transfer. When I bought my home here, my wife and I had only first son who wasn't attending a school yet and didn't think about school territory and were not familiar with the territory issue and it wasn't a deal breaker.

When my first son was about to start his school, we realized that we had to send him to Glendale School district which didn't make sense to me, especially as one who used to live in a different country.

At any rate we were able to send him to Palm crest. Now the boy is in 3rd grade. For the past 3~4 years, I feel uncomfortable since we had to ask for permission for my boy to go to school in his city where we live......as if we weren't supposed to send kids to a LCUSD school district.

However, we live in La Canada area and I had no idea what the back ground of sagebrush was. This is just confusing to anyone who didn't have enough knowledge regarding the sagebrush area.

I am planning to move to another area since I am uncomfortable to deal with the fact that I have to explain the area issue so my sons don't need to feel awkward.

We should correct it to right way. Please consider this seriously.

Best,
Jay Kim
Hello Allison,

As a homeowner in Sagebrush since 2000 I strongly endorse the permanent transfer of the Sagebrush Territory into LCUSD. Schools have the biggest influence on unifying a community, not only for its students but also their families as a whole. More than any other resource families are engaged with their communities through its schools. Sagebrush families overwhelmingly (90% per Glendale Unified School District own survey) want to be able to go in La Canada schools. Smaller classes, no split classes and higher faculty to student ratio are all valid reasons for the desired move.

After so many years we want this resolved. It's not right we must petition on an individual student basis and be subject to Glendale Unified's approval. As shown in the past, Glendale Unified can choose to no longer allow transfers and then it's completely out of our hands. Sagebrush students make up only 1% - 2% of Glendale Unified School District’s total enrollment so the impact on Glendale Unified is very minimal if at all.

As La Canada residents, Sagebrush families want to participate in and contribute to all that La Canada has to offer.

Sincerely,

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

April 12, 2019

Re: Support for the GUSD/LCUSD Territory Transfer Petition

Dear Allison,

I am a resident of the area of La Canada Flintridge that is currently petitioning to be transferred from the Glendale USD to the La Canada USD and I strongly support the proposed transfer for the reasons stated in the petition itself. Our community is needlessly fractured by the current district boundaries and must be united. Our students would be better served with access to our hometown schools and the City/school district alliance that is the fabric of our community.

I am also writing to address one point regarding the CEQA review that was conducted for the proposed transfer. I had the pleasure of addressing the County Committee during the public comment period regarding the CEQA review on October 3, 2018 when TAHA presented its findings to the Committee.

Unfortunately, I am unable to attend the upcoming May 1, 2019 Committee meeting where I intended to once again comment on the CEQA Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration that was prepared by the environmental consultant TAHA. I want to specifically address the one mitigation measure that the IS/MND identified regarding the possible installation of portable classrooms on two of the LCUSD campuses.

For most of my 19-year tenure with the City of Simi Valley I served as the Director of the Department of Environmental Services and am quite familiar with how the CA CEQA Guidelines treats portable classroom from an environmental clearance perspective.

When I addressed the Committee at its October 3, 2018 meeting, I mentioned that in my opinion there are typically no CEQA-related issues associated with the installation of portable classrooms. The installation of portables is a routine operational tool used by most school districts across California to manage enrollment fluctuations. This is true to the extent that such “projects” are considered to be Categorically Exempt from CEQA review with a few prescribed exceptions, none of which would seem applicable in this case.
Furthermore, special districts, which would include LCUSD, typically act as the lead agency and would file for a Categorical Exemption if and when they would need to install portable classrooms to add capacity. It is unclear at this point if LCUSD would even need additional capacity to accept the incoming student transfers should the petition be approved.

Quite simply, any CEQA review conducted beyond claiming an Categorical Exemption would lead to the same conclusion - that there would be no significant environmental impacts arising from a project to install portable classrooms on either of the two LCUSD campuses referred to in the TAHA report.

Therefore, I would ask the Committee to adopt the findings of the CEQA review performed by TAHA including the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Thank you for you time and attention to this matter.

Best regards,

[Signature]

Peter Lyons, AICP MBA
2207 Canalda Drive
La Canada Flintridge 91011
Hello Allison Deegan,

I am writing you in support of the GUSD/ LCUSD territory transfer vote on 5/1/19. Please vote to approve this transfer. Our entire family supports the territory transfer for many reasons:

- We live in the Sagebrush area of LCF and have a 5 year old daughter who will attend Kindergarten in Fall 2019 at either Palm Crest ES (via permit) or Mountain Ave.
- Sagebrush students currently are about 5% of LCUSD enrollment with no permanent rights either for parents to vote or for students to stay during transition years. GUSD can change its policy and stop all future releases and also require new releases.
- This transfer will have very little impact on GUSD. 215 Sagebrush students have already enrolled via permit in LCUSD schools. The transfer will only effect about 151 students who will permanently transfer to lcusd and any students who wish to stay in GUSD can stay if they choose.
- It will help ease over-crowding in GUSD classrooms and save GUSD money since they do not have to educate those students.
- Voting to approve the transfer will bring to a close our 5 year effort that we have supported to make LCUSD whole as a city/community and school district.

Thank you for your support.

Thomas, Roxanne & Ava Scarnecchia
5420 Ocean View Blvd.
La Canada Flintridge, CA 91011
-----Original Message-----
From: Rhoads Stephenson <rody@earthlink.net>
Sent: Saturday, April 13, 2019 9:21 PM
To: Deegan Allison <Deegan_Allison@lacoe.edu>
Subject: Sagebrush transfer to La Canada

I strongly support the transfer.

Please approve the EIR and approve the transfer on May 1.

The EIR showed a negligible impact.

I have lived in LCF 10 years on the school district side, and 29 in the Sagebrush area.

I think it is very important to have community-wide identity and cohesion.

We are also getting a lot more young families in Sagebrush, and they should have the option to go to LCF schools.

Rhoads

R. Rhoads (Rody) Stephenson
4455 Rockland Pl., Unit 10
La Canada, CA 91011
rody@earthlink.net
-----Original Message-----
From: Betina Pavri <betinapavri@icloud.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 14, 2019 2:24 PM
To: Deegan_Allison <Deegan_Allison@lacoe.edu>
Cc: nick@krpapergroup.com; nalini@lasiewicz.com; Randy Pollock <randypollock@me.com>
Subject: SUPPORT for GUSD/LCUSD Territory Transfer

Dear Dr. Deegan,

I am writing in support of the “Sagebrush” territory transfer petition.

We have lived in the Sagebrush region of western La Cañada since 1997. Both my husband and I work at NASA’s Jet Propulsion Laboratory facility on the eastern border of La Cañada. Our son is now in college, but we continue to support the petition to transfer the Sagebrush region to LCUSD on behalf of our neighbors with school-aged children.

Our understanding is the committee will be considering the nine Conditions attached below when deciding whether to approve the petition. My email addresses Condition #2: “The districts are each organized on the basis of a substantial community identity.”

Attending school (and for those who choose it, day care) with children from neighboring families is an important part of community cohesion - not only for students, but for their families as well. Currently in our neighborhood, some students attend LCUSD and some attend GUSD. Various extracurricular activities are organized along city boundaries, leading to still further division of the Sagebrush community. All of this generates a perception that our families are not part of either La Cañada or La Crescenta (the community across the arroyo to the west, in GUSD). These social considerations are important, but I also wanted to call the committee’s attention to the safety-related aspects of our situation. Our personal experience with this was the confusion about which areas were under mandatory evacuation and which were not during the Station Fire in 2009. Our area of La Cañada was under mandatory evacuation, but it was not initially covered by the La Cañada city announcements. We were returning home from travel at the time and could not locate information on the status of our neighborhood and whether it was safe to return. We eventually just drove back, only to be stopped several blocks away because our neighborhood was surrounded by fire on three sides. La Cañada eventually corrected the omission in their database, and we were able to follow status updates on our neighborhood after that. Fortunately our house survived and there were no serious consequences in our case... but what if similar confusion resulted in families not receiving an order to evacuate in the future? Given which areas were initially omitted from La Cañada’s status reports, I suspect the school district boundaries were a significant reason for the confusion among the county fire services, La Cañada, and La Crescenta/Glendale. I think this sort of mistake will be far less likely if the city and school district boundaries are aligned.

One final point: while it is not one of the official evaluation conditions, stability for students and families is an important consideration as well. I know many families are now choosing interdistrict transfers from GUSD to LCUSD. Some parties may feel that this process makes an official territory transfer unnecessary. Our experience suggests otherwise. Such transfers leave students and families in an unfortunate limbo, subject to changing school demographics and administrative policies. When it came time for our son to attend kindergarten, we evaluated both La Cañada and La Crescenta schools. We chose to request an interdistrict transfer to La Cañada based on the strength of the day care program available for working
parents. We also based our decision on the experiences of other parents; they reported that the interdistrict transfer requests were merely a formality. Our son attended LCUSD Palm Crest Elementary for kindergarten & day care and flourished there. Unfortunately, when we attempted to renew the interdistrict transfer to LCUSD the following year, we were informed that LCUSD would not be accepting any interdistrict transfer students that year. This unexpected policy change on short notice (1 week prior to the start of the school year) was tremendously disruptive to the many families affected. In our case, it left two working parents scrambling to register our son in a new school, evaluate & secure good daycare for him, and explain to a 6 year old why he would no longer be attending school or day care with any of his friends. Interdistrict transfers are only a temporary solution to this long-term issue. I respectfully request that the committee address the long-term issue once and for all and align La Cañada's school district boundaries with the city boundaries.

I very much appreciate the Committee's careful consideration of the Sagebrush transfer petition. Please feel free to contact me if you have additional questions.

Sincerely,
Betina Pavri
5452 Rock Castle Drive
La Cañada, CA 91011

> Conditions Affecting Reorganization Proposals:
> 1. The reorganized districts will be adequate in terms of number of pupils enrolled.
> 2. The districts are each organized on the basis of a substantial community identity.
> 3. The proposal will result in an equitable division of property and facilities of the original districts.
> 4. The reorganization of the district will preserve each district’s ability to educate students in an integrated environment and will not promote racial or ethnic discrimination or segregation.
> 5. Any increase in costs to the state as a result of the proposed reorganization will be insignificant and otherwise incidental to the reorganization.
> 6. The proposed reorganization will continue to promote sound education performance and will not significantly disrupt the educational programs in the districts affected by the proposed reorganization.
> 7. Any increase in school facilities costs as a result of the proposed reorganization will be insignificant and otherwise incidental to the reorganization.
> 8. The proposed reorganization is primarily designed for purposes other than to significantly increase property values.
> 9. The proposed reorganization will continue to promote sound fiscal management and not cause a substantial negative effect on the fiscal status of the proposed district or any existing district affected by the proposed reorganization.
From: Yvonne.Cresmer@lw.com <Yvonne.Cresmer@lw.com>
Sent: Monday, April 15, 2019 10:16 AM
To: Deegan_Allison <Deegan_Allison@lacoed.edu>
Cc: Martin.C.Cresmer@apmterminals.com
Subject: SUPPORT for GUSD/LCUSD Territory Transfer

Dear Dr. Deegan,

As concerned parents of school-aged children who reside in the Sagebrush area, and as members of the La Canada community, we urge you to carefully consider the LCUSD Territory Transfer Petition, and to approve it, so as to grant Sagebrush children the right to attend LCUSD schools. For too long our community has been divided, with children of residents living in the Sagebrush area being directed to attend GUSD schools, while their peers in church, scouting, and other activities attend LCUSD schools. Both districts offer fine educational and athletic programs, but we have seen how those Sagebrush students directed to attend GUSD schools lose out on the benefits of daily interaction with their peers, not able to develop the social capital or obtain the full benefits of our community’s social fabric.

Our sons have benefitted from being able to attend LCUSD schools over the past few years, as both boys are achieving academically. To a greater extent, they have been allowed to fully participate in growing up in La Canada, as a part of La Canada, developing the bonds that will strengthen them and this community for the near and long term future. This bonding would not have taken place without the opportunity to attend LCUSD schools alongside other students residing in the city of La Canada.

We would like to thank you for your time in reading our letter and considering the points we have made. We care deeply concerned about our sons' growth and development, and for that of others living the Sagebrush area with school-aged children. Please consider the points we have presented, along with the voices of countless others in the La Canada area, and approve the transfer of the Sagebrush Territory to the LCUSD’s jurisdiction.

With Best Regards,

Martin and Yvonne Cresmer
Sagebrush Residents

Yvonne Cresmer
Director of Tax

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
555 West Fifth Street, Suite 800
Los Angeles, CA 90013-1021
Direct Dial: +1.213.891.7099
Fax: +1.213.891.7123
Email: yvonne.cresmer@lw.com
http://www.lw.com
From: Jay <jay@jinternet.net>
Sent: Monday, April 15, 2019 12:26 PM
To: Deegan_Allison <Deegan_Allison@lacoe.edu>
Subject: SUPPORT for GUSD/LCUSD Territory Transfer

Dear Allison Deegan, Ed.D.:

I initially wrote a letter to you in January 2017 in support of the territory transfer and I wanted to send this letter again, ahead of the May 1st hearing, to reiterate my support for the territory transfer. Since I wrote the letter, my oldest child is now of school age and we applied for a permit to LCUSD. We have also read in the Los Angeles Times of reports of overcrowding and inadequate facilities for elementary school children. It is a very stressful time for us because we do not know if our children will get into our preferred school of choice and your decision at this hearing can affect our children’s futures on where they can attend school until they reach college.

I moved to the Sagebrush area in May of 2012 and previously lived on Briggs St in La Crescenta. The distance between where I lived previously and where I live now is exactly one block but I wanted to highlight some of the differences I noticed after moving to La Canada.

More specifically, I live in the Paradise Valley section of Sagebrush and in my 27 years of living in Southern California, it is the first time I have felt like a part of a community. The moment we went into escrow, the real estate agent told us, there was a neighborhood block party planned twice a year where a street is closed down and the local police, fire department, and city officials are invited and all the neighbors get together and meet each other. We were a little hesitant to go at first but we decided it would be good to go see what the neighborhood had to offer. What we saw was a very tight-knit community that is different from anything I have ever seen. I know all of my neighbors and their kids by name; we attend many of the same activities together, and see each other on a regular basis around the city.

The only issue I would say our community has is the school system. When I grew up, all the kids on my block, we all played in the streets together and went to the same school together. This is not the case in our community. Living in La Canada and going to a Glendale school does not make much sense. We go to community events in La Canada and interact with people from La Canada. However, when it comes to school we go to school with people from another city. It is polarizing for our community and it needs to stop.

I want my children to grow up in a cohesive and united neighborhood. It will be very hard to do as a resident of one city and a parent of children in another city’s school district. As of 2019, we have people going to both La Canada and Glendale school districts and I personally have seen the divisions it is creating in this great community. For this reason, I respectfully request you approve this territory transfer.

Sincerely,

Jae Chi

2125 Bristow Drive, La Canada-Flintridge, California 91011
Subject: SUPPORT for GUSD/LCUSD Territory Transfer

Dear Allison Deegan

We bought our house in 2005. We knew it was a La Canada house in the Glendale school district but that did not concern us at the time because we knew all local schools to be well performing. We were excited to be moving our family into a lovely new area.

We did not however expect the Sagebrush area to be in a blind spot, a community of not quite here or there. The dysfunctional arrangement of having a foot in each "camp", so to speak, could not be predicted. It turns out that we are disenfranchised, not part of the vast Glendale community that resides on the other side of the Pickens Canyon wash but also not genuinely part of the small La Canada community that is so dedicated to serving their schools. In fact, the La Canada schools are the bonds that bring families here together. So, as it stands now, we are effectively like outsiders on both sides. It's an ongoing straddling of an invisible fence we didn't know existed. Nor should it exist.

This may be a decision about school districts but it is also about families. It's not about scholastic ratings or property values.... It's about no longer being a senselessly and detrimentally divided community held hostage by a boundary deal made several decades ago. Long before the ripple effect could be experienced by residents.

It's time for Glendale to release its unnecessary hold on Sagebrush so the small town of La Canada can be whole and Sagebrush can stop being some sort of fostered annex. All La Canada residents going forward deserve to support and be served by their city and their schools together as one city. GUSD is a huge school district and will not suffer from the loss of a few dozen Sagebrush students, most of whom are already on permits to attend their proper city schools.

I am asking the committee to finally Free Sagebrush and vote to approve the transfer petition.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Jordan
2212 Richey Drive
La Canada, CA 91011
Dear Dr. Deegan,

I write in support of the proposed territory transfer. I have a unique perspective in that I currently have a student in all three affected schools, Mountain Avenue, Rosemont Middle School and Crescenta Valley High School.

While the teachers and faculty at all of these schools are generally great, it is absolutely not true that GUSD can give the kids the “same” quality of education as LCUSD. The reason is simply because of class and school size. It is not mathematically possible for a teacher to provide the same level of instruction with 36 kids in a class, when their counterparts at LCUSD have less than 30. I was stunned when my kids moved to 4th grade and their class sizes ballooned to 36.

If the transfer results in the reduction of class size and school size, it seems to me that everyone would want that, especially the teachers and the La Crescenta parents. I am disheartened by the parents and teachers who show up at the meetings to oppose the transfer when the teachers and the La Crescenta students would be benefitting by the reduction in class size. Teachers throughout the state point to class size as one of their biggest complaints and the proposed transfer could actually have a direct, positive impact on that concern.

I have personally experienced at least two of my kids falling victim to the class size problem, one of whom is an excellent student and one who is not.

My seventh grader has been excelling in all of his classes, achieving an average score of over 105% in math and other classes. He is done with all of his homework within an hour. He was not placed in advanced math or advanced English, where he clearly should have been. Rosemont has recognized this error by offering a 5-hour per day, 5 week “make up” math class over the summer so that he can be placed in the advanced math class next year. The kids who were properly placed in advanced math this year do not have to take the summer course; while the kids like mine who were misplaced in regular math this year, are being penalized by giving up nearly their entire summer vacation to make up for the error. Besides the fact that we already have a vacation and summer camps planned and paid for, the summer class is a tremendous burden that could have been avoided if my son had been properly placed for 7th grade. When I called the school to inquire whether my son had been placed in the wrong class, I was advised that though my son scored highly on his state exams, that his teacher had not marked the box recommending him for advanced math. And, when Rosemont placed him in regular math despite his high test scores, they also did not inquire why he was not recommended for advanced math. So between his sixth grade teacher and Rosemont, no one stopped to ask me whether my son should be in advanced math. There was no 6th grade parent-teacher conference or exit interview; there was no call from the middle school to ask what I thought. This lack of individual attention tells me that the class size and school size are just too big to give personalized attention to every child. Now my son will be behind in math unless and until we decide to take his summer vacation away from him to catch up and remedy GUSD’s mistake.
Another example of being “too big to care” is my high school son at CVHS. He is not a great student and he is not a fan of school. But, to me, I wish that just one teacher would take an interest in him and inspire him in just one subject. Now at the end of his junior year, that has not happened. When my son’s grades dropped below a C, there was not a single call or email from the school or any teacher – just the bad news on a report card when it was already too late. The teachers in those classes are also the ones who do not post test scores or assignment scores online, telling us that there are too many kids to do that. Even when I would specifically ask for scores to be provided, I could not get them. To this day, the AP History teacher has never provided me with any scores other than the grade for the quarter. While CVHS seems to be a school that is good for the proactive and diligent students, those who do not achieve at a high level just fall through the cracks. The message they have sent to me is that they will take an interest in your kid if your kid is a high achiever, but otherwise, he is just a number. School is supposed to be there to support kids who want to be there as well as those who are disengaged. In fact, the teachers and staff should be working harder for the kids who are disengaged in order to make them be engaged. The answer is that it is too hard with so many kids at that high school and only the squeaky wheel gets the grease. I can’t help but think if I had my son at La Canada High School - which is half the size of CVHS - that maybe someone would have had the time to inspire him. But, sadly, no one at CVHS has taken the time.

In summary, GUSD’s drumbeat argument that they can give Sagebrush students as good an education as LCUSD, cannot be true. With class size and school size at GUSD levels, kids cannot get the attention they all need and deserve to succeed.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my opinion. Please do not hesitate to reach out to me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Crastz

Jennifer Witherell Crastz
Attorney at Law
Hemar, Rousso & Heald, LLP
15910 Ventura Boulevard, 12th Floor
Encino, California 91436
Telephone: 818-501-3800
Direct Dial: 818-907-3104
Facsimile: 818-501-2985
Email: jcrastz@HRHLaw.com
website: www.HRHLaw.com
------ Original message ------
From: Julie Eleftheriou <jetilton10@gmail.com>
Date: 4/16/19 1:36 PM (GMT-08:00)
To: Deegan_Allison <Deegan_Allison@lacoe.edu>
Cc: ick@attorney-network.com, nalini@lasiewicz.com
Subject: SUPPORT for GUSD/LCUSD Territory Transfer

Ms. Deegan,

Please consider the following in your decision about the potential transfer of Sagebrush into the LCUSD:

1) **Residents' rights:** The fact that Sagebrush residents have sought this transfer for 50 years - for multiple generations of schoolchildren - should convey something about the importance and merit of the effort. The Sagebrush community is the most directly affected by its outcome. The vast majority of residents support and would be impacted positively by a transfer, while GUSD would suffer very little to no negative impact.

2) **Freedom of choice:** Approximately half of Sagebrush families already permit into LCUSD (and as I understand it state funds follow them, so I'm not clear on the financial issue raised by GUSD). Families that prefer to continue at GUSD will be able to do so *per policy* - e.g. we won't be trading one group's permit issues for another's. With a transfer, every Sagebrush family would enjoy the option of sending their children to school in the city in which they live, or continuing at GUSD.

Our family relocated here from Minnesota in 2015. We chose LCF because of the schools, and rented a home for a two years on Tondolea Lane. When it was time to purchase, we found one we liked and could afford on Castle Rd. The fact that it was in Sagebrush gave us serious pause because we knew it would put our kids in a school district limbo of sorts. While we understand that GUSD is also great, our children's friends and fellow students live in the city of La Canada Flintridge - as we do. Each year we have to apply for a permit with no guarantee of acceptance; it's an annual source of stress for our entire family.

I urge you to resolve this issue with a permanent territory transfer.

Thanks,
Julie Eleftheriou
Cell: 952.913.3065
------- Original message -------
From: Carl Husfeld <chusfeld@sbeglobal.net>
Date: 4/16/19 6:16 PM (GMT-08:00)
To: Deegan_Allison <Deegan_Allison@lacoe.edu>
Subject: Support for GUSD/LCUSD Territory Transfer

To Los Angeles County of Education,

We are submitting this email to voice our support for the GUSD/LCUSD. We have been living in the Sagebrush area of La Canada for the last ten years. We have two school aged children who currently attend La Canada middle and high school. When we initially moved into the area, my oldest child was attending private school and we decided to enroll our youngest into Mountain Avenue Elementary school. My daughter was enrolled into a split class which was first graders and kindergarten children and were informed because of capacity issues. We found this practice of split classes to be odd. We also quickly realized that everyone we met was either from the Glendale or Montrose area and their children did their activities in the Glendale area. My daughter did not have any of her classmates in any of her activities as she attended things in La Canada. Any activities advertised for the families at Mountain Avenue all took place in Glendale.

My daughter felt a disconnect with her classmates and also a disconnect with her friends that she made through activities in La Canada because she didn’t attend La Canada schools.

Now my children are permitted in which we need to re-permit every year with La Canada. We would like this process to be eliminated and have a permanent transfer. Sagebrush residents support this transfer and have voiced it many times in the last 50 years. Just because a decision was made 50 years ago, doesn’t mean it is in the best interest for our community. It is also a small financial impact on Glendale.

Now that my children attend La Canada schools, they are able to do activities in La Canada with their friends and also see their friends in school. They now feel a part of their community and not feel out of place, but would like this to be permanent. We would like to be considered a La Canada resident family not a permitted family to the La Canada School District.

Carl and Mia Husfeld
Sent from my iPad
Allison Deegan, Ed.D.
Regionalized Business Services Coordinator
Business Advisory Services
Los Angeles County Office of Education

April 16, 2019

Please accept this short letter as an expression of my support for the Sagebrush school district boundary change.

Nothing defines a community better than its school district. It is where kids socialize, parents become acquainted with their neighbors and establish relationships with each other. As a Sagebrush parent, I urge the County Committee to unify our community and allow our kids to attend the schools in the city where they reside.

We, the residents of Sagebrush, are committed and stand together to become one community and establish a sense of belonging. The LCUSD has welcomed our children with open arms and we are grateful for their support. We ask that the Committee strongly consider unifying La Canada to become one and unite our fractured community.

I would like to thank you for your consideration in our effort to bringing our community together for a good cause. Sagebrush children who already attend LCUSD are grateful for the opportunity and we like this to be a reality for every resident in La Canada.

We again ask that the Committee strongly consider unifying La Canada to become one community fully united with its local school district.

Sincerely,

Arin Kamali
Sagebrush Parent and La Canada resident
4709 Cypress St.
La Canada CA, 91011
----- Original message -----
From: Gregory Jones <gregandmichie@sbcglobal.net>
Date: 4/16/19 10:15 PM (GMT-08:00)
To: Deegan Allison <Deegan_Allison@lacoe.edu>
Subject: Sagebrush Tranfer

Ms. Deegan,

I strongly support the permanent transfer of Sagebrush into the LCUSD.

For more than 50 years, Sagebrush residents have sought this transfer - for generation after generation of schoolchildren - which should convey something about how important the initiative is to the Sagebrush community. The vast majority of our residents would be affected positively by a transfer, while GUSD would suffer very little, if any, negative impact.

Families that prefer to continue at GUSD will be able to do so per policy - so they won't be put in the same position Sagebrush families are in now. They'll have the freedom to choose GUSD without worrying about permit approval.

A transfer means every Sagebrush family would enjoy the option of sending their children to school in the city in which they live, or continuing at GUSD.

I urge you and the committee to approve a permanent territory transfer.

Regards,
Michie Jones

Sent from my iPhone
Dear Los Angeles County Committee and Ms. Deegan:

Hi, I have been a resident here in the Sagebrush area for over 15 years and there's nothing more I would want to do than support my community but unfortunately I have other obligations (my three kids), therefore, I am not able to attend the May 1st L.A. County meeting regarding to the Sagebrush transfer. In my absents I would like to write that I WISH I could be there to support my fellow neighbors and friends to support our request to the Los Angeles County Committee of our Sagebrush Territory transfer.

There are three great reasons why I support the Sagebrush transfer:

1. It is the Sagebrush kids that are at stake and NOT GUSD or LCUSD! Our kids deserve the best that can prepare them for their future. They need a school that can help them achieve their goals, and I believe LCUSD is better qualified because for one they have smaller class sizes and that grants their teachers to be able to pay better attention to each child.

2. GUSD schools are over- crowded! Two of my kids have attended Mountain Avenue Elementary in the past (from 2007 - 2015). My oldest son was at Mountain Avenue Elementary from kindergarten (2007) to sixth grade (2014), then went to continue 7th grade at Rosemont Middle School, which both was all part of GUSD (our "assigned" school.) My middle daughter also attended Mountain Avenue from 2009-2015 (Kindergarten - Fifth grade). While my kids were at Mountain Avenue, I have volunteered in the classrooms throughout different grade levels. Class sizes were always large compare to our friends who were attending LCUSD. Kindergarten, we had 24-26 kids in Mountain Avenue while our friends at LCUSD only had 19-20 kids. As the grade level progress, our class size got even larger at Mountain Avenue. In 4th grade, my son's class had 38 kids. For first grade thru third grade, class sizes were 27-29 kids; and for fourth grade thru sixth grade, class sizes were 35-38 students with many different level split classes (fifth and sixth graders together in one class) due to lack of teachers and not enough classrooms! In Rosemont Middle School was the same situation, my son's classes were 36-38 students! While I was volunteering at Mountain Avenue many times teachers relied on us parent volunteers to be at class to help out, and many times due to the size of the class, teachers were not able to assist some students with help that was needed.

3. A mistake was made many, many decades ago when LCUSD was formed and was neglected to include the Sagebrush area because this area had belonged to a private citizen. But, that doesn’t change the fact that this area still belongs to La Canada and our zip code is 91011 and not 91214 for La Crescenta or any of other Glendale zip codes. We eat and play in La Canada (and some of us even work in La Canada), our neighbors and friends go to La Canada, our community is La Canada, therefore, we like our kids to go to school in La Canada and be united with our friends. We want our taxes to support our community and school where we eat and play- La Canada. Just because a mistake was made many, many decades ago, does not mean we have to carry that mistake for many more decades. Let's rectify that mistake now!
Now, my kids have been in LCUSD for the past four years, we couldn’t be happier! My youngest daughter just started kindergarten this year at Palm Crest Elementary with LCUSD. My two oldest kids are at La Canada High School, my oldest son is an 11th grader and my middle daughter is in 9th grade. Both my older kids are extremely happy that I transferred them to LCUSD. They both had said that they feel they are getting a better education in LCUSD. They feel they got more homework to reinforce what they learned in class and the teachers lectured them better in a way that they understood better. Their teachers are not always interrupted by other students and is not too many students for their teacher to handle. Many of their classes are only about 26 kids!

In the end, it is about what is best for our kids, LCUSD puts our kids first and want what is best for our kids and can accommodate our kids. GUSD is all about the money! They just want our kids for number count - money count! They do not have enough teachers and classrooms to support our kids. Their class sizes were always over-crowded and too large for one teacher to handle. Our experiences are the testament that GUSD do not care about our kids! GUSD do not have the class size to accommodate with the needs of our Sagebrush kids. We are merely numbers for GUSD. We want what is right for our kids and that is their education. It is the Sagebrush kids that are at stake not GUSD or LCUSD! They deserve the best that can prepare them for their future and LCUSD is best qualified with smaller class sizes and better education. Therefore, a transfer would only makes sense, we want to support our community and pay our taxes to support our school and community! We do not want our taxes to go to a community that do not support our kids! Make it make sense and transfer us back to our rightful owners- La Canada-.LCUSD!

Thank you for your time and helping us fight for our kids!

Sincerely,

Tina Tamara
Subject: SUPPORT for GUSD/LCUSD Territory Transfer

Allison Deegan, Ed.D.
Regionalized Business Services Coordinator
Business Advisory Services
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242
(562) 922-6336

04/16/19:

Please support the Sagebrush Territory Transfer into La Canada Unified School District.

Hello Ms. Deegan Allison,

I am a parent in the Sagebrush Territory of La Canada-Flintridge. I am requesting your support in allowing our region of La Canada-Flintridge to be transferred into the La Canada Unified School District, (LCUSD). I have two children currently enrolled in La Canada Unified School District on a permit basis. I have another child that is 3 years old and I would also like her to be able to attend La Canada Unified School District with her brothers.

I am requesting the Sagebrush Territory Transfer in order to strength the student achievement of my children. La Cañada Unified has smaller class sizes, no split grade level classes, and more counselors available to help improve the education of my children. I would also like to know that my children have a stable future in LCUSD. Currently our children are enrolled on a permit that GUSD could revoke in subsequent years.

Our children have now been attending LCUSD for many years and it would be emotionally and socially detrimental to force them to attend another school. It would negatively impact their community relationships and sense of community support.
Our oldest son attended Mountain Avenue Elementary school in Glendale Unified School District, GUSD. I witnessed first-hand that Mountain Avenue is at full capacity. Class sizes at Mountain Ave Elementary school in GUSD were extremely large and the student desks barely fit into the class rooms. In addition, I witnessed teachers challenged to maintain the focus of so many children. There were also many split grade classes which also presented challenges for the teachers and students at Mountain Avenue Elementary School. We decided to switch school districts because of the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) goals of La Cañada Unified to maintain smaller class sizes and have no split level grade classes.
I am requesting that you respect and honor the voice of LCF residents. For over 50 years the residents of the Sagebrush area, have sought a transfer so that all residents of La Cañada Flintridge can have the same benefit enjoyed by every household within the City of Glendale and unincorporated La Crescenta and Montrose, that is, the right to have their children permanently attend schools in their hometown city of La Cañada Flintridge.

- Sagebrush support for the transfer is indisputable:
  - From GUSD’s 2014 survey of its Sagebrush constituents:
    - 90% of Sagebrush voters supported the transfer, and
  - By a margin of nearly 5 to 1, Sagebrush voters rejected an Open Boundaries/Permissive Enrollment alternative in favor of a permanent transfer to LCUSD that comes with a $450 parcel tax

**Please support the Sagebrush Territory Transfer into La Canada Unified School District.**

Respectfully,

Ana Grace

2234 Canalda Drive

La Canada Flintridge, CA 91011
From: Nancy Eschen <nancyeschen@yahoo.com>
Date: 4/17/19 10:10 AM (GMT-08:00)
To: Deegan Allison <Deegan_Allison@lacoe.edu>
Subject: Support of Sagebrush Territory Transfer

My family has lived in Sagebrush since 2000. My son started at Mountain Ave. Elementary in second grade, my daughter started in kindergarten. Most of the teachers were excellent, and we were very satisfied with the education our children were receiving.

My son was eventually put into a split 3rd/4th grade class. Class size went up, and his teacher did her very best to give the attention every student needed, but based on the class size increasing and having to cover 2 grade curriculums, we had to find a new school for him. This idea to find a new school was actually suggested to us by his teacher at Mountain Ave., since she felt strongly he would be better supported by smaller class size. We will always be grateful to her to helping us understand our son's needs.

We were not budgeted for private school, but LCUSD would not allow us to enroll him into Palm Crest Elementary. We pulled him out of Mountain Ave. to attend a private school with smaller average class size.

My daughter went through the GUSD schools. Again, we felt most of the teachers were very good, but after going to open house one year at Crescenta Valley High School, we were shocked that some of her classes had close to 40 students. Eventually we had her transfer to a private school, where class sizes were smaller.

Class size matters. My friends who had children go through the LCUSD schools did not have the same concerns. LCUSD's Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) stress smaller class size, no split classes, and more counselors. The fact that we live in La Canada, and did not have the option to attend La Canada schools is very unfortunate and unfair to the residents of Sagebrush.

My daughter and I were members of The National Charity League of Glendale. Our class was mostly comprised of families from La Canada, and Glendale. There was definitely separation with the girls who went to the La Canada schools, (many of them who grew up together since kindergarten) and the rest from other schools. We made new friends from the La Canada members, yet we never felt part of the La Canada community. We live in La Canada, yet we feel very disconnected. Being part of the La Canada community is very important, and I hope future residents will be able to have this sense of community, that we were not able to experience.

A majority of Sagebrush families support this transfer, close to 90%. I believe close to 50% of Sagebrush students have already transferred. The current process of allowing Sagebrush to enroll in La Canada schools based on permit applications, that can change at anytime is not beneficial to our Sagebrush families, LCUSD or GUSD.

The residents of Sagebrush have clearly expressed their preference to be part of LCUSD. Must we wait another 50 years to be fully integrated into the La Canada schools and community?

Thank you,

Nancy Eschen
4828 Matley Rd,
La Canada, CA 91011
Good afternoon Ms. Deegan,

I strongly support the permanent transfer of Sagebrush into the LCUSD.

For more than 50 years, Sagebrush residents and LCUSD have sought this transfer, which should convey something about how important the initiative is to LCF as a community.

The vast majority of Sagebrush residents would be affected positively by a transfer, while GUSD would suffer very little, if any, negative impact. Families that prefer to continue at GUSD will be able to do so per policy - so they won't be put in the same position Sagebrush families are in now. They'll have the freedom to choose GUSD without worrying about permit approval.

A transfer means every Sagebrush family would enjoy the option of sending their children to school in the city in which they live, or continuing at GUSD.

I urge you and the committee to approve a permanent territory transfer.

Thank you for your attention,
Nick Eleftheriou
April 17, 2019

Dear Allison

My family and I have been living in the sagebrush area for nine years now. We have three children, ages 10, 5 and 3. Our oldest daughter always attend private school in La Canada because we were not allowed to put her in the La Canada school system because we chose to buy outside the LCUSD area. The private school tuition placed a financial strain on the family, but we made due.

My daughter plays team sports and could never understand why she could not attend the same school as her teammates. We live in the same neighborhood but could not send our daughter to school with her friends. It simply did not make sense. Part of raising children is to have them feel a sense of community, but how is that possible if they are not fully engaged with their community?

Luckily last year we were finally able to get a permit for our oldest daughter to attend La Canada elementary. We had to go through the whole permit process but it was well worth it. She can finally go to a better ranked school for a much lower cost and she can be with her friends from the neighborhood.

We have two more children and will have to go through the whole permit process again unless Sagebrush is finally fully united with the rest of La Canada. Please for the sake of our children and community........ unite all of La Canada with it's local schools

Sincerely,
Reili Sengul
5150 Oceanview blvd
La Canada, Ca 91011

Sent from my iPhone
LYNN & CHRIS KNOX
2104 NORMANTON DRIVE
LA CANADA, CA 91011

April 17, 2019

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

RE: SUPPORT for GUSD/LCUSD Territory Transfer

Dear Allison,

We are Lynn & Chris Knox of 2104 Normanton Drive in La Canada also known as the "Sagebrush" area of La Canada. My wife, Lynn, grew up at this address having moved here in 1961. Her father, Richard Stanczak, was an early proponent of this transfer when the La Canada Unified School District was first formed and he helped write the first petition from the "Sagebrush" citizens to join the LCUSD. It was submitted and unfortunately denied.

Fifty plus years later and two more filed petitions and we are still fully in favor of this transfer. In our opinion, this is not about the quality of the schools. Both GUSD and LCUSD have excellent credentials and reputations and my wife attended Montrose Elementary, Rosemont Junior High, and Crescenta Valley High School. This is about community and the right to have our children attend schools within their own community. La Canada is like many small towns. We attend church and civic organizations within our specific community. To live in La Canada and be forced to send our children to GUSD schools is not only unfair, it makes no sense. We want our future generations to have a strong sense of community (along with family and national patriotism). To divide those interests between two different communities, to us, seems counterproductive.

The overwhelming majority of the residents of the Sagebrush territory have demonstrated that they are more than just casually in favor of this petition, especially those with school-aged children. Let us be united in our community. We strongly encourage the Los Angeles County Office Education to do what is right and support this transfer once and for all. It is 50 years overdue!

Sincerely,
Chris & Lynn Knox

RECEIVED
APR 18 2019
BUSINESS ADVISORY SERVICES
5225 Castle Rd
La Canada Flintridge, CA 91011

Allison Deegan
Regional Business Services Coordinator
Business Advisory Services
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242

April 17, 2019
Dear LA County Committee on School District Organization,

We are writing a letter in support of the sagebrush transfer. We moved to the city of La Canada in 2018 with two young boys ages 2 and 4 yrs. Our oldest is looking forward to going to kindergarten as well as starting this new adventure with his best friends. His friends currently reside in La Canada and will be attending Palm Crest elementary school. Our hope is that our son can continue to be with his friends in a community rich environment. Not only do we feel it is in our sons’ best interest to attend La Canada schools with their neighborhood friends, but also witness a sense of community through sports and social gatherings. We believe our children should have the right to attend their neighborhood school in the city in which we reside.

Furthermore, while applying for kindergarten in the Glendale Unified School district this year, it was unnerving when we were asked to sign a form that stated our son may be sent to any school in the entire district due to possible overcrowding. For us, this transfer is about goodwill, consistency, academic success, and a sense of community. The decision should not be based on economics but what is best for the new leaders of tomorrow.

We appreciate your attention,

[Signature]

Dr. Kristin Konrade and Justin Moles
April 17, 2019

Dr. Allison Deagan
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242

RE: The “Sagebrush” Issue

As a 47 year resident of La Cañada, I strongly support the unification of our city with its school district and I encourage the members of the County Office of Education to concur and endorse this concept and grant the petition to transfer our part of the city of La Cañada from Glendale’s school district and unite this city community.

Glendale’s arguments for retaining this portion of our community in their district have revolved primarily around revenue and what produces it for them. Very little argument has been centered on the students themselves other than what requirements may have been addressed in the Criteria Reports. This is not to say that the quality of education and the care of school faculties in delivering it is less than that delivered by La Cañada schools. That has never been an issue with us, especially those of us whose children attend(ed) Glendale’s schools up here. (My daughters included.)

Please consider the following observations on some of the topics of contention:

“The loss of Sagebrush Territory will adversely affect tax revenues for Glendale’ school district.”

There has been, and will continue to be, increased construction of multi-family housing up here in unincorporated county territory primarily along Montrose Avenue which is already the site of many apartment complexes. This is, and will continue to be, a major part of the future base of tax revenues and a student source for their schools in the La Crescenta/Montrose area. Within the last two years (2017-19), tear down of preexisting multiple units has given way to the construction of larger complexes. At least 50 separated units have been constructed at two sites along Montrose Avenue in the unincorporated portion alone. This statement does not take into consideration the building frenzy taking place within the city of Glendale.

The city of Glendale, itself, (the major portion of it located 6 miles south over a 3000’ mountain range) has and will continue to experience expanded growth in commercial development and is undergoing rapid increases housing construction as evidenced by large development of multifamily housing units along Los Feliz Blvd, Central Avenue and other areas down in Glendale proper.

Glendale is also the home of ABC/Disney, major retail malls and businesses, and has many buildable tracts of land in its industrial sections parallel with the Golden State Freeway (i-5) on its western edges. These two facts, alone, will provide ample funding for its namesake school district which would easily offset any ‘loss’ created by the granting of our petition.

La Cañada is strictly a residential area and does not have large commercial or industrial development potential, nor are there large areas suitable for massive multi-unit complexes. There are and virtually no existing vacant lots available for the construction of single family dwellings. This fact holds true for the Sagebrush territory more so. All this portion of La Cañada provides Glendale’s district is property tax levies from some 900 or so parcels (including some 200 apartment units located exclusively west of the current Roscomare Ave.” Sagebrush” district
boundary line) and ADA revenue produced by some 220 or so students who attend 3 schools. (Mountain Avenue Elementary, Rosemont Middle and Crescenta Valley High.)

This section of La Cañada provides Glendale with less than 2% of its assessed valuation levies and ADA revenues which are an even smaller percentage of its total ADA revenue. Overall, Glendale's school district would incur possibly a 1 to 2% decrease in its revenues should the transfer of territory go into effect, but that deficit would be overcome quickly by revenues from the continued economic and student population expansion within its city limits, let alone within the unincorporated areas up here.

"Mountain Avenue may be forced to close due to lack of students"

Mountain Avenue Elementary will never be closed. Those that live in its immediate neighborhood/attendance area would not tolerate its closure. Should Glendale threaten to close it due to a lack of 30-50 "Sagebrush" kids not being a part of its student body, attendance areas up here are easily re-drawn to make up for "losses" (as is general practice in any school district.) in the case of overcrowding in other schools, students would have to be moved about. But given the goal of smaller student to teacher class ratios, any reduction could very well be beneficial.

Two, portions of the Monte Vista elementary school attendance areas are closer to Mountain Avenue, and 20% of Mountain Avenue's attendance area drawn on the map is uninhabited mountainous terrain. Its attendance area could be re-drawn to include the new multiple family housing units one mile south of its campus.

This tactic has been used to engender support of the local Mountain Avenue populace to bolster Glendale's argument that territory transfer should be denied. It happened in the 90's, and it continues to be a favored tactic in opposition to our efforts today. Given the fact that the aforementioned revenues all go into a big pot to help finance the school District, it is up to that district to allocate funds to Mountain Avenue and the other two school to which our students attend. The three schools do not receive all of the revenues provided by the Sagebrush portion of La Cañada.

The mere fact that local enrollment in the Crescenta Valley area has remained stable and is likely to increase disproves the need to close one outstanding and successful elementary school for the lack of 50 kids and discredits the philosophy of this threat tactic.

"Sagebrush residents just want to improve the value of their property by becoming part of the La Cañada school district."

Please consider the following empirically experienced, observable and provable facts: Neither La Cañada or La Crescenta are NOT transient communities. Folks who live in this portion of La Cañada are long term residents. I've been here in La Cañada for 47 years. My next door neighbor, 42 (not including the fact that he was born and raised here.) The neighbors across the street, 70+ and 55 year home owners, respectively. The new-comers 5, 10, 20+ years and counting.

The only people who benefit from increased real estate values of any kind are the speculators and flippers, those that "buy", renovate, tear down and rebuild then sell within 2 years or less. This sad phenomena is also happening
in La Crescenta. Should Glendale present that real estate value argument to you, I would encourage you to summarily reject it.

Community Identity

Prior to the incorporation of La Cañada in 1976, the Sagebrush area developed separately from La Crescenta and was considered by all as a section of La Cañada. When the city boundaries were fixed in 1976, that sense of community identity was expressed in those boundaries. Many residents here at that time more than likely would have opted for inclusion into the La Cañada school district, but no legal procedures or vehicles were available at the time to effect such a change of school district boundaries. It took but two years for such a vehicle to come into being, and the campaign to seek the territory transfer began.

Glendale’s school district serves its namesake, the city of Glendale. It exists to serve its citizenry based upon that citizenry’s goals, values and needs dictates. It seeks to be responsive to it. It is a part and champion of its own community.

By the same token, La Cañada’s school district serves its residents with the same purpose and mission. It is immediately responsive to the goals, values and needs of the people of La Cañada.

We, the “Sagebrush” residents, reside in La Cañada. We do not reside in Glendale.

We desire to unite this community to provide our residents, our children, to attend schools in their own geographically contiguous neighborhood and be active participants and beneficiaries of what that community is purposed to provide them. The children of residents here should have their intellect and talents fostered by the community in which they live and by default are a part of, mentored by parents and teachers local community organizations and a board of education which provides the schools and education for the residents if its name sake city, La Cañada.

Again, we live in and are a part of La Cañada. We are not Glendale. Therefore, it is only logical that we in this portion of La Cañada be in its school district. This is what we have sought for well over 42 years.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

John W. Spencer
4731 Castle Road
La Cañada
From: Mike Shaar <Mike@sigpm.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 18, 2019 7:58 PM
To: Deegan_Allison <Deegan_Allison@lacoe.edu>
Cc: nick@kpartnergroup.com; nalini@laslewicz.com
Subject: SUPPORT for GUSD/LCUSD Territory Transfer
Importance: High

Dear Allison Deegan, Ed.D.,

I have lived in the La Canada area for over a decade. Over 25 years ago when I began working in this area, my broker explained that a certain part of La Canada was different from the rest. I still recall him lecturing me to disclose to any buyers or tenants who wanted to live in that area, that they are not able to send their children to the city’s schools. It never really made sense then and it still does not. It is one city and the school system should be one.

I lived in the sagebrush area for many years. The uncertainty of not knowing where my future children would go to school was always irritating. As you are well aware this debate has gone on for far too long. It is time that this situation be corrected once and for all in a manner that will make sense.

Ultimately, I ended up selling our home on Oceanview and moving into the area of La Canada that would not be in question for our children’s education. I am hopeful that future residents won’t have to go through this same situation and I thank you for working through this process to make the right decision.

Sincerely,

Michael Shaar, Broker
2018-9 Program Chair, Glendale Sunrise Rotary Club
2017 President, National Assoc. of Residential Property Managers- LA Chapter
2017 Treas, Sunland Tujunga Chamber of Commerce
Past President WCR San Gabriel Chapter
Realtor of the Year, Pasadena Foothills Assoc of Realtors
Past CAR Regional Chair, California Association of Realtors (CAR)
Past President- Pasadena Foothills Assoc of Realtors
(818) 287-6692 SIG Direct
(818) 249-7368 x101 SIG
(818) 790-9700 x101 RE/MAX

S.I.G. RE/MAX
PROPERTY MANAGEMENT
Tri-City Realty

BRE License #01126958
-----Original Message-----
From: Douglas Ross <douglas@evolutionusa.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 18, 2019 9:41 PM
To: Deegan_Allison <Deegan_Allison@lacoee.edu>
Cc: Nick Karapetian <nick@krpartnergroup.com>; Nalini Lasiewicz (nalini@lasiewicz.com)
<nalini@lasiewicz.com>
Subject: letter in support of the Sagebrush School District Territory Transfer

Dear Ms. Deegan,

I am a new resident of the Sagebrush neighborhood of La Cañada with plans to start a family. Inasmuch, I am writing to support the territory transfer because I want my children to be able to attend their hometown school without the uncertainty of having to obtain a permit to do so.

As a product of neighborhood public schools, I know the value of that type of educational environment and I hope to be able to give my children that same opportunity.

After doing research I have determined that my priorities for the education of my children are more closely aligned with La Cañada Unified’s goals than that of GUSD. Plus, I would want the ability to be more directly involved in the supervision — and selection of school board officials — which would only be accorded to me for La Cañada Unified because I am a resident of LCF and not Glendale.

For these and many other reasons, I strongly support the Territory transfer.

Thank you for your consideration.

Douglas A. Ross
5228 Escalante Dr.
La Cañada Flintridge, CA 91011
818-236-3605
From: tarbenz <tim@timarbenz.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 18, 2019 6:04 PM
To: Deegan, Allison <Deegan_Allison@lacoe.edu>
Subject: Support for GUSD/LCUSD Territory Transfer

Ms. Deegan,

We have been residents of the “Sagebrush” area of La Canada Flintridge for 25 years, and strongly support the “Territory Transfer” from GUSD to LCUSD to be voted on at your May 1, 2019 Meeting.

Sincerely
Tim & Maria Arbenz,

2113 Sunnybank Drive,
La Canada Flintridge, CA 91011.
(818) 957-8753
tim@timarbenz.com
Alison Deegan, Ed.D.
Regionalized Business Advisory Services Coordinator
Business Advisory Services
Los Angeles Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242

Re: Support for Petition for Transfer of Sagebrush Area from Glendale USD to La Canada USD

April 18, 2019

Dear Dr. Deegan and Committee Members:

I attended and spoke at the public hearing that the Committee on School District Organization held in the fall of 2016 in La Canada Flintridge to obtain input from community members. I am writing prior to the Committee’s May 1 meeting to reiterate the case for approving the Petition to transfer the Sagebrush Area from Glendale Unified School District to the La Canada Unified School District.

I am a long-time resident of the area and am familiar with local educational and other community matters. I attended local public schools myself and, in high school, La Canada Flintridge students were my classmates. Until July 2018, I represented La Canada Flintridge (along with west Altadena and west Pasadena) as a member, and for a time President, of the Pasadena Area Community College District Board of Trustees. For 17 years, I was a part-time faculty member at USC. It is with these deep roots in the community and experience as an educator, I present the following compelling reasons to approve the transfer Petition:

- In all but a single yet extremely important exception, its school district status, the Sagebrush Area is an integral part of the fabric of the La Canada Flintridge community

- The current school district boundary is an anachronism which, if the school district boundary were to be drawn today, would never be drawn to cut off the Sagebrush Area from the rest of the school district that serves the rest of La Canada Flintridge, the city of which it is a part in all other respects

**Community Identity**

It is a truth universally acknowledged that a sense of community is an important factor in fostering student success. Because of the current school district boundary, that full sense of community is now lacking for residents and particularly the students of the Sagebrush area.

In every conceivable respect that defines a community, except its local school district, the Sagebrush Area is an integral part of the City of La Canada Flintridge. The residents of the Sagebrush Area:

- Pay property taxes to the city
- Rely on the city for municipal services
- Shop in the city
- Affiliate with religious institutions in the city
- Support and belong to countless civic organizations in the city
- Belong to sporting and other recreational organizations in the city
- And a large number work in the city

But when it comes to a key element that plays a huge part in defining and promoting a sense of community, the Sagebrush Area is lacking. It does not have its assigned school district in common with the rest of its city. In terms of Glendale USD, the Sagebrush Area is merely a small appendage of a much larger school district that serves a much larger city with which it has relatively little in common.

Permitting the Sagebrush Area to become a part of La Canada USD will be an important step to fully assimilating its residents and students into the community of which in virtually all other aspects they have been and are now an integral part.

**Boundary Location**

The boundary line that is the focus of this Petition is a relic and an anachronism from another time. It was drawn decades before the creation of La Canada USD as well as the establishment of the City of La Canada Flintridge from what was then an unincorporated area of Los Angeles County that straddled the existing school district boundary.

The location of the boundary line is a vestige of a bygone era that bears virtually no relationship to current physical, social and cultural connections in the area. If the boundary between Glendale USD and La Canada USD were to be drawn anew today, it is inconceivable that it would be drawn to cut off and disassociate the Sagebrush Area from the rest of the City of La Canada Flintridge and its school district to which it belongs in every other respect.

The Committee now has an opportunity to remedy what has, over the years, developed into an exceedingly dysfunctional arrangement for not just the students but all of the residents of the Sagebrush Area.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Ross Selvidge, Ph.D.
638 W. California Blvd.
Pasadena, CA 91105
I am a resident of the SageBrush Area on Castle Road in La Canada Flintridge. I wanted to write to you and express my support for the territory transfer. As I have two young children, I wanted to express the importance of this Territory transfer to my family. My children are already forming close bonds with their preschool classmates who live two blocks east from us and are in the predefined La Canada Flintridge Boundary, we go to events with them at Memorial park in La Canada, we are members of the church in La Canada, and we generally go out of our way to support the local businesses of La Canada as well. I very much want my children to continue to be linked into this community as we are so connected already and we are La Canada City Residents.

We are also very concerned about the Pickens Canyon pedestrian bridge and the access risks during a fire or seismic emergency. My understanding is that about 50% of sagebrush resident students already are permitted into LCUSD schools as well. As a 15 year employee of the Jet Propulsion Lab, I have interacted with many La Canada High School students from their Robotics Programs, helped provided tours, and have even help them seek out internship opportunities. La Canada Flintridge is my community, that I work in, that I support, and that which my family lives is. I strongly want my children to be part of this La Canada School District and integrated members of this community.

Thank you for your Time.

Sincerely,

Eric Kulczycki
From: Liezle Magbanua <liezle486@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, April 19, 2019 12:11 AM
To: Deegan_Allison <Deegan_Allison@lacoe.edu>
Subject: SUPPORT for GUSD/LCUSD Territory Transfer

Dear Ms. Deegan,

I have been a resident of Sagebrush for 29 years. I unfortunately did not attend school within LCUSD, however my sister who was developmentally delayed did. The program for special needs children is amazing! It made me realize how important it was for my kids to get into the La Canada School District. Until now, I still am thankful for the opportunities she had.

However, the application is very difficult and time consuming.

The waiting period for approval/rejection is nerve racking.

In the meanwhile, I enrolled my kid at 2 other different schools as a back up. Therefore, taking up spots at Mountain Elementary and another local private school.

Fortunately, I was able to get my 1st son into Palm Crest.

Then, my second son. Same process again. However...this time he was allowed into a different La Canada elementary school (Paradise Canyon). My children ended up at 2 different schools.

Meanwhile, as I petition for my 3rd son, I wonder why petitioning is still necessary, considering I have a La Canada address. I live here, I perform all my daily routines in La Canada, I am an involved community member here, so why shouldn't my kids attend school here also?

The reason I am painstakingly outlining my challenges is because the petitioning process is time consuming, anxiety ridden, and a huge waste of resources especially for when I apply to other schools and end up pulling them out of that applied spot. Despite these troubles, I will continue to go through the process because I believe in the smaller class sizes and amazing counselors available to the students of LCUSD.

Hopefully, this helps you realize this is a problem for us little folks in Sagebrush that has been going on for more than 50 years. We really need to address this problem and it will not go away.

Thank you for your time and consideration!

With Utmost Respect,
Liezle Arevalo
Dear Dr. Deegan,

I'm writing in support of the territory transfer.

We moved into Sagebrush in 2009 and at the time my boys were 7 and 5 years old. Our neighbor had similar age boys and it was one of the advantages we saw moving into this beautiful neighborhood. The anticipation was that our kids would grow up and form lasting bonds with neighbors, attend same schools and be part of the same community. This was short-lived as our neighbor’s kids were permitted into LCUSD. It was difficult to explain to our kids what was happening, we live on the same street, steps away from each other and yet we go to different schools.

The major disparity we saw living in Sagebrush was during the aftermath of the 2009 Station fire when we were evacuated about 10 times in the span of 2.5 months. The City of La Canada Flintridge and LCUSD combined assisted residents with evacuation and shelter but our school district’s (GUSD) agenda did not change to accommodate Sagebrush students.

Concerned with safety and possible future emergencies as above, we saw the apparent need to live and go to school in the same city. We started requesting to be permitted into LCUSD. In 2016, my older son was finally permitted but not the younger one.

From my experience, stemmed from safety concerns, I see a compelling need for a permanent solution to keep residents of La Canada Flintridge, inclusive of Sagebrush, united so that all residents may enjoy the same benefit of having their children permanently attend schools in the city of residence, La Canada Flintridge.

I hope that this permanent transfer comes to fruition as it has been the desire of the Sagebrush community for decades.

Best Regards
Sossi Badalian
5616 Ocean View Blvd
La Canada, CA 91011
------ Original message ------
From: "Youngblood, Cory A" <YOUNGBCA@ELAC.EDU>
Date: 4/20/19 6:57 AM (GMT-08:00)
To: Nick Karapetian <nick@krpartnergroup.com>, Deegan Allison
<Deegan.Allison@lacoe.edu>
Subject: Re: Sagebrush transfer

Hello Nick. I sent a letter to all seven board members of the LA County Board of Education as listed on its website, but apparently it didn't go where it needed to. Luckily, it sounds like Allison is passing it on to the people who will be making the decision. Is there anything further I need to do to make sure I have reached out to the right people?

I also applied for the LCUSD permit lottery again after doing so unsuccessfully last year. Thanks for the information. And feel free to add me to your mailing list.

From: Nick Karapetian <nick@krpartnergroup.com>
Sent: Friday, April 19, 2019 3:56 PM
To: Youngblood, Cory A
Cc: Tom Smith (smithtomg@gmail.com); Nalini Lasiewicz (nalini@lasiewicz.com)
Subject: FW: Sagebrush transfer

Cory

I'm Nick Karapetian, a fellow Sagebrush resident and one of the co-chief Petitioners for the Territory Transfer.

It seems you sent the letter to the wrong LA Committee and Allison Deegan with LACOE... is making sure it will be seen by the appropriate LA County Committee which will decide on our petition.

Your sentiments ring true to many of us who attended MAE and now have our kids at the LCUSD schools. I thank you for taking the time and effort to write your peace and truth.

If you are interested in permitting into LCUSD, please know that there is only 1 week left to send in an application – deadline is April 26th.

LCUSD link for permit instructions and the application form: [LCUSD Website LINK](http://example.com)

UniteLCFI link with information & flyer with FAQs (English & Korean) [Permit Info 2019-20](http://example.com)

Lastly, please let me know if you would like to receive updates from us and I will send you the latest update we sent our supporters.
Thank you.
Nick Karapetian  
*UniteLCF!*

(mobile) 310-266-7088  
*Sagebrush Resident and Parent since 2004. Our kids attended GUSD’s Mountain Avenue K-4th and permitted into LCUSD in 5th grade and are currently in LCUSD’s 7/8 school.*

**Additional information can be found at the UniteLCF website.**

Web Site: [www.UniteLCF.com](http://www.UniteLCF.com)  
Facebook page: [www.facebook.com/UniteLCF](http://www.facebook.com/UniteLCF)

---

**From:** Deegan_Allison  
**Sent:** Friday, April 19, 2019 3:19 PM  
**To:** Youngblood, Cory A  
**Cc:** Hass_Eric; Crafton_Keith; Castelo_Octavio; Nick Karapetian; Nalini Lasiewicz  
**Subject:** RE: Sagebrush transfer

Thank you for your comments. They will be forwarded to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization. For your information, the Los Angeles County Board of Education (the body you sent multiple emails to) plays no role in the County Committee process and has no oversight for the petition mentioned in your letters to their board members. Please contact me if you have any questions about the proper parties to address regarding this matter.

Allison Deegan, Ed.D.  
(562) 922-6336  
*deegan_allison@lacoed.edu*

Business Advisory Services Coordinator  
Division of Business Advisory Services  
Los Angeles County Office of Education  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, CA 90242

---

**From:** Youngblood, Cory A  
**Sent:** Friday, April 19, 2019 2:52 PM  
**To:** Saenz_Thomas  
**Subject:** Sagebrush transfer

Dear President Saenz:

I am writing to you today because of the impending vote regarding the possible transfer of Sagebrush territory from Glendale Unified School District to La Canada Unified School District. I don’t envy you
being caught between two districts vying for this territory and the students and funding it represents. I hope that after careful deliberation you and your colleagues will arrive at a decision that reflects the best interests of the students in question, which could require some courage since the easiest thing to do would be to do nothing and preserve the status quo.

My son currently attends Mountain Avenue Elementary School. It’s a good school, and we like the teachers and principal there. However, recent events have caused me to lose confidence in the Glendale Unified School District as a whole and its leadership. An alleged race riot, followed by numerous emails and automated calls from the superintendent of the district insisting that it was not a race riot, following by the firing of that superintendent, paint a picture of a district in chaos. Indeed, GUSD’s recently passed Resolution No. 21 makes it clear that the chief reason they oppose the transfer is that they don’t want to lose money. Money talks—loudly—but what about the wishes of these children and their parents?

As a parent who resides in the Sagebrush area, my preference would be for my child to attend La Canada schools. We live in La Canada, and it is unfortunate that he is currently excluded from attending the schools that all the other children who live in our city get to attend. Making the boundaries of the LCUSD match the boundaries of the City of La Canada is a sensible step that would bring all the children of the city together and allow kids like my son to attend school with their neighbors. I therefore urge you to support the transfer of territory and to persuade your colleagues to do the same.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Cory Youngblood

4455 Rockland Pl Unit 14
La Canada, CA 91011
From: Jamie Abrahamian <jamjacobs@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 20, 2019 11:07 PM
To: Deegan_Allison <Deegan_Allison@lacoe.edu>
Subject: Sagebrush Transfer

Dear Dr. Deegan,

I am writing to express our family’s desire for this transfer to occur. In 2014 we moved from Glendale to La Canada. At the time we were at Verdugo Woodlands GUSD wanted me to move my son to Mountain part way into the school year. After speaking with our Principal we were given a permit to stay at Verdugo Woodlands. Once we started the process to transfer to LCUSD, GUSD told me my daughters would attend Mountain for Kindergarten but my son would be moved to another school because Mountain did not have room in that grade level. Thankful we got permits to attend Palm Crest. 

In our four years at Palm Crest I have sat on the PTA board, PTA council board, I will be on the PTA 7/8 board next year as well. I volunteer at the school once a week and sit on various committees. We live in La Canada and we participate in the La Canada community. We should have a voice in our Board of Education and if I want to run for my kids school board I should be allowed to.

We also learned La Canada History in 3rd Grade and my kids would not have learned this if attending GUSD and that would have been sad. This is their community and we should not have to permit in to our city’s school we should have the same rights and benefits as all LCF residents.

During our two years in GUSD I emailed the Board and the Superintendent on two different issues. I never once received a response. I regularly email our LCUSD board and superintendent and I always get a response. When shopping and at community events we run into them and get to speak with them. This is our community this is the LCF life please Unite LCF. We are stronger together and our kids thrive in our community.

Thank you for your time and consideration.
Dr. Serj and Jamie Abrahamian
5158 Castle Road
La Canada CA 91011
Dear Ms. Deegan,

I've written before to support the Sagebrush petition that would unite La Canada students in La Canada schools. And my position has not changed, so forgive me if this all sounds familiar.

I support the petition for several reasons. In short:

**Glendale doesn't have room for our kids:** Glendale Unified has made the seemingly magnanimous gesture of inviting Sagebrush kids to "petition" to go to La Canada schools. They are approving these petitions easily. But, they're doing this because their classrooms are over crowded. They simply don't have the room for La Canada students. Glendale says this makes the petition to unite La Canada kids in La Canada schools unnecessary. It does not. In reality, if Glendale schools became less crowded tomorrow, they could rescind the right to get transfer petitions approved. That leaves our kids at risk of having the stability of going to neighborhood schools ripped away at a moment's notice.

**Geology divides La Crescenta and La Canada.** Pickens Canyon creates a natural dividing line between La Canada and La Crescenta. Our schools, however, have a much less logical division. Someone, 60 years ago -- before houses dotted this region -- drew a line with a pencil. Now that there are houses packed in this region, that penciled in division is ridiculously arbitrary. It goes right through properties. That's made the determination of whether you have a right to go to La Canada Schools vs. Glendale schools fraught with unfairness.

Moreover, the geological division between the cities creates a practical access issue. There is one way across Pickens Canyon before you hit Foothill Blvd. -- a footbridge. If some natural disaster blocked that footbridge, Sagebrush parents whose kids were forced to go to Glendale schools would be cut off from their children by this geological barrier.

**Sagebrush kids are in a no-man's land.** Because they can't necessarily go to their local schools, they often can't participate in city-wide activities, contests and the social connections that are a normal part of a small town. This is a travesty that has gone on too long. It should be corrected.

**There is overwhelming support for the transfer.** Both parents and school officials are committed to uniting La Canada kids with La Canada schools. That means that the school administration is will do what it takes to have the appropriate number of classroom seats and teachers.

We've been fighting to unite our kids with the schools they should always have been able to attend for decades. I hope the county sees the way to approve this petition to correct this long-standing injustice.

Thanks so much for your consideration.

Best--
Kathy Kristof
From: Gary Stibal <garystibal@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 21, 2019 6:04 PM
To: Deegan_Allison <Deegan_Allison@lacoed.edu>
Cc: Nick Karapetian <nick@kpartnergroup.com>; Nalini Lasiewicz <nalini@lasiewicz.com>
Subject: SUPPORT for GUSD/LCUSD Territory Transfer

Dear Allison,
I'm a homeowner at 2103 Normanton Drive, La Canada that has lived in the Sagebrush area since 1973. My daughter and son went to the GUSD schools in the 80's. As adults they look back at their school years with some sadness because they missed out on so much. They never felt like they fully belonged to both their city and schools as they "straddled" them. They always felt neither a full bond with La Canada, where they lived or with GUSD where they went to school.

I do a lot volunteering in the City of La Canada Flintridge and I feel the same way. I often meet up with parents of children who are the same age of my children. These parents have long-standing relationships. I, like my children, feel like I've missed out on some sense of total "belonging" due to the city and schools separation we live with, purely because of where we reside. Having our children attend school out of their home city affects both the children and their parents in a negative way and now is the opportunity to correct that.

Therefore, I am strongly in favor for the transfer of the Sagebrush children to the La Canada United School District.

Yours truly,
Gary Stibal
From: Han-Chun (Migi) Hsieh <migi700111@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2019 10:11 AM
To: Crafton_Keith <crafton_keith@lacoe.edu>; Deegan_Allison <Deegan_Allison@lacoe.edu>
Cc: Nick Karapetian <nick@krpartnergroup.com>; nalini@lasiewicz.com
Subject: Support Sagebrush Territory Transfer

re: Sagebrush School District Territory Transfer Petition

Names: Han-Chun Hsieh and Yao-Yi Chiang
Address: 2117 Tondolea Ln, La Canada, CA, 91011

Please find the attached letter which states why we fully support the Petition of Sagebrush Territory Transfer.

Thank you
April 22nd, 2019

Re: Support Sagebrush Territory Transfer

Dear Director Keith D. Crafton and Dr. Allison Deegan:

I am writing this letter in support of the Sagebrush Territory Transfer. As a current resident in Sagebrush, an educator, and a soon-to-be parent, I believe strongly that a unified school district in the City of La Cañada Flintridge will benefit not only my family but the community as a whole as outlined in the petition.

If you have any question, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Best regards,

[Signature]

Yao-Yi Chiang, Ph.D.
Associate Professor (Research)
Spatial Sciences Institute
Dana and David Dornsife College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences
University of Southern California
Telephone: 213 740-7618
Email: yaoyic@usc.edu
http://spatial.usc.edu/
From: David Gonzalez <david@mavagonzalez.net>
Sent: Tuesday, April 23, 2019 9:15 AM
To: Deegan_Allison <Deegan_Allison@lacoe.edu>
Cc: nick@krpartnergroup.com; nalimi@lasiewicz.com
Subject: SUPPORT for GUSD/LCUSD Territory Transfer

Dear Dr. Deegan,

My name is David Gonzalez and I live in the Sagebrush area of La Canada. My daughter has been a student at Palm Crest in La Canada since fall of 2015. I know you have heard many charged and emotional testimonies but ultimately your committee will be faced with a fact-based decision. I would like to outline some of the undisputed facts:

1. The data presented by the petitioners demonstrate overwhelming support from the Sagebrush residents, mayor, superintendent, LCUSD school-board and stakeholders. Source: Unite LCF Petition and Town Hall Meetings

2. Class Sizes at Mountain Avenue, Rosemont, and CV High’s in many cases surpasses the GUSD average and consistently surpasses the state’s average. Source: CDE Edsource

3. GUSD’s total enrollment has been consistently over 26,000 students for the past 5 years. Source: CDE Edsource

4. This petition affects several hundred Sagebrush students. This is approximately 1% of the student population of GUSD. Source: Unite LCF Petition

5. Based on GUSDs vast size and enrollment data, the fiscal impact to GUSD is extremely small. Source: LCF Petition and CDE Edsource

I would add, that as a resident of La Canada, my daughter has the right to attend the same school as her friends down the street. I hope you recognize that the current boundaries are both unpractical and divisive for our community. The facts are clear; our petition is fair and has widespread support from our entire city. I ask you to please look at the data, honor the will of the people and support our petition.

Thank you,

David Gonzalez
Enrollment
Glendale Unified
CDS Code 19-64568-0000000

View by Ethnicity, Grade & More

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26,070</td>
<td>26,168</td>
<td>26,117</td>
<td>26,075</td>
<td>26,071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.ed-data.org/district/Los-Angeles/Glendale-Unified
Dear Dr. Deegan,

I am writing in support of the GUSD/LCUSD Territory Transfer.

I am a resident of La Cañada and a previous resident of Glendale. My youngest son is now a junior at La Cañada High School. Before attending LCHS (beginning in junior high) he attended two Glendale schools: Mark Keppel (elementary through 2nd grade) and Mountain Avenue (3rd grade – 6th grade). In the sixth grade I am proud to say he was the study body president.

I am employed at NASA’s Jet Propulsion Laboratory that lies within the La Canada school district. For eighteen years I was JPL’s Director of Communications and Education. JPL has no position on the issue of territory transfer and I do not wish to imply otherwise. I believe, however, that my experience overseeing a talented and dedicated staff that provides meaningful and inspirational educational opportunities for a wide range of age groups (from informal
elementary school outreach programs to on-site college internship programs for 1000+ students annually) might perhaps provide a different perspective than others on the issue of the transfer.

My experience has been that, generally, when students feel comfortable and "at home" in their settings they perform best. For my youngest son, his mother and I believed, when we were residents of Glendale, that what was best for him was as to be part of GUSD. Now that we are residents of La Cañada I believe it is in the best interest of my son to be part of his local community.

It is because of this that I support the transfer so that all students residing in La Canada have the right to attend their local schools.

Sincerely,

Blaine Baggett