April 25, 2016

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

FROM: Keith D. Crafton, Secretary
County Committee

SUBJECT: Regular Meeting of the County Committee—Wednesday, May 4, 2016

The next regular meeting of the County Committee will be held at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, May 4, 2016, in the Board Room of the Los Angeles County Office of Education, located at 9300 Imperial Highway in Downey. Reserved parking spaces will be available on the east side of the building for County Committee members.

Attached is the agenda for the meeting of May 4, 2016.

If you have any questions, please call me at (562) 922-6144.

KDC/AD/EH:ah
Attachments
AGENDA

LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION
(COUNTY COMMITTEE)

Regular Meeting

Los Angeles County Office of Education
Board Room
May 4, 2016
9:30 a.m.

I, Information
D, Discussion
A, Action

I. CALL TO ORDER – Vice-Chairperson Mr. Frank Ogaz

II. FLAG SALUTE – Mr. Ogaz

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – Mr. Ogaz

The minutes of the regular meeting of the County Committee, held on January 6, 2016, will be submitted for approval. (Enclosure)

IV. ADMINISTRATION OF OATH OF OFFICE – Mr. Ogaz

The County Committee Chairperson will administer the oath of office to Ms. Nicole Kluft, who was re-elected to the County Committee for the Third supervisorial district.
V. PRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC – Secretary

Mr. Keith Crafton

Any persons present desiring to address the County Committee on any proper matter may do so at this time. (Form to be completed and submitted to the secretary)

VI. COMMUNICATIONS – Secretary Crafton

Informational Correspondence

- Notice of Filing form Local Agency Formation Commission for the County of Los Angeles, “Notice of Filing: Annexation No. 420 to County Sanitation District No. 14” [Attachment 1]

VII. PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORY FROM THE LAWNDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT (SD) AND THE CENTINELA VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT (HSD) TO THE WISEBURN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (USD) – Secretary Crafton

The Secretary and Staff will present additional information gathered on the petition to transfer territory from the Lawndale SD and Centinela Valley Union HSD to the Wiseburn USD. [Attachment 2]

VIII. PETITION TO ESTABLISH TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING IN THE CASTAIC UNION SD – Secretary Crafton

The Secretary will present a petition to establish trustee areas and trustee area voting within the Castaic Union SD. [Attachment 3]

IX. PETITION TO ESTABLISH TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING IN THE SAUGUS UNION (SD) – Secretary Crafton

The Secretary and Staff will present a feasibility study to establish trustee areas and trustee area voting within the Saugus Union SD. [Attachment 4]
X. UPDATE ON THE CALIFORNIA VOTING RIGHTS ACT (CVRA) AND TRUSTEE AREA ISSUES – Secretary Crafton

The Secretary and staff will provide an update on Glendale USD, the in-service held in February, and other CVRA activities in Los Angeles County and statewide.

XI. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE – Secretary Crafton

The secretary will provide an update on current legislation and discuss the legislative advocacy process. [Attachment 5]

XII. UPDATE ON COUNTY COMMITTEE WEBSITE – Secretary Crafton

The Secretary and staff will provide an update on the County Committee website.

XIII. UPDATE ON REVIEW OF COUNTY COMMITTEE POLICIES – County Committee Chairperson

The Chairperson will request a report from the County Committee policy review subcommittee.

XIV. LEGAL UPDATE

The Secretary will explain the County Committee’s plan for legal advisory services.

XV. UPDATE ON LOS ANGELES USD REORGANIZATION PROPOSALS – Secretary Crafton

The Secretary will provide an update on school district reorganization proposals affecting the Los Angeles USD. (“Summary of Los Angeles USD Reorganization Proposals”). [Attachment 6]

XVI. UPDATE ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY REORGANIZATION PROPOSALS, EXCLUDING THOSE AFFECTING THE LOS ANGELES USD – Secretary Crafton

The Secretary will provide an update on school district reorganization proposals affecting Los Angeles County school and community college districts, other than the Los Angeles USD. (“Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals [excluding those affecting the Los Angeles USD]”). [Attachment 7]
XVII. ADDITIONAL COMMUNICATIONS, CONCERNS, OR ITEMS FOR NEXT AGENDA

XVIII. ADJOURNMENT
The Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) met on Wednesday, January 6, 2016, at the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) in Downey. The meeting was called to order at 11:35 a.m., by Mr. Frank Bostrom.

Members Present

Frank Bostrom
Maria Calix
Ted Edmiston
Owen Griffith
John Nunez
Joel Peterson
Frank Ogaz
Suzan Solomon

Members Absent

Nicole Kluft
AJ Willmer

Staff Present

Keith D. Crafton, Secretary
Allison Deegan, Staff
Eric Hass, Staff
Diane Tayag, Staff
Anna Heredia, Staff

Mr. Frank Bostrom called the meeting to order.

Ms. Maria Calix led the flag salute.

It was MOVED by Mr. Frank Ogaz and SECONDED by Ms. Maria Calix that the minutes of the regular meeting held on October 7, 2015 be approved. Motion carried.

Mr. Bostrom made a motion to accept the nominations as follows: Ms. Suzan Solomon will be the Chair and Mr. Ogaz will be the Vice-Chair. Ms. Calix seconded, all in favor.

Secretary Crafton gave the results of the Election as follows:

Susan Andriacchi-2nd District
Nicole Kluft-3rd District
Suzan Solomon-5th District
Ted Edmiston-At Large

Approval of the Regular Meeting Minutes of October 7, 2015
Nomination Committee for New Officers
Results of the Annual County Committee Election of Members Conducted on October 19, 2015
Mr. Frank Bostrom administered the Oaths of Office to Ms. Susan Andriacchi, Suzan Solomon, and Ted Edmiston.

Mr. Bill Magoon, Petitioner, Dr. Ellen Dougherty, Superintendent and Mr. John Vinke, Deputy Superintendent addressed the Committee.

Secretary Crafton directed the Committee to review articles in their folders that pertain to CVRA activity.

Secretary Crafton advised staff that due to security measures, LACOE is now requiring all Committee Members to have a LACOE badge.

Secretary Crafton presented a Petition to Establish Trustee Areas and Trustee Area Voting in The Saugus Union SD. He instructed the Committee to find the Petition in their folders. Staff is in the process of setting a date for a Public Hearing.

Secretary Crafton stated that the process is moving along, staff has contracted with Terry Hayes and Associates to prepare the CEQA report. The information that was requested from the Chief Petitioners and also the districts involved have been received. Mr. Bostrom made a motion to receive and file the information received. Ms. Calix seconded.

Secretary Crafton stated that there is lots of activity. Glendale USD is a City Charter which is moving to Trustee areas, however they do not need to come before the County Committee. Discussion occurred regarding this.

Secretary Crafton stated that there are no updates at this time.

Secretary Crafton stated that the website continues to be updated.

Ms. Solomon reported that there is a new process which will involve all of the Committee Members.

The first three members that will review are: AJ Willmer, Joel Peterson and Frank Bostrom, they will then report and then ask for input from the County Counsel.

Following this process, the next three members will do the same.

Secretary Crafton stated there are no updates to report.
Secretary Crafton stated there is lots of activity. There are several potential petitions having to do with districts such as Santa Monica Malibu, La Canada/Glendale USD, and Monrovia USD/Arcadia USD.

County Committee adjourned to closed session at 11:50 a.m.

County Committee reconvened to open session at 12:10 p.m.

Discussion occurred regarding the LACSTA meeting to take place on February 29, 2016.

Secretary Crafton informed the Committee that there is a possibility that there will be lots of activity the first part of the year due to pending petitions.

Meeting Adjourned at 12:35 p.m.
NOTICE OF FILING

Los Angeles County Supervisor (Fifth District)
Los Angeles County Chief Executive Office
Consolidated Fire Protection District
Los Angeles County Office of Education
United States Department of the Interior-Bureau of Reclamation
Lancaster Cemetery District
Antelope Valley Mosquito & Vector Control District
Antelope Valley Resource Conservation District
Antelope Valley – East Kern Water Agency
Palm Ranch Irrigation District
Westside Union School District
Antelope Valley Union School District

LAFCO File: Annexation No. 420 to County Sanitation District No. 14

Pursuant to Government Code Section 56658, notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexation listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO). The application proposes to annex approximately 1.76± acres of uninhabited territory to the unincorporated Los Angeles County. The affected territory is generally located on Avenue M-2 approximately 200 feet west of 50th Street West, within the unincorporated Los Angeles County.

The proposal application, map, and legal description are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by April 8, 2016.

Pursuant to Government Code section 56662(a) the Commission may make determinations upon the proposed annexation without notice and hearing and may waive protest hearing if the affected territory is uninhabited, no affected local agency has submitted a written demand for notice and hearing during the 10-days following this notice, and satisfactory proof has been provided to LAFCO that all the landowners within the affected territory have given their written consent to the proposed annexation.

If you have any questions about this proposal, please contact this office at (626)204-6500.

Date: April 7, 2016

Enc.

Amber De La Torre
Government Analyst
APPLICATION TO INITIATE PROCEEDING FOR CHANGE OF ORGANIZATION/REORGANIZATION/
SPECIAL REORGANIZATION
(Pursuant to the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000,
Division 3, Title 5 Commencing with Section 56000, of the Government Code)

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO.: A-14-420

1. County Sanitation District No. 14 of Los Angeles County
2. 

PROPOSAL INITIATED BY: ☑ RESOLUTION ☐ LANDOWNER/REGISTERED VOTER PETITION

APPLICANT: Grace Robinson Hyde

TITLE: Chief Engineer and General Manager

CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER: County Sanitation District No. 14 of Los Angeles County

ADDRESS: P.O. Box 4998 CITY: Whittier STATE: CA ZIP CODE: 90607-4998

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: Donna J. Curry TELEPHONE: (562) 908-4288 ext. 2708
E-MAIL ADDRESS: dcurry@lacsd.org

By submitting this Application to Initiate Proceedings, the applicant acknowledges receipt of the "Instruction for Filing Application for Change of Organization/Reorganization/Special Reorganization" and agrees to be bound by same, including, but not limited to the provisions contained therein regarding filing and processing fees, and defense and indemnification of the Commission.

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY
80 SOUTH LAKE AVENUE, SUITE 870, PASADENA, CA 91101
TELEPHONE: (626) 204-6500 FAX: (626) 204-6507
As a condition of any LAFCO approval, the applicant shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless LAFCO and its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against LAFCO or its agents, officers, and employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul the approval of LAFCO concerning the processing of the proposal or any action relating to, or arising out of, such approval. At the discretion of the Executive Officer, a deposit of funds by the applicant may be required in an amount sufficient to cover the anticipated litigation costs.

SIGNATURE: Marc R. Hyde
DATE: March 30, 2016

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:

Describe the location of the proposal area including major streets and highways that border the project area.

Thomas Brothers Map Page 4104, Grid H6

Located on Avenue M-2 approximately 200 feet west of 50th Street West, all within unincorporated Los Angeles County.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:

1.76 acres or 0.0028 square miles

Is the proposal area inhabited (having 12 or more registered voters residing within the territory)?

□ Yes  X No

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

1. PROPOSAL AREA: Give a detailed description of the proposal area and what it consists of (e.g. Existing commercial corridors, residential communities, existing redevelopment area, public utility right-of-way, relevant structures, etc.)

The subject territory consists of one proposed public library building and is located within a vacant area.

2. TOPOGRAPHY: Describe the topography, physical features, (rivers, drainage basins, etc.) and natural boundaries of the subject territory.

The topography is flat.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. What is the current population of the subject territory?

0

2. If the proposal includes development, what is the estimated population of the proposed area?

0

3. Number of registered voters within the proposed territory.

0

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory.

1
5. What is the proximity of the subject territory to other populated areas?
   N/A

6. What is the likelihood of significant growth in the area; and in adjacent incorporated and unincorporated areas within the next ten years?
   N/A

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:
   0

8. Give a summary of regional housing needs and to what extent will the proposal assist in achieving its fair share of regional housing needs as determined by SCAG?
   N/A

9. To what extent will this proposal promote "environmental justice" (fair treatment of people of all races, cultures and income) with respect to the location of public facilities and provision of public services?
   N/A

LAND USE AND ZONING

1. What is the assessed land valuation of the subject territory (give source and date of information)?
   The assessed valuation per the Assessor's current tax roll is $147,897

2. What is the current land use and zoning designation within the subject area?
   The present land use is vacant. The current zoning is Light Industrial [M-1].

3. What is the proposed planned land use of the subject area?
   The proposed land use is commercial.

4. Describe any proposed change in land use and zoning as a result of this proposal (including, if applicable, pre-zoning by an affected city):
   N/A

5. What is the land use in the surrounding area? Be specific.
   The land use in the surrounding territory is commercial.

6. If annexation to a city is involved as a part of this proposal, what is the city’s general plan designation for the area?
   N/A

7. Is the proposal consistent with city or county general plans, specific plans, and or other adopted land use policies?
   Yes

8. Will this proposal result in development of property now or in the near future? Describe the type of development proposed (type of business or industry, single-family or multi-family residential, etc., and number of units or facilities).
   The territory is being developed to include one proposed public library building.
9. What effect would denial of this proposal have on the proposed development, if any?

Denial would prevent said territory from obtaining off-site sewage disposal services from the Sanitation District. There are no other local agencies providing off-site sewage disposal services. Therefore, property owners can request permission from their local jurisdiction to construct a septic system.

10. Is the subject territory currently within a redevelopment area or proposed to be included within a redevelopment project area upon completion of this proposal?

No

11. Are there any agricultural or open space lands within the proposal area? What is the effect of this proposal on agricultural or open space lands?

No

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Explain in detail the reasons for this proposal and why it is necessary.

All of the owners of real properties within the territory proposed to be annexed have requested, in writing, that their properties be annexed to County Sanitation District No. 14 so that said district can provide off-site sewage disposal service to said properties.

2. What will be the effect of the proposal and of alternative actions on the following: (include the names of other local agencies having the authority to provide the same or similar services as those proposed.)

   a. Adjacent areas:
      N/A
   b. Mutual social and economic interests:
      N/A
   c. The local government structure of the County:
      No effect.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

"Government services" refers to governmental services and whether or not those services would be provided by the local agencies subject to the proposal. It includes public facilities necessary to provide those services.

1. Estimate the present cost and describe the adequacy of government services and controls in the area.

   The wastewater generated by the proposed project will be treated by the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant (LWRP). The LWRP has a design capacity of 18 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 15 mgd. The District's sewerage facilities have adequate capacity to collect, treat, and dispose of the wastewater to be generated by the subject territory.

2. Estimate the probable future need for government services (including public facilities) or controls in the area:

   Although the present area is not currently serviced by the District, the area was included in the future service area that might be served by the District. The District's future wastewater management needs were addressed in the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant 2020 Facilities Plan.
3. If the proposal includes incorporation, formation, or annexation, what will be the effect of this proposal or exclusion and of alternative courses of action on the cost and adequacy of services and controls in the proposed area and adjacent areas?

N/A

4. If, as a result of this proposal, increased service demand exceeds the existing capacity, describe what will be done by the service provider to increase capacity of services.

The capacity of the LWRP is 18 mgd. On June 16, 2004, the Board of Directors of District No. 14 approved the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plan 2020 Facilities Plan and certified the associated EIR. The 2020 Plan addresses the sewerage needs of the LWRP service area through the year 2020 and the services planned to meet those needs. The 2020 plan allows the capacity of the LWRP to increase to 26 mgd by 2020.

5. List any assessments, fees, or other charges to be levied as part of this proposal and or that may be levied in the near future.

The property owner will be paying a service charge for the Districts services.

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

Provide the following information if the proposal requires a sphere of influence amendment.

1. Is the proposed area within the existing sphere of influence of the annexing agency?

   Yes [X] Name of Agency: County Sanitation District No. 14 of Los Angeles County No [ ]

2. List any communities of social or economic interest within the proposed area or immediately adjacent. To what extent will any of those communities of interest be affected by the proposal?

   N/A

BOND INDEBTNESS

1. Do the agencies whose boundaries are being changed have any existing bonded debt?

   Yes. The District only has outstanding revenue bonds. These are not general obligation bonds subject to taxation.

2. Will the proposal area be liable for payment of its share of the existing debt?

   Because all of the District’s existing bonded indebtedness is in the form of revenue bonds, liability for payment of the debt is apportioned to and collected from every parcel pursuant to the terms of the District’s Service Charge Program and not as a separate property tax levy. The District’s Master Service Charge Ordinance provides that local governmental parcels are exempt as long as they continue to be used for local governmental purposes. Likewise, the Ordinance provides an exemption for parcels that are not connected to the sewerage system (e.g. open space) until such time as they connect to the sewerage system.

3. To what extent will landowners within the proposal area be liable or remain liable for any existing indebtedness of the city or district?

   Until revenue bond is paid in full.

4. In the case of detachment requests, does the detaching agency propose that the subject territory continue to be liable for existing bonded debt?

   N/A
**NOTIFICATION**

1. List the name and address of any person(s), organization, community group, or agency known to you who may wish notification, or who may be opposed to this proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Provide the names and addresses of up to three persons who are to receive notice of hearing, staff report, and minutes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donna J. Curry</td>
<td>P.O. Box 4998, Whittier, CA 90607-4998</td>
<td>(562) 908-4288 ext. 2708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annexation No. 420 shown thus

Boundary of Sanitation District No. 14 prior to Annexation No. 420 shown thus

Prior Annexations shown thus

Area of Annexation 1.756 Acres
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I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

On July 1, 2015, a feasibility study concerning the proposed transfer of territory from the Lawndale School District (SD) and the Centinela Valley Union High School District (HSD) to the Wiseburn Unified School District (USD) was presented to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) at its regularly scheduled meeting.

The County Committee reviewed the matter and heard presentations from the impacted parties and members of the public, and provided a preliminary approval of the transfer of territory, pending review of additional material it requested, along with the results of an environmental review, per California Education Code (EC) §35706(b), required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The additional information which the County Committee wished to be gathered concerned the interdistrict attendance permitting of students, assessed valuation of the transfer area, and the potential impact on the districts resulting from a proposed property exchange.

Supplemental Requests for Information (RFIs) were sent to the two chief petitioners, Ms. Shavonda Webber-Christmas and Mr. Bill Magoon, and to the impacted districts, the Lawndale SD, the Centinela Valley Union HSD, and the Wiseburn USD.

This Supplemental Feasibility Study will review the responses to the RFIs, the CEQA report and other materials gathered at the request of the County Committee or submitted by one or more of the impacted parties.

II. SUPPLEMENTAL REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

Following its July 1, 2015 preliminary approval of the transfer of territory petition, the County Committee directed staff to gather additional information from the impacted parties. Requests for Information (RFIs) were districted to the Lawndale SD, the Centinela Valley Union HSD, the Wiseburn USD, and to both of the chief petitioners, Ms. Shavonda Webber-Christmas and Mr. Bill Magoon. All parties submitted responses to the RFIs. Their responses are contained in Appendices A – E (Lawndale SD, Appendix A; Centinela Valley Union HSD, Appendix B; Wiseburn USD, Appendix C; Petitioner Webber-Christmas, Appendix D; and Petitioner Magoon, Appendix E).

The questions covered in the RFIs, adapted slightly for the roles each party plays in the process, were as follows.

Chief Petitioners’ Questions:

1. What knowledge do you have about the Lawndale SD and Centinela Valley Union HSD being willing to release all students residing within the petition area as automatic interdistrict transfer students, or whether individual permits are required each year?

2. What knowledge do you have about the Wiseburn USD’s willingness to receive special education students residing in the petition area as automatic interdistrict permit students, or are individual permits required each year?

3. What knowledge do you have about the Lawndale SD’s and Centinela Valley Union HSD’s willingness to enter into a written MOU articulating an attendance agreement...
with the Wiseburn USD to allow all students residing in the petition area the choice to enroll in Wiseburn USD schools?

4. Please provide any additional information or details regarding the proposed property swap from the Wiseburn USD to the Lawndale SD/Centinela Valley Union HSD, in addition to the material previously provided by Wiseburn USD (see Appendix 1).

5. Please add any additional information you feel would be important for the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization to consider as it continues to evaluate this proposal.

Lawndale SD and Centinela Valley Union HSD Questions:

1. If the transfer is not approved, is [the district] willing to release all students residing within the petition area as automatic interdistrict transfer students, or will individual permits be required each year?

2. If the transfer is not approved, is [the district] willing to release special education students residing within the petition area as automatic interdistrict permit students, or will individual permits be required each year?

3. If the transfer is not approved, is [the district] willing to enter into a written MOU articulating an attendance agreement with the Wiseburn USD to allow all students residing in the petition area the choice to enroll in Wiseburn USD schools?

4. Please provide any additional information or details regarding the proposed property swap from the Wiseburn USD to the Lawndale SD/Centinela Valley Union HSD, in addition to the material previously provided by Wiseburn USD.

5. Please provide an assessment of the impact of the proposed transfer on the obligations of [the district] under the Local Classroom Funding Authority JPA (among Wiseburn USD, Centinela Valley Union HSD, Hawthorne SD, Lawndale SD and Lennox SD), including any changes to the percentage assignment of revenue articulated thereunder.

6. Please add any additional information you feel would be important for the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization to consider as it continues to evaluate this proposal.

Wiseburn USD Questions:

1. If the transfer is not approved, is Wiseburn USD willing to accept all students residing within the petition area as automatic interdistrict transfer students, or will individual permits be required each year?

2. If the transfer is not approved, is Wiseburn USD willing to accept all special education students residing in the petition area as automatic interdistrict permit students, or will individual permits be required each year?

3. If the transfer is not approved, is Wiseburn USD willing to enter into a written MOU
articulating an attendance agreement with the Lawndale SD and the Centinela Valley Union HSD to allow all students residing in the petition area the choice to enroll in Wiseburn USD schools?

4. Please provide any additional information or details regarding the proposed property swap from the Wiseburn USD to the Lawndale SD/Centinela Union HSD, in addition to the material previously provided by Wiseburn USD (see Attachment 1).

5. Please provide an assessment of the impact of the proposed transfer on the obligations of the Wiseburn USD under the Local Classroom Funding Authority JPA (among Wiseburn USD, Centinela Valley Union HSD, Hawthorne SD, Lawndale SD and Lennox SD), including any changes to the percentage assignment of revenue articulated thereunder.

6. Please provide an assessment of the impact of the proposed transfer on the obligations of the Wiseburn USD under the Local Public Schools Funding Authority JPA (among Wiseburn USD and Centinela Valley Union HSD), including any changes to the financial obligations articulated thereunder.

7. Please add any additional information you feel would be important for the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization to consider as it continues to evaluate this proposal.

Staff Review

In reviewing each party’s RFI response, staff attempted to arrive at consensus responses. However, as they stated when they presented their cases and materials before the County Committee in July of 2015, the parties disagree in their perceptions of relevant issues covered by this study.

Student Permit Policies

Both the Lawndale SD and the Centinela Valley Union HSD stated that they are willing to, and currently already do, release all students residing in the transfer area (regardless of special education status) who wish to attend Wiseburn USD schools. The Wiseburn USD stated that it would enroll any transfer area student who wishes to enroll there. There are some materials memorializing these permit agreements but there is no formal permit Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to cover permits for transfer area students among the districts. Though the districts assure they will grant them, students must apply for the permits each year. The Centinela Valley Union HSD and the Wiseburn USD stated their willingness to develop a specific MOU for permits for these students. The Lawndale SD stated that the existing writing covering these issues is sufficient and that they would continue to stand by them and allow all transfer area students to transfer out to Wiseburn USD who desire to do so.

The chief petitioners perceive the current permit policy as inadequate and not providing enough security for transfer area students. They also dispute that special education students receive the same treatment as non-special education students.
Staff did not find any additional information in the RFIs submitted regarding student permit policies that contributed to a different understanding or uncovered additional facts beyond what was presented at the County Committee meeting on July 1, 2015. The information presented would not merit a recommendation that the County Committee withdraw its preliminary approval of the transfer petition.

Assessed Valuation, Tax Rates and Financial Impact

At the time of the July 1, 2015 County Committee review of the petition, a report on the assessed valuation of the transfer area, developed by staff at the Los Angeles County Assessor/Auditor-Controller (Assessor), was not yet available. Because County Committee staff had been in close dialogue with staff from the Assessor’s office, it determined that the loss of the transfer area (and its assessed valuation) would not cause a significant financial impact on the Lawndale SD or the Centinela Valley Union HSD.

In July of 2015, County Committee staff received that Assessor’s report. It is included as Appendix F. This report determined the assessed valuation and tax rates of the districts currently and after any transfer of the petition area. As was understood during the original review of this petition, any property moving from the Lawndale SD / Centinela Valley Union HSD into the Wiseburn USD would inherit the tax rate assessed to Wiseburn USD parcels. Obligations of property in the Wiseburn USD include continuing to pay bond obligations on all debt issued and outstanding before 2012 by the Centinela Valley Union HSD. It is assumed that new territory transferred into Wiseburn USD would fall under this obligation, which was the result of legislation related to the Wiseburn unification.

An additional result of the transfer of territory would be a slight increase in the shared tax obligation of homeowners in the Lawndale SD and the Centinela Valley Union HSD, due to having fewer homes to meet the outstanding tax obligations. However, the willingness of residents of the Wiseburn USD to continue to meet outstanding bond obligations of the Centinela Valley Union HSD (following legislation), and the fact that transfer parcels would have the same obligation, contributes to lowering the burden of shared tax obligations that are not typically assessable under the EC. Thus, following the transfer, homeowners in the Centinela Valley will remain whole regarding issued and outstanding obligations (meaning they would not have to pay more due to a smaller taxpayer pool following the transfer).

Regarding potential financial impact on the districts if the territory is transferred, the districts maintained the same conclusions presented at the July 2015 meeting. The Lawndale SD stated that the transfer would have a significant financial impact. Though each party presented a different count of students residing in the transfer area, there would be fewer than 100 students lost to Lawndale SD or Centinela Valley Union HSD as most of the students residing in the transfer area do not attend these schools – they attend other public schools on permits or private schools. Thus, projections of significant loss of student funding to a level that would financially hamper a district are not found.

Staff did not find any additional information in the Assessor’s materials or the RFIs submitted regarding assessed valuation, tax rates or financial impact that contributed to a different understanding or uncovered additional facts beyond what was presented at the County Committee meeting on July 1, 2015. The information presented would not merit a recommendation that the County Committee withdraw its preliminary approval of the transfer petition.
Property Swap

During the information gathering stage of reviewing the transfer petition, the Wiseburn USD communicated that it had proposed a swap of commercial property within its district for the transfer area property (which is residential), which was near equivalent value of the assessed valuation of the transfer area property. It proposed transferring this swap property into the Lawndale SD and Centinela Valley Union HSD in exchange for those districts supporting the transfer area moving into Wiseburn USD. Information regarding that proposed property swap is include as Appendix G.

The RFIs requested that the impacted parties comment on this proposed swap of properties. It is staff’s understanding that the Wiseburn USD proposed this property swap as a potential addendum to the current transfer petition. It was not a part of the information examined by the County Committee. Because the County Committee has not yet rendered a final decision on the transfer petition, it may consider any additional information or possibilities that aid it in deciding this matter. Thus, the information on the proposed property swap is presented for review. Contained in the information provided by the Wiseburn USD in Appendix G is data about the value of homes in the petition area.

In the RFI responses, the Lawndale SD disputed that it had any knowledge of the proposed swap, and that the County Committee had the authority to consider it. In fact, the County Committee has full authority to construct its own petition or to amend petitions before it. The Centinela Valley Union HSD also stated that it was unaware of any proposed property swap. The Wiseburn USD promoted the proposed property swap as a way to resolve the transfer of territory petition. The chief petitioners had limited knowledge beyond stating that it was proposed to Lawndale SD and rejected.

Staff did not find any additional information in the RFIs submitted regarding the proposed property swap that contributed to a different understanding or uncovered additional facts beyond what was presented at the County Committee meeting on July 1, 2015. The information presented would not merit a recommendation that the County Committee withdraw its preliminary approval of the transfer petition. Staff offers no recommendation on whether or not the County Committee should take up developing a new petition or amending the instant petition to include this proposed property swap. The EC does not require that property be exchanged in a transfer of territory.

III. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

At the January 6, 2016, meeting of the County Committee, after the review of the initial transfer of territory petition and the rendering of its preliminary approval of the transfer, the Lawndale SD presented additional material for the County Committee. This additional information, contained in Appendix H, contained much information that had previously been presented to the County Committee.

Staff did not find any additional information presented in Appendix H that contributed to a different understanding or uncovered additional facts beyond what was presented at the County Committee meeting on July 1, 2015. The information presented would not merit a recommendation that the County Committee withdraw its preliminary approval of the transfer petition.
IV. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

As required under EC §35706(b), an environmental review under CEQA was required for this petition. LACOE engaged an environmental consulting firm to review the CEQA implications of the transfer petition. Terry A. Hayes Associates developed a Negative Declaration, attached as Appendix I. Mr. Hayes and his associates will present the findings in this CEQA review at the May 4, 2016 County Committee meeting.

V. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff did not find any additional information resulting from review of responses to the RFIs or other material submitted by the impacted parties that contributed to a different understanding or uncovered additional facts beyond what was presented at the County Committee meeting on July 1, 2015. The information submitted would not merit a recommendation that the County Committee withdraw its preliminary approval of the transfer petition. Thus staff recommends that the County Committee finalize its preliminary approval with a formal approval of the petition to transfer territory from the Lawndale SD and the Centinela Valley Union HSD to the Wiseburn USD.

VI. ELECTION AREA

Under EC 35710.51, the County Committee has full authority to determine the area of election for any petition it approves. Regarding the petition to transfer territory, the County Committee has the option to scope the election area to the petition area, or to include any or all of the territory of the impacted districts. Because of the low student census that may potentially be shifted, and the understanding on the petitioners’ part that they will inherit an additional tax obligation if their property is transferred into the Wiseburn USD, staff concludes that the impact of the transfer on the wider region is limited. In addition the willingness of the Wiseburn USD to accept the transfer territory has been unwavering. Thus, staff recommends that the County Committee limit the election area to the transfer area, to assure that a majority of residents do indeed consent to be transferred.
VII. APPENDICES
December 15, 2015

To: The Staff of the LA County Committee on School District Organization
From: Lawndale Elementary School District
Re: Supplemental Request for Information relating to the proposed Choice Block transfer

Here are the answers prepared by the Lawndale Elementary School District (often referred to in our responses as Lawndale SD) to the supplemental questions presented by the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization. We believe we have provided all of the information that is available to us.

We specifically request that a copy of our entire response be made available to every member of the County Committee. If you would like us to prepare additional copies for that purpose, please advise.

If you should have questions about any part of our response, please contact Dr. Ellen Dougherty at 310-973-1300 x50002.

We have made a continuing public records request for all records presented to the County Committee, members and staff in this matter. In accordance with that request, please provide us copies of the responses to your questions that you receive from the Petitioners, Wiseburn, and Centinela Valley.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Dr. Ellen Dougherty
Superintendent
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION

SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION (RFI) FROM THE LAWNDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT (SD) RELATING TO THE PROPOSED TRANSFER OF CERTAIN TERRITORY FROM THE LAWNDALE SD AND THE CENTINELA VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT (HSD) TO THE WISEBURN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (USD)

1. If the transfer is not approved, is Lawndale SD willing to release all students residing within the petition area as automatic interdistrict transfer students, or will individual permits be required each year?

The Choice Blocks area lies within the boundaries of Lawndale SD, and has for many years. Because these are our residents, we have for decades allowed them to enjoy full choice to attend school in Lawndale SD or in the Wiseburn Elementary School District, now Wiseburn Unified. We even put our agreement in writing, both in 2008 and again in May of 2012.

If the Choice Blocks remain in Lawndale SD, we will stand by the commitment we made to people in the area years ago. They will continue to have true choice. Students will only need to apply for a permit when they enter school for the first time. No annual permits are needed. We will continue with Choice even though the Superintendent of Wiseburn, in a letter dated April 28, 2014, told us that now that Wiseburn is unified, our written agreement on choice no longer serves any purpose. So we cannot guarantee that Wiseburn will honor our longstanding relationship.
2. If the transfer is not approved, is Lawndale SD willing to release Special Education students residing in the petition area as automatic interdistrict permit students, or will individual permits be required each year?

Please see answer to #1. Our Special Education students are treated the same as any other students in the Lawndale Elementary School District.
3. If the transfer is not approved, is Lawndale SD willing to enter into a written MOU articulating an attendance agreement with the Wiseburn USD to allow all students residing in the petition area the choice to enroll in Wiseburn USD schools?

Yes, however, an existing MOU articulating the attendance agreement with the Wiseburn USD already allows students residing in the petition area to have the choice to enroll in either Wiseburn USD or Lawndale ESD. This underscores that this transfer of property is unwarranted.
4. Please provide any additional information or details regarding the proposed property swap from the Wiseburn USD to the Lawndale SD/Centinela Valley Union HSD, in addition to the material previously provided by Wiseburn USD.

The Petition that is being considered by the County Committee does not involve, nor does it even mention, any property swap. Your correspondence states this proposed property swap is "from the Wiseburn USD." The Lawndale Elementary School District is unaware of any formal proposal of a "property swap", even though we have a standing request that all information that was provided by the petitioners and other member agencies be shared. We are unaware of any discussions or presentations regarding a property swap in the hearing, or Commission meetings.

Your letter of November 5, 2015, includes what purports to be a list of residential parcels labeled "Lawndale Elementary School District – Proposed Residential Compensation" and a smaller list of commercial properties labeled "Wiseburn School District – Proposed Commercial Compensation." If the residential parcels list is intended to describe all such parcels within the Choice Blocks, it is not accurate or complete. And the type size is so small as to make the document unreadable. Nor is there any narrative description of what these documents are intended to convey.

If these lists are related to a "swap", we emphasize that any swap is not within the jurisdiction of the County Committee.

In conclusion, we will need clarification on any specific proposal in order to give an intelligent response to this question. But it is clear, that any type of swap of property values would not negate the huge detrimental loss of state funding (over $1,064,574) for the students currently eligible to attend the Lawndale Elementary School District.
5. Please provide an assessment of the impact of the proposed transfer on the obligations of the Lawndale SD under the Local Classroom Funding Authority JPA (among Wiseburn USD, Centinela Valley Union HSD, Hawthorne SD, Lawndale SD and Lennox SD), including any changes to the percentage assignment of revenue articulated thereunder.

The Measure CL Parcel Tax was levied by a JPA and the agreement of five (5) districts is to share percentages of total parcel taxes received as follows:

- Centinela Valley Union High School District – 40%
- Wiseburn Unified School District – 20%
- Hawthorne School District – 16.6%
- Lawndale School District – 14.7%
- Lennox School District – 8.7%

The proposed transfer of the Choice Blocks should have no impact on Lawndale, because these agreed-upon percentages are fixed and tied to the total parcel tax revenue levied by the JPA. The percentages do not depend on the boundaries of the individual districts. However, if Wiseburn seeks to abrogate the parcel tax agreement in such a way as to modify the percentages by reducing Lawndale’s percentage and increasing Wiseburn’s, this will be contested by Lawndale on legal and equitable grounds. If Wiseburn is suggesting that the percentages or the base to which they are applied will change, this is evidence of bad faith of Wiseburn’s part.

If the percentages for distribution were lowered to reflect the loss of parcels currently assigned to Lawndale, it would be constitute a permanent loss of funding to Lawndale and adversely affect our students.
6. Please add any additional information you feel would be important for the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization to consider as it continues to evaluate this proposal.

1. We were surprised that the Committee would be asked to consider this matter without all the facts and critical information necessary for an informed decision. Specifically, there should have been an analysis from the County of Los Angeles Department of Auditor-Controller on the impact the proposed transfer would have on tax rates for those affected by the transfer.

In fact, only after the Committee took its preliminary vote was this critical information shared. That report by the Los Angeles County Auditor-Controllers' Office clearly states that the area under consideration for transfer to Wiseburn "will see an increase in tax rates due to inheriting Wiseburn's much higher debt." (This report was provided to us by LACOE staff.)

In fact, an independent expert on the impact of property tax rates in proposed land exchanges has confirmed that the tax rates will increase $436.41 annually (per property valued at $500,000) for properties moved from the Lawndale School District to the Wiseburn School District. This is a dramatic increase for those residents, which to our knowledge, has not been disclosed to them.

2. Immediately prior to its preliminary vote, the County Committee members engaged in a discussion of the impact of the various schedules (unspecifed but presumably bell schedules and vacation schedules) on the petitioners. There was absolutely no evidence presented to the Committee at any time on this subject.

Any conclusion that schedules have an impact on the ability of students residing in the Choice Blocks to participate in activities is without any basis in evidence or in logic. As we have been advising the Committee from the outset, those Choice Block students who wish to attend school in Wiseburn already have that right. We have pledged to continue that right if the petition is denied. We understand the Centinela Valley Union High School District has done the same.

Activities relate to the school that students attend. There will be absolutely no change in the ability of Choice Block students to attend the activities they are already engaged in, even if the petition is denied.
Our position from the beginning of this process has always been the same. This is a matter of choice. The families in the Choice Blocks already have that choice. They can go to Lawndale Elementary School District or Wiseburn Unified School District. There is no reason to change the boundaries. Students can easily get a permit to attend Wiseburn schools from Lawndale Elementary School District and Centinela Valley Union High School District. Those permits are not denied or pulled away from the student unless Wiseburn chooses to do so.

Students that live in the area now can attend AYSO Soccer, Little League and Boy Scouts with all of their friends in the Wiseburn area. School district boundaries have nothing to do with these “community” activities. The walk to Lawndale schools is actually shorter than to Wiseburn schools. The intersections that students cross to reach Lawndale campuses are actually less dangerous than those they must use to get to Wiseburn campuses.

3. There is compelling evidence that a strong motivator of these boundary changes is that including these properties in the Wiseburn District will raise property values. On at least three different occasions, Wiseburn School District officials or residents have said that changing these boundaries would raise property values. In a meeting with Tom Cox, then interim Superintendent of Centinela Valley, Wiseburn Superintendent Tom Johnstone and Ellen Dougherty on August 11, 2014, Dr. Johnstone stated that there were 2 reasons why the petitioners were moving forward. He stated that one was fiscal; Choice Blocks house evaluations would go up by $20,000 per household. The second reason was the residents would not want to pay for future bonds that Centinela Valley might present to the voters.

At another meeting with Dr. Johnstone, Bob Cox, Ron Hacker (Assistant Superintendent of Business, Centinela Valley), John Vinke, Deputy Superintendent of Lawndale Elementary and Ellen Dougherty, Dr. Johnstone again stated that the real estate is now worth $20,000 more, north of 139th Street, and that Cathy Jenkins, a real estate agent, did a study confirming these values. He stated that this is part of the residents’ motivations.

Again on this topic of property values, on at least three (3) different Neighborhood Watch meetings at a home in the Choice Blocks area, Chief Petitioners urged people to write letters to the County Committee because this territory change would raise their property values by $20,000. The Petitioners also asked them not to mention property values in their letters as this was not a valid, legal reason to change school boundaries. There was also a real estate agent at the meeting who supported the Chief Petitioners' comments.
4. We are attaching additional copies of documents we have presented before: Attached you will find a letter opposing a territory change from Dr. Joe Condon, the past Superintendent in the Lawndale SD. You will also find letters of opposition from parents in Lawndale SD, the Lawndale Teachers Association and the Lawndale Federation of Classified Employees.

Also attached are Resolutions opposing the territory change from the Hawthorne School District Board of Education and the Lennox Teachers’ Association. In addition, we have attached our presentation to the County Committee at the Public Hearing on March 2, 2105 and the PowerPoint that was presented at that time.

5. In conclusion:

Changing territory boundaries will have a negative impact on the finances of the Lawndale Elementary District. Those negative impacts will be felt by students across the District, because loss of ADA funding and bonding capacity results in cuts in programs or staff.

Families in the Choice Blocks area now have total choice. Why make a change requested by a small group of residents that will have a negative impact on the entire Lawndale Elementary School District? Why impose higher property taxes on all the residents of the Choice Blocks to cover the costs of Wiseburn’s large bonded indebtedness, even on those residents who have expressed no interest in Wiseburn and continue to enroll their students in Lawndale?

Finally, we reiterate our closing comment to the County Committee during the hearings on March 2 of this year: If this transfer is approved by the committee, we strongly urge that the area of voting be the entire Lawndale SD territory, so that all of those residents who are affected have a voice in the outcome. This is a matter that is of importance to all of our voters, not merely those who live within the Choice Blocks.
June 10, 2015

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Joe Condon, and for approximately seventeen years I was the Superintendent of the Lawndale Elementary School District. The purpose of this communication is to provide the Committee with some historical background related to the issue of attendance boundaries between the Lawndale and Wiseburn school districts.

In the late 1990’s, a number of parents of students who live in the area in question discussed with me and the Superintendent of Wiseburn, (Don Brann) their desire for flexibility in the selection of their child’s school. Specifically, parents in the area northwest of Inglewood Ave. and Rosecrans Blvd. sought the ability to enroll their children in either Lawndale or Wiseburn schools based upon their preference.

Given Lawndale’s history of supporting parent choice and in an effort to accommodate parent request for flexibility, Don Brann and I agreed that the area would be considered as an open enrollment area with school attendance based upon parent choice. I believe that parents currently are able to select their preferred district with the understanding that both districts would accept any student from the area on a permanent basis. At the time of my retirement in 2009, approximately half of the students in the area enrolled in each district.

Finally, in conversation with the current Wiseburn Superintendent, Tom Johnston, I learned that some individuals are under the impression that the agreement for providing parent choices was related to Diane Bollinger, a former Trustee in the Lawndale School District who at one time resided in the area in question. As I told Brian, that information might have made sense had Diane Bollinger not predeceased the agreement.

Should you wish to discuss this matter with me, please contact me directly at the number provided.

Sincerely,

Joseph Condon, Ed.D.
Retired Superintendent
Executive Coach
310-901-3749

79145 Camino Resada
La Quinta, CA 92253
310-901-3749
June 8, 2015
RE: Wiseburn/Lawndale Choice Block

I am writing this letter in favor of the Lawndale Elementary School District. My son attends 3rd grade and we don’t live in the Mitchell Boundary. This year, the transportation for my son is ending and we were left with a choice. We could either continue at Mitchell or enroll at Green. This is one point about Lawndale that is so fantastic. Lawndale gives choice and they always have. Whether a parents wants Dual Immersion or has special needs or wants ballet folklorico, Lawndale is flexible. I believe this is already the case in the Wiseburn/Lawndale Choice area as well. Lawndale is the flexible entity that has always given the residents choice. The residents are always granted a permit to attend elsewhere or come to Lawndale. So, again Lawndale is being flexible while the Wiseburn district is only trying to force these residents into a decision. I have always found Lawndale teachers to be innovative, cutting edge and challenging. I am always welcomed into the schools and the administration is available if there is a concern. This issue really is a moot point because overruling an already existing flexible agreement only means that choice is taken away and the parents cannot come to Lawndale. Why take this choice away? If a parent wants Lawndale, they can attend. If the parent wants Wiseburn, they are already given the flexibility. Please consider keeping the flexibility instead of forcing a decision.

Sincerely,

Justine Torres
Future PTA President – Mitchell – 2015-2016
June 8, 2015
To Lawndale Elementary School District
RE: Lawndale/Wiseburn Choice Block

I am writing this letter as a concerned parent at Mitchell Elementary School. My kids have been attending Mitchell School on permit now for 6 years. I believe in the school and respect the teachers and the education my kids are getting. As a parent on permit, I know I have a choice and I chose Mitchell School. One of my son’s has special needs and he receives outstanding services in the learning center and in speech. Without these specialists, he would not have made as much progress as he has made. The great thing about Lawndale is that my permits were accepted without reservation. This is what it means to have choice, whether it is in the Wiseburn/Lawndale choice area or out of district and wanting a permit to enter a school district. I believe the people in the choice area already have a choice and they can chose Lawndale or Wiseburn without a forced decision being implemented.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Teresa Palma Lopez
Mitchell PTA President
March 2, 2015

Dear Lawndale Board of Trustees,

As the President of the Lawndale Teachers Association (LTA), I am writing to support the Lawndale Elementary School District Resolution that opposed the petition to transfer territory from LESD to the Wiseburn Unified School District. This transfer of territory would be detrimental to the employees of our certificated staff and the students of the Lawndale Elementary School District (LESD).

Within the boundaries of the Lawndale ESD is an area known as the “Choice Blocks.” Students residing in this area have the option to attend LESD or be granted a permit to attend the Wiseburn Unified School District (WUSD). At this time, approximately half of the students in this area have chosen to attend LESD schools and the other half have chosen to attend WUSD schools. This agreement has worked well for both school districts, as well as the students and their families, for the past 20 years.

This proposed transfer will have a number of negative impacts on the Lawndale Elementary School District such as the loss of enrollment leading to an adverse effect on education programs, a loss of revenue based on enrollment, and a loss of assessed valuation to support future Lawndale capital improvements. The instability caused by a loss of revenue would have an immediate and negative impact on the certificated employees in our District due to a loss of positions and funds for raises, professional development, and equipment or teaching materials. The decline in enrollment would have an effect on class sizes and would require teachers to be laid off and/or an increase in combination classes. Additionally, this transfer of territory would have a significant impact on all of Lawndale ESD’s technology funding due to the changes within the Local Classroom Funding Authority Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement (JPA) and their distribution of the funds from Measure CL, which Lawndale uses for the purchase and upkeep of our technology.

Finally, this proposed territory transfer would have a negative impact on the students and families living within this area, simply by removing the choice that they currently have, and have had for 20 years, as to which school district they would like their children to attend.

Shannon Schwerdtfeger

President, Lawndale Teachers Association
February 18, 2015

To Whom It May Concern:

As the President of the Lawndale Federation of Classified Employees, Local 4529, I am writing to support the Lawndale Elementary School District Resolution that opposes the petition to transfer territory from the Lawndale Elementary School District to the Wiseburn Unified School District. This transfer of territory would be detrimental to the all employees and especially the students of Lawndale Elementary School District.

The Lawndale Elementary School District has had an area known as the “Choice Blocks”. The students in this area are able to attend Lawndale Elementary School District or be given a permit to attend the Wiseburn Unified School District. Approximately half of the students in the “Choice Blocks” area attend Lawndale schools and the other half attend Wiseburn schools. This agreement has worked well for both districts over the past 20 years.

This proposed transfer will have a number of negative impacts on the Lawndale Elementary School District. Impacts such as the loss of enrollment with an adverse effect on education programs, a loss of revenue based on enrollment, and a loss of assessed valuation to support future Lawndale capital improvements. In addition, the instability will cause a loss of revenue that would have an immediate and negative impact on the non-certificated employees in Lawndale. This would be due to a loss of positions and funding.

The Classified staff take pride in serving the needs of all students and we use our resources prudently to deliver high-quality services to all of our students. We form relationships with the students and model teamwork and good citizenship. Classified staff have an integral part of the school environment. Losing this revenue would be detrimental to the students in Lawndale and would diminish the services that we are able to offer our students to become successful learners.

The leaders and membership of the Lawndale Federation of Classified Employees, proudly stand united with the Lawndale Elementary School, Lawndale Teachers Association, and all other stakeholders who would be adversely impacted in opposition of this petition.

Sincerely,

Carl Williams
President of Lawndale Federation of Classified Employees
Local 4529

Cc: Ellen Dougherty, Superintendent
Lawndale Elementary School District Board of Trustees
2014-2015
RESOLUTION #25
A RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNING BOARD OF THE HAWTHORNE SCHOOL DISTRICT
OPPOSING THE PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORY FROM THE LAWNDALE
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT TO THE WISEBURN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

WHEREAS, the area bounded by residences on 139th Street, 140th Street, 141st Street, 142nd Street, and Rosecrans Avenue between La Cienega on the west and Inglewood Avenue on the east, all residences on La Cienega Blvd., Oceanview Avenue, Shoup Avenue and Inglewood Avenue between 139th Street on the north and Rosecrans Avenue on the south, located within the unincorporated portion of Los Angeles County, has been a part of the Lawndale Elementary School District since October 1906, and

WHEREAS, the Lawndale Elementary School District and the Wiseburn School District had an arrangement to allow all students within the subject area to elect to attend school in either the Lawndale or Wiseburn school districts and that arrangement existed for more than two decades and was formalized in writing in 2008, with the result that the subject area became known as the Choice Blocks, and

WHEREAS, the territory of the Wiseburn Elementary School District was unified into a K-12 district by election in November 2013, effective for all purposes on July 1, 2014, and

WHEREAS, a petition to transfer the Choice Block territory from Lawndale to the Wiseburn Unified School District was circulated and submitted to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization on January 7, 2015, starting the statutory process and timeline for the County Committee's consideration of the matter, and

WHEREAS, the Choice Blocks are included within territory that is subject to a Joint Powers Agreement among the Lawndale, Lennox, Hawthorne, Centinela Valley and Wiseburn districts to share and distribute revenues generated by a parcel tax and a School Facilities Improvement District, according to a formula negotiated and agreed to by all parties, and

WHEREAS, the proposed transfer of territory does not consider or reflect the best interests of the children living within the Choice Blocks because it does not provide for the level of choice that has existed between Lawndale and Wiseburn for more than two decades, and cannot lawfully compel the continuation of that choice arrangement, and

WHEREAS, the proposed transfer of territory does not reflect the fact that the Wiseburn Unified School District does not now have its own high school, other than charter schools within its boundaries, and is not projected to have a high school until 2017 at the earliest, and

WHEREAS, Hawthorne School District students matriculate into Centinela Valley Union High School District Schools any proposal which impacts programs for Centinela Valley Union High School District impacts children served by the Hawthorne School District, and

WHEREAS, all neighboring school districts work collaboratively to serve the best interests of all students and families and strive to maintain a harmonious relationship with all school districts in
the Centinela Valley,

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Governing Board of the Hawthorne School District is opposed to the proposed transfer of its territory to the Wiseburn Unified School District, and to any future proposal to transfer additional territory from Lawndale to Wiseburn,

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Superintendent of the Hawthorne School District is authorized to communicate this opposition to the County Committee, based on the findings made above and any further information that the Superintendent and her staff may develop.

The foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Governing Board of the Hawthorne School District on the 25th day of March, 2015 by the following vote:

AYES: 5
NOES: 0
ABSTAIN: 0
ABSENT: 0

Cristina Chiappe, President

Alexandre Monteiro, Vice President

Luciano A. Aguilar, Clerk

Dr. Eugene M. Krank, Member

Sergio R. Mortara, Member

ATTEST BY:

Dr. Helen E. Morgan, Superintendent
Lennox Teachers Association
Resolution on the Transfer of Territory from
the Lawndale Elementary School District to the Wiseburn Unified School District

Be it hereby resolved that the Lennox Teachers Association, proudly representing the teachers of the Lennox School District, does oppose the petition to transfer territory from the Lawndale Elementary School District (LESD) to the Wiseburn Unified School District (WUSD). We believe that this transfer of territory would be detrimental to the students, teachers and community of Lawndale, as well as to the students, teachers and communities of Hawthorne and Lennox, who – like Lawndale – send the majority of our middle school graduates to the Centinela Valley Unified School District (CVUSD).

The loss of territory would have a negative impact on the LESD and its ability to provide the best-possible educational program to its students. It could also lead to the layoff of a number of highly-qualified Lawndale teachers and require the creation of additional combination classes where students from multiple grade-levels are squeezed together into the same classroom due to a lack of teachers. Similarly, the high schools of the CVUSD could be forced to layoff teachers, reduce course offerings and limit the educational opportunities of the Lawndale, Hawthorne and Lennox students enrolled there.

The current “choice” agreement between the LESD and the WUSD allows students living in the territory in question to attend school in either district and has served the communities in question well for over 20 years. The LESD has publicly reiterated its commitment to this agreement and so has the WUSD. There is no need to change the boundaries of either school district, thereby increasing the size of the WUSD and reducing the choices available to the families in the neighborhood, half of whom currently choose to attend schools in the LESD. Beyond the negative impact on many residents of the “choice” blocks and the rest of Lawndale, the deleterious effects of transferring territory from the LESD to the WUSD would ripple across Hawthorne, Lennox and the whole of the Centinela Valley Unified School District.

It is for these reasons that the Lennox Teachers Association opposes the petition to transfer territory from the Lawndale Elementary School District to the Wiseburn Unified School District.

April 16, 2015
Good evening. My name is Dr. Ellen Dougherty and I am the Superintendent of the Lawndale School District. 4 members of the Lawndale School Board are also present this evening and I would like to ask them to stand so that everyone will know who they are. Board President Bonnie Coronado will join me in our presentation.

You are considering a petition to take a part of the Lawndale district and move it into the newly-formed Wiseburn Unified School District. This would also result in a loss of territory for the Centinela Valley Union High School District.

In effect, this is an expansion of the Wiseburn unification that only became effective this last July first. It may well be the next step in a continual Wiseburn expansion that will reach even further into Lawndale, as well as into Lennox and Hawthorne.
On January 1, 2015, my Board of Trustees adopted a resolution to oppose this transfer. The Board’s vote was unanimous. Centinela has also unanimously opposed this petition.

As you know, the area in question has come to be known as the Choice Blocks, for reasons I will explain. This name is important, because this issue is very much about choice for parents to decide where to send their children to school. Choice has existed and been carefully preserved in the territory for decades. The proposed transfer will restrict and may well eliminate choice going forward.

This Transfer Has Been Disapproved Before

- 1969 – Denied by County Committee and County Board of Education
- 1980 - Denied by State Board of Education

In 1969, this proposed transfer was heard and denied by the County Committee and later – under the law at the time – denied again by the County Board of Education.

In 1980, the County Committee approved the transfer solely for the safety of students crossing a busy intersection. In 1981,
The State Board of Education overruled the County Committee and denied the petition.

The History of Choice Between Lawndale and Wiseburn
- Choice has been in place for decades by oral agreement
- Choice by written agreement with Wiseburn in 2008
- Choice reaffirmed by written agreement with Wiseburn in 2012

Lawndale and the Wiseburn Elementary District have worked cooperatively over the years to provide choice to the residents of the territory. This was in response to the desire of some parents to have their children attend school in Wiseburn. Originally, an oral agreement between the two district superintendents allowed any pupil living in the territory to attend school in either district.

The 2008 Agreement
- "[A]ll students from the District Choice Blocks who choose to attend Wiseburn schools will be treated as if they are residents of Wiseburn irregardless of their participation in Special Education programs."
- "it is also understood that the families in the District Choice Blocks will discontinue their efforts to ... have the Wiseburn and Lawndale School District boundaries redrawn to place the District Choice Blocks in the Wiseburn School District"

In 2008, the longstanding oral arrangement was reduced to writing. Dr. Joe Condon, my predecessor as Lawndale superintendent, was part of that process. He cannot be here
this evening but will be testifying in opposition to the transfer when your Committee meets again on this matter.

One purpose of the written agreement was to eliminate Wiseburn’s practice of rescinding attendance permits for special education students. Wiseburn Superintendent Dr. Tom Johnstone acknowledged in writing that this practice was not morally or ethically defensible.

A major provision of the agreement was that residents would discontinue their efforts to transfer the Choice Blocks into Wiseburn.

The 2012 Agreement

- “The prior agreement between Lawndale and Wiseburn to allow students in the District Choice Blocks to elect whether to enroll in Lawndale or Wiseburn schools is confirmed and incorporated into this Agreement”
- “Limits will apply to the total number of Lawndale resident students who may elect to attend Wiseburn schools [80 in 2014-2015 and 75 thereafter] “unless the districts mutually agree otherwise”
- “In consideration of this Agreement, Lawndale agrees that it will not oppose Wiseburn’s unification effort

A detailed written agreement between our districts was entered into in May of 2012. It specified numbers of students who could automatically attend Wiseburn schools. And the Lawndale
district expressly agreed not to oppose the Wiseburn unification.

April 28, 2014 Letter from Wiseburn Superintendent to Lawndale

- "the formalization of the District Choice agreement was initiated by Wiseburn to prevent the derailing of the main Wiseburn unification movement"
- "With the conclusion of the Wiseburn Unification . . . the conditions that existed in 2008 are no longer the same"
- "While the Wiseburn Unified School District has no intentions or interest in leading any effort for the Choice Blocks to secede from Lawndale, we have always supported the Choice Blocks residents and we will continue to support them"

This long-standing and successful arrangement was shattered when Dr. Johnstone, on April 28, 2014, wrote to me and my board president, effectively declaring the choice agreement to be null and void. He said that now that Wiseburn’s unification was approved by the voters, the conditions that gave rise to the agreement were no longer the same.

Since the Choice agreement was to allow pupils in the territory to elect to attend either Lawndale or Wiseburn schools at the elementary level, I cannot see how the unification of Wiseburn changes anything. Now, however, Lawndale still supports choice, but it appears Wiseburn does not. I am forced to
conclude that the written agreement was employed solely to keep Lawndale from opposing the Wiseburn unification.

Had we known that Wiseburn would not continue to honor our agreement, and that the unification would now be extended to include the Choice Blocks, Lawndale would have opposed the Wiseburn unification from the beginning.

Dr. Johnstone’s April 28 letter states that Wiseburn Unified has no intention or interest in leading any effort for the Choice Blocks to “secede” (his word) from Lawndale. However, his board adopted a resolution on May 8, 2014 in support of the secession. That resolution was not in reaction to my own board’s resolution, which was not adopted until 8 months later.

It is difficult to see how Wiseburn claims that they “have always supported the Choice Block residents and we will continue to support them.” In fact, Wiseburn seems only interested in supporting those residents who want to transfer into their district. Wiseburn offers no support for those
residents who have repeatedly chosen to send their children to Lawndale schools and want to continue to do so.

You may be told that if the transfer is approved, choice will continue. Except that it will now be a choice of the newly-minted Wiseburn residents to continue to attend Lawndale schools if they want to.

There are several problems with this argument. First, the County Committee has no authority to compel any district to adopt or continue a Choice program. Even if the County Board of Education, hearing interdistrict attendance appeals, grants permission to parents in the new Wiseburn boundaries to send their children to Lawndale schools, only the Lawndale school board can determine what schools those children will attend.

Finally, on this Choice issue, something profound happens when territory is transferred that strongly affects community identity. Even if Choice Block parents wish to have their children remain in Lawndale schools, and Lawndale agrees,
those parents will lose permanently their right to elect the school board members who are responsible for those schools. They will not be able to hold them accountable, as they do now. Lawndale parents who have chosen to attend Wiseburn schools may have been willing to do without the right to hold Wiseburn trustees accountable at the ballot box. Parents choosing Lawndale schools should not be forced to make the same decision.

The Petition States

"The Choice Blocks are currently assigned to the Lawndale Elementary School District"

This is incorrect. The Choice Blocks are part of the Lawndale District and have been since the district was formed in 1907. No one "assigned" the Blocks to Lawndale and this is not simply a matter of "reassigning" them.

The Petition Also States

"A territory transfer is the Choice Blocks' greatest hope for future access to Wiseburn Unified School District's high schools (Da Vinci Charters). The priority enrollment for residents in USD and extreme competition for non-resident slots will block Choice Block kids from being accepted"
The petitioners claim that the territory transfer is their "greatest hope for future access to Wiseburn Unified School District's high schools (Da Vinci Charters)." In other words, this is all about giving them a leg up in attending charter schools, because Wiseburn itself has no high schools. The Centinela Valley High School District representatives can address this matter, but we strongly insist that our elementary district should not be a pawn in the competition to gain admission to charter high schools. Lawndale should not lose territory, students and revenue just so some parents can gain priority in enrolling their children in charter schools.

Wiseburn can simply change the priority enrollment policies for its charter high schools to include the Choice Blocks, and leave the boundaries, the choice agreements, and the current governance and finance structure in place.

Statutory Factors Under Education Code Section 35753

(f) The proposed reorganization . . . will not significantly disrupt the educational programs in the districts affected by the proposed reorganization.
(i) 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.

As soon as I finish, Board President Bonnie Coronado will describe some of our educational programs and accomplishments. During the unsuccessful 1980 attempted transfer, our board minutes record a comment that some people thought there was more "prestige" in attending Wiseburn schools. Our board president responded at the time that the quality of education in Lawndale was very good. So it is. We are proud of what we offer to all of our residents.

We will provide data showing that our school rankings, compared to similar schools throughout the state, are comparable to those in Wiseburn. Our API growth over time is significantly greater. We have an advantage in the richness and variety of our educational program offerings, our staff development, our partnerships with UCLA and other institutions, and the technology we provide to our students.
Our schools, like those of Wiseburn, have won many awards. We do more than compete – we excel.

However, a transfer of territory should not be considered or approved based on a competition for the most “prestigious” school. If that is the major motivating factor, it runs up against the statutory prohibition that a transfer cannot be approved if its major purpose is to improve property values. And we believe it is bad public policy for Los Angeles County to encourage the changing of school district boundaries every time someone wants to chase after the latest test scores.

**Fiscal Impact on Lawndale Elementary School District**

- Loss of funding under LCFF (current year figures): $976,099
- Loss of Assessed Valuation: $103 million
- Loss of bonding capacity: $780,000
- Potential dispute over JPA parcel tax revenue share

If we lose students, we lose revenue. Now that the state has implemented a new Local Control Funding Formula, the loss is
greater than it would have been under the old revenue limit system. We have calculated the total loss this transfer would cause for Lawndale, and it is just short of $1 million.

This negatively impacts our ability to continue to offer rich and innovative educational programs. And it threatens our staffing levels.

A district that loses only a few students per classroom cannot reduce its spending to accommodate the loss. A room with 3 or 4 fewer students still needs one full-time teacher, an aide, the same utilities, the same maintenance, the same administrative and support staff.

The loss of territory results in a decrease in assessed valuation. While this may not affect per pupil funding, it directly impacts bonding capacity for future capital projects.
There is also a Joint Powers Agreement in effect – and a process for levying and dividing a special parcel tax among the affected districts. This has very recently been upheld by the Court of Appeal. The agreement guarantees each district a specified percentage of the parcel tax revenue. Lawndale receives 14 percent of that revenue.

Lawndale will argue that the percentage does not change, nor does the revenue to which it is applied, even if there is a territory transfer. We will be waiting to hear Wiseburn’s assurance that this is the case. If it is not forthcoming, this is another potential revenue loss that the transfer will cause for Lawndale.

In closing, we oppose this transfer because it threatens to eliminate a successful and cooperative plan of choice that has been in existence for decades. It threatens the Lawndale
district economically which has an impact on the quality of education we can offer to our students. It undermines our ability to offer competitive programs for all of our students in order to benefit only a small group.

We will continue to urge the County Committee to disapprove this petition. In any event, if the petition is approved, we strongly urge that the area of voting be the entire Lawndale Elementary School District territory, so that all of those residents who are affected have a voice in the outcome.

Now I would like to introduce our Board President, Bonnie Coronado.
Statement to Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization

LAWNDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
March 2, 2015

This Transfer Has Been Disapproved Before

- 1969 – Denied by County Committee and County Board of Education
- 1980 – Denied by State Board of Education
The History of Choice Between Lawndale and Wiseburn

- Choice has been in place for decades by oral agreement
- Choice by written agreement with Wiseburn in 2008
- Choice reaffirmed by written agreement with Wiseburn in 2012

The 2008 Agreement

- “All students from the District Choice Blocks who choose to attend Wiseburn schools will be treated as if they are residents of Wiseburn irregardless of their participation in Special Education programs.”
- “It is also understood that the families in the District Choice Blocks will discontinue their effort to ... have the Wiseburn and Lawndale School District boundaries redrawn to place the District Choice Blocks in the Wiseburn School District.”
The 2012 Agreement

- "The prior agreement between Lawndale and Wiseburn to allow students in the District Choice Blocks to elect whether to enroll in Lawndale or Wiseburn schools is confirmed and incorporated into this Agreement"
- "Limits will apply to the total number of Lawndale resident students who may elect to attend Wiseburn schools [80 in 2014-2015 and 75 thereafter] unless the districts mutually agree otherwise"
- "In consideration of this Agreement, Lawndale agrees that it will not oppose Wiseburn's unification effort"

April 28, 2014 Letter from Wiseburn Superintendent to Lawndale

- "The formalization of the District Choice agreement was initiated by Wiseburn to prevent the derailment of the main Wiseburn unification movement"
- "With the conclusion of the Wiseburn Unification... the conditions that existed in 2008 are no longer the same"
- "While the Wiseburn Unified School District has no intentions or interest in leading any effort for the Choice Blocks to secede from Lawndale, we have always supported the Choice Blocks residents and we will continue to support them"
The Petition States

- "The Choice Blocks are currently assigned to the Lawndale Elementary School District"

The Petition Also States

- "A territory transfer is the Choice Blocks' greatest hope for future access to Wiseburn Unified School District's high schools (Da Vinci Charters). The priority enrollment for residents in WUSD and extreme competition for non-resident slots will block Choice Block kids from being accepted"
Statutory Factors Under Education Code Section 35753

- (f) The proposed reorganization . . . will not significantly disrupt the educational programs in the districts affected by the proposed reorganization.

- (i) 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.

Fiscal Impact on Lawndale Elementary School District

- Loss of funding under LCFF (current year figures): $976,099
- Loss of Assessed Valuation: $103 million
- Loss of bonding capacity: $780,000
- Potential dispute over JPA parcel tax revenue share
Academic Achievement:
State Rankings for Similar Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LESD, Billy Mitchell Elementary</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUSD, Peter Burnett Elementary</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUSD, Juan De Anza Elementary</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESD, Jane Addams Middle</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUSD, Dana Middle</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exemplary Programs:
State Preschool, LEAP Program, All Day TK & Kindergarten
- Comprehensive, standards-aligned curriculum

Lawndale Provides Exemplary Programs:
RAP (Realizing Amazing Potential) Extended Day Program
- STEAM Focus – Aligned with Common Core Standards
- Award-winning bands and dance troupes
- Support for students and families from 7am-6pm
Exemplary Programs: Nutrition and Physical Fitness

- Nutrition Education Grant
- Peer Parent Educators
- Partnership with Providence Little Company of Mary for P.E.
- District Wellness Policy

Exemplary Programs: Health and Wellness

- 27 Counseling & Social Work Interns from USC have been assigned to our schools
- Providence Little Company of Mary provides weekly visits from the Partners for Healthy Kids Mobile Medical Van & other health services
Exemplary Programs: Science
- PS Science
- Middle School Green Panthers
  - Science Olympiad
  - Robotics
- Stem & Robotics in RAP Program

Exemplary Programs: Dual Immersion
- District K-8 Dual Language Academy
- Bilingual and Biliterate in Spanish and English
- Highest achievement in district
Exemplary Programs: Arts and Music

- Arts Instruction through PS Arts for all TK-5 students, in visual arts, theater and music
- Middle School Arts and Music
- Regional Arts Initiative with Hawthorne and Centinela Valley
- TakePART Arts Festival founded by Lawndale

Exemplary Programs: Arts and Music

- Lawndale PS Arts Program Recognized by President Obama
State of the Art Facilities and Technology

- $75 million in facility upgrades
- Over $5 million in technology upgrades
December 11, 2015

Mr. Keith Crafton  
Division of Business Advisory Services  
Los Angeles County Office of Education  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, CA 90242-2890

Dear Mr. Crafton:

Proposal to Transfer Territory from the Lawndale School District (SD)  
and the Centinela Valley Union High School District (UHSD)  
to the Wiseburn Unified School District (USD)

This letter and attached documents are in response to the Request for Information (RFI)  
sent to us from your office on November 5, 2015 regarding the proposal to transfer  
territory from the Lawndale SD and the Centinela Valley Union High SD to the Wiseburn  
USD. We have attempted to provide you with all of the information you requested.

If you have any questions or concerns, please call me at (310) 263-3201.

Sincerely,

Dr. Gregory O'Brien  
Superintendent

Enclosures
1. If the transfer is not approved, is Centinela Valley Union HSD willing to release all students residing within the petition area as automatic interdistrict transfer students, or will individual permits be required each year?

As is our current practice, Centinela Valley Union HSD will continue to release all students residing within the petition area as automatic interdistrict transfer students, and we will not require individual permits to be filed each year.

2. If the transfer is not approved, is Centinela Valley Union HSD willing to release special education students residing within the petition area as automatic interdistrict permit students, or will individual permits be required each year?

As is our current practice, Centinela Valley Union HSD will continue to release all special education students residing within the petition area as automatic interdistrict permit students, and we will not require individual permits to be filed each year. We will do this in accordance with the MOU that is currently in place through the SELPA.

3. If the transfer is not approved, is Centinela Valley Union HSD willing to enter into a written MOU articulating an attendance agreement with the Wiseburn USD to allow all students residing in the petition area the choice to enroll in Wiseburn USD schools?

Yes, we are willing to enter into a written MOU.

4. Please provide any additional information or details regarding the proposed property swap from the Wiseburn USD to the Lawndale SD/Centinela Valley Union HSD, in addition to the material previously provided by Wiseburn USD.

Centinela Valley Union HSD is unaware of any proposed property swap with Wiseburn USD. We were unable to find any mention of a property swap in the original petition.

5. Please provide an assessment of the impact of the proposed transfer on the obligations of the Centinela Valley Union HSD under the Local Classroom Funding Authority JPA (among Wiseburn USD, Centinela Valley Union HSD, Hawthorne SD, Lawndale SD and Lennox SD), including any changes to the percentage assignment of revenue articulated thereunder.

The proposed transfer would have no financial impact to Centinela Valley Union HSD related to the Local Classrooms Funding Authority (LCFA) JPA. However, it is important to note that the proposed transfer would alter the makeup of both Lawndale ESD and Wiseburn USD, which could require the districts to modify the percentages in the original JPA agreement.
6. **Please add any additional information you feel would be important for the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization to consider as it continues to evaluate this proposal.**

Since the last meeting, it came to our attention that there would be a significant increase in the property tax rates for those home owners in the proposed territory transfer boundaries. I know there have been a few vocal proponents of the transfer at several of the meetings; however, I think it would be prudent to hear from all property owners in the area before making a decision to increase the property taxes of all residents in order to comply with the request of a few. In fact, it has been suggested that a change in taxes may require an actual vote by all registered voters in areas impacted by the swap.
APPENDIX C
November 17, 2015

Mr. Keith D. Crafton, Director
Division of Business Advisory Services
Los Angeles, County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242-2890

Re: Proposal to Transfer Territory from the Lawndale SD and the Centinela Valley Union HSD to the Wiseburn USD

Dear Mr. Crafton:

This is in response to the Supplemental Request for Information (RFI), dated November 5, 2015:

1. If the transfer is not approved, is Wiseburn USD willing to accept all students residing within the petition area as automatic interdistrict transfer students, or will individual permits be required each year?

   Yes. Wiseburn's position on this has been consistent throughout this process. Given the current state of the landscape concerning the Choice Blocks, we are more than willing to take the Choice Block students into Wiseburn as our own, but for tracking purposes, we require that Choice Block residents complete a Wiseburn Permit Application every year.

   We want to make it very clear that Wiseburn has absolutely no ambition to expand its territory. Our only concern and only desire is to square off these 4 blocks. These blocks clearly belong to the Wiseburn neighborhood and community, while being assigned to the Lawndale School District for education purposes. In effect, the vast majority of the families in the Choice Blocks have voted with their feet and are currently attending Wiseburn schools. During the current 2015-16 school year, we have 82 Choice Block students attending Wiseburn schools K-8 and another 33 Choice Block students attending Wiseburn high schools.

2. If the transfer is not approved, is Wiseburn USD willing to accept all special education students residing in the petition area as automatic interdistrict permit students, or will individual permits be required each year?

   Yes, same answer as question one above.
3. If the transfer is not approved, is Wiseburn USD willing to enter into a written MOU articulating an attendance agreement with the Lawndale SD and the Centinela Valley Union HSD to allow all students residing in the petition area the choice to enroll in Wiseburn USD schools?

   Yes

4. Please provide any additional information or details regarding the proposed property swap from the Wiseburn USD to the Lawndale SD/Centinela Union HSD, in addition to the material previously provided by Wiseburn USD (see Attachment 1).

   Wiseburn is fully and unequivocally committed to supporting the Choice Blocks. Beyond the willingness to accept every Choice Block student in Wiseburn schools, we are fully committed to back this action with unanimous Board support to swap commercial assessed valuation (AV) for bond purposes with an amount that is identical to the residential assessed valuation (AV) that Wiseburn would gain if the transfer is approved. See additional materials.

5. Please provide an assessment of the impact of the proposed transfer on the obligations of the Wiseburn USD under the Local Classroom Funding Authority JPA (among Wiseburn USD, Centinela Valley Union HSD, Hawthorne SD, Lawndale SD and Lennox SD), including any changes to the percentage assignment of revenue articulated thereunder.

   No impact. The Wiseburn Board supports maintaining the status quo with regards to Measure CL. We propose that the percentages remain the same as they are now, with no modifications or disruptions.

6. Please provide an assessment of the impact of the proposed transfer on the obligations of the Wiseburn USD under the Local Public Schools Funding Authority JPA (among Wiseburn USD and Centinela Valley Union HSD), including any changes to the financial obligations articulated thereunder.

   Wiseburn will continue to honor the current language in the Local Public Schools Funding Authority that places a cap of 450 students enrolling at Da Vinci Schools from Hawthorne, Lawndale and Lennox. In the current school year, there are 318 students attending Da Vinci Schools from Hawthorne, Lawndale, and Lennox, including 33 students from the Choice Blocks. I remain confident that Da Vinci will never exceed the enrollment cap of 450 and if that cap is ever exceeded, we will accept the consequences as per the MOU.

7. Please add any additional information you feel would be important for the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization to consider as it continues to evaluate this proposal.

   None

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Tom Johnstone, Ed.D
Superintendent

Enclosure(s)
CENTINELA VALLEY UHSD]  
FEEDER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Lennox Elementary  
Wiseburn Elementary  
Hawthorne Elementary  
Lawndale Elementary
Overview Map
Existing Lawndale Parcels

- Area is defined as W 139th Street to Rosecrans Ave and La Cienega Blvd to Inglewood Ave
- 406 residential parcels
- Total assessed value: $104,853,660
- Average AV per parcel: $257,000
Existing Wiseburn Parcels

- Area is defined by triangle bordered by the 405 Freeway, Rosecrans Ave and the light rail train tracks
- Includes all properties currently under the taxing jurisdiction of Wiseburn School District with the exception of the Ayers Hotel
- 16 commercial and industrial parcels
- Total assessed value: $104,336,428
- Average AV per parcel: $6,500,000
# Land Swap Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wiseburn SD</th>
<th>Lawndale ESD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. Parcels</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Commercial / Industrial</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average AV</td>
<td>$6,521,027</td>
<td>$258,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total AV</td>
<td>$104,336,428</td>
<td>$104,853,260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi Tom,

We currently have 318 students residing within the CV boundaries, of which 33 live in the choice blocks. There is a lack of consistency with regard to how families designate their district of residence. When asked what is their district of residence, some respond with their elementary district and others with their high school DOR. This is how the data is broken down in PowerSchool:

CV - 125  
Hawthorne - 164  
Lawndale - 16  
Lennox - 13

Total = 318; includes 33 students living in the choice blocks

Please let me know if there is anything else you need.

Thanks,
Carla
APPENDIX D
Response to Supplemental Request for Information re: Transfer of Territory Proposal

1. What knowledge do you have about the Lawndale SD and Centinela Valley Union HSD being willing to release all students residing within the petition area as automatic interdistrict transfer students, or whether individual permits are required each year?

Lawndale ESD has not conveyed its willingness to release all students residing within the petition area as automatic interdistrict transfers. Several residents in the petition area have testified of their difficult experiences obtaining a release permit from LESD. In addition, some parents were not aware that this opportunity existed, as LESD does not publish nor advertise this information to residents in the petition area. At this time, individual release permits are required every 5 years (since 2012).

The current petition is only necessary because LESD has shown a lack of willingness to release all students residing within the Orphan Blocks for many years. They have clearly stated that they want to keep all students from the Orphan Blocks. If they were willing to negotiate, we could have moved forward amicably with the transfer of territory request.

Centinela Valley Union HSD has never needed to release Orphan Block students to attend Wiseburn USD schools. Even though the community passed Wiseburn’s unification measure in 2013, permits are not necessary because Wiseburn USD offers charter schools as its high school option. To my knowledge, permits are available to Orphan Block students wanting to attend other public high schools, as a standard (non-automatic) opportunity for all CVUHSD residents.

2. What knowledge do you have about the Wiseburn USD’s willingness to receive special education students residing in the petition area as automatic interdistrict permit students, or are individual permits required each year?

I believe it is the Wiseburn USD’s intent to receive special education students from the Orphan Blocks through the interdistrict permit process. An inter-district permit is required from Lawndale SD (every 5 years) and from WUSD (renewed each year). That said, this is a population that may begin receiving services (therapy, etc) from the district of residence prior to kindergarten entrance. I am not aware of the ability to transfer these type services to a non-residential district. Therefore, service transitions may be difficult and more convoluted once the parent is able to seek a transfer. Several parents have suggested they be allowed to work with the district they want their child to attend for a smoother transition. Others noted that they did not receive any or proper services until their child was permitted into WUSD.

Shavonda Webber-Christmas, Supplemental RFI Response December 2015
3. What knowledge to you have about the willingness of Lawndale SD and Centinela Valley Union HSD to enter into written MOU articulating an attendance agreement with the Wiseburn USD to allow all students residing in the petition area the choice to enroll in Wiseburn USD schools?

I am not aware of any willingness of the Lawndale SD to enter into a written MOU to articulate an attendance agreement with Wiseburn for the purpose of providing Orphan Block residents the choice to enroll in WUSD schools beyond the permit process specified in question #1. As previously noted Centinela Valley Union HSD does not require an interdistrict release permit for students wanting to attend WUSD high schools.

Nevertheless, there is a written agreement regarding attendance with WUSD that resulted from Wiseburn’s succession from CV. The agreement that exists clearly restricts student attendance to the newly formed district. It notes a maximum number of student transfers from each of the previously combined districts. It also specifies a maximum number of students to attend the high school (WUSD residents and transfers). Only the Lawndale SD portion of the agreement discusses Orphan Block residents.

4. Please provide any additional information or details regarding the proposed property swap from Wiseburn USD to the Lawndale SD/Centinela Valley Union HSD, in addition to the material previously provided by the Wiseburn USD (see Attachment 1).

The property swap was presented to Lawndale SD to facilitate the transfer of territory more than once and it rejected by Lawndale SD more than once. I do not have any additional information.

5. Please add any additional information you feel would be important for the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization to consider as it continues to evaluate this proposal.

It is important to note that this petition is requesting the County Committee on School District Organization to make a decision based on the 9 specified conditions for reorganization, which your committee previously noted were overwhelmingly met. I do not believe any other solution can resolve this issue. Orphan Block residents have lived with what district personnel proposed for over 30 years. A new agreement does not allow taxpayers to support the schools their children attend, but rather keeps tax dollars supporting schools they do not benefit from. Ironically, we are afforded many more community/family opportunities through WUSD school events, which we do not support financially. Furthermore, a new agreement would continue to maintain the emotionally charged “Permit Stigma” that families are forced wear like a scarlet letter. The only true solution is a transfer of territory to not only allow Orphan Block residents to attend the WUSD schools, but to align the tax allocations with student attendance and to support the emotional well-being of the children and their families. I, therefore, ask that you maintain your position and approve this transfer of territory.

Shavonda Webber-Christmas, Supplemental RFI Response December 2015
APPENDIX E
Response to Latest Supplemental Request for Information re: Transfer of Territory Proposal

1. What knowledge do you have about the Lawndale SD and Centinela Valley Union HSD being willing to release all students within the petition area as automatic inter-district transfer students, or whether individual permits are required each year?

"Willing" is a subjective word. In my opinion, if Lawndale SD were "willing" to release students residing in the petition area then we would not be addressing this issue. If Lawndale SD were "willing" to do what most of the petition areas students, parents and virtually all Choice Block residents have wanted and asked for, for what seems like ions then we would not be debating this issue nor would we have had to go through all of this process.

That said, to the best of my knowledge Lawndale SD and WUSD have an agreement (CVUHSD is involved in this as well but I think to a lesser degree) to allow students to attend either district but in order to attend WUSD a written release from Lawndale SD is required in the form of an an inter-district permit.

2. What knowledge do you have about the Wiseburn USD's willingness to receive special education students residing in the petition area as automatic inter-district permit students, or are individual permits required each year?.

To the best of my knowledge WUSD has always allowed and never has questioned the enrollment of special education students residing in the petition area. However, I do believe a written release from Lawndale SD even for special ed students is required in the form of an an inter-district permit.

3. What knowledge do you have about the willingness of Lawndale SD and Centinela Valley Union HSD to enter into written MOU articulating an attendance agreement with the Wiseburn USD to allow all students residing in the petition area the choice to enroll in Wiseburn USD schools?.

As previously stated if Lawndale SD was "willing" and petition area students and their parents were "allowed" real choice (standard accepted dictionary interpretation) in this matter and given the freedom to choose what school they wanted to attend we would not be debating this issue nor would we have had to go through all of this process, but to the best of my knowledge it is my understanding that there is a written agreement to allow the enrollment and attendance of all students residing in the petition area to attend either district. However, in order for petition area students to attend WUSD a written release from Lawndale SD is required in the form of an an inter-district permit.

4. Please provide any additional information or details regarding the proposed property swap from Wiseburn USD to the Lawndale SD/Centinela Valley Union HSD, in addition to the material previously provided by the Wiseburn USD (see Attachment 1).

WUSD has on numerous occasions attempted to make Lawndale SD and CVUHSD a property swap deal that would in effect negate any financial loss or hardship that either Lawndale SD or CVUHSD may acquire should the transfer of territory be allowed to proceed. To the best of my knowledge Lawndale SD and CVUHSD have turned this property swap deal down every time.

5. Please add any additional information you feel would be important for the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization to consider as it continues to evaluate this proposal.

I will just simply say that the Wiseburn community residents want this transfer. We want to be a whole community. We do not want an old, outdated School District boundary line cutting off 4 blocks of our neighborhood. We are united, devoted and determined to get this done one way or the other. Should this transfer not go through rest assured WE WILL IMMEDIATELY start the process again!... If it is the wish of the LACOE committee to settle this Choice Block issue once and for all then the committee must grant this transfer of territory!!.
APPENDIX F
### COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
DEPARTMENT OF AUDITOR-CONTROLLER  
(as of 9/23/15)  
TAX RATE IMPACT TO LAWNDALE AND WISEBURN ON ANNEXATION (GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS)  
NO TRANSFER OF PUBLIC SCHOOL PROPERTY OR BUILDING (C)

#### Assessed Valuations
- **Lawndale 2 (estimated FY15/16)**: 113,191,381.42
- **Lawndale 1 (FY15/16 data)**: 3,352,960,736.00
- **Wiseburn 1 (FY15/16 data)**: 7,415,145,524.00
- **Centinela Valley (FY15/16 data)**: 15,906,286,099.00

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessed Valuation (AV)</th>
<th>Outstanding Debt (as of 6/30/15)</th>
<th>Tax Rate (c = a / b x 100)</th>
<th>Share on Centinela Valley UHSD's Tax Rate (d = b / A x B)</th>
<th>Total Tax Rate (e = c + d)</th>
<th>Per $100,000 of AV (f = e / 100 x 100000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Centinela Valley</strong></td>
<td>$548,073,084.81 $15,906,286,099.00</td>
<td>3.445638 % <strong>B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current (before annexation)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lawndale 1</strong></td>
<td>$26,579,043.75 $3,352,960,736.00</td>
<td>0.792704 %</td>
<td>0.726322 %</td>
<td>1.519026 %</td>
<td>$1,519.03 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wiseburn 1</strong></td>
<td>$349,681,780.78 $7,415,145,524.00</td>
<td>4.715778 %</td>
<td>1.606377 %</td>
<td>6.322055 %</td>
<td>$5,322.06 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>After annexation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lawndale 1</strong></td>
<td>$26,579,043.75 $3,352,960,736.00</td>
<td>0.820399 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,522.20 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Lawndale 2</td>
<td>$113,191,381.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lawndale 3</strong></td>
<td>$26,579,043.75 $3,390,769,354.58</td>
<td>0.701893 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,522.20 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wiseburn 1</strong></td>
<td>$349,681,780.78 $7,415,145,524.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add: Lawndale 2</td>
<td>$113,191,381.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wiseburn 2</strong></td>
<td>$349,681,780.78 $7,520,336,705.42</td>
<td>4.644874 %</td>
<td>1.630797 %</td>
<td>6.275671 %</td>
<td>$5,275.67 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Per Education Code section 35575, since Lawndale 2 does not contain public school property or buildings, Lawndale 2 shall "drop" any liability for outstanding bonded indebtedness from Lawndale 1. Therefore, Lawndale 3 will assume the district's outstanding debt (i.e., higher tax rates to remaining Lawndale property owners - a smaller number of properties will bear the existing debt).

2. Divide this amount by the total years to bond maturity to obtain the annual amount per $100,000 of AV.

### Legend (For Discussion Purposes):
- Lawndale 1 – existing Lawndale School District
- Lawndale 2 – area proposed for annexation to Wiseburn
- Lawndale 3 – Lawndale after annexation
- Wiseburn 1 – existing Wiseburn Unified School District
- Wiseburn 2 – Wiseburn after annexation

### Summary:
1. Lawndale 3 will see an increase in tax rates (from having a lower AV to spread the debt): 1.519026% to 1.522224% (inclusive of Centinela debt)
2. Lawndale 2 (now part of Wiseburn) will see an increase in tax rates due to inheriting Wiseburn's much higher debt: 1.519026% to 6.275428% (inclusive of Centinela debt)
3. Wiseburn 2 will see a decrease in tax rates due to a higher AV to spread the debt: 6.322055% to 6.275428% (inclusive of Centinela debt)
APPENDIX G
November 17, 2015

Mr. Keith D. Crafton, Director
Division of business Advisory Services
Los Angeles, County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242-2890

Re: Proposal to Transfer Territory from the Lawndale SD and the Centinela Valley Union HSD to the Wiseburn USD

Dear Mr. Crafton:

This is in response to the Supplemental Request for Information (RFI), dated November 5, 2015:

1. If the transfer is not approved, is Wiseburn USD willing to accept all students residing within the petition area as automatic interdistrict transfer students, or will individual permits be required each year?

   Yes. Wiseburn’s position on this has been consistent throughout this process. Given the current state of the landscape concerning the Choice Blocks, we are more than willing to take the Choice Block students into Wiseburn as our own, but for tracking purposes, we require that Choice Block residents complete a Wiseburn Permit Application every year.

   We want to make it very clear that Wiseburn has absolutely no ambition to expand its territory. Our only concern and only desire is to square off these 4 blocks. These blocks clearly belong to the Wiseburn neighborhood and community, while being assigned to the Lawndale School District for education purposes. In effect, the vast majority of the families in the Choice Blocks have voted with their feet and are currently attending Wiseburn schools. During the current 2015-16 school year, we have 82 Choice Block students attending Wiseburn schools K-8 and another 33 Choice Block students attending Wiseburn high schools.

2. If the transfer is not approved, is Wiseburn USD willing to accept all special education students residing in the petition area as automatic interdistrict permit students, or will individual permits be required each year?

   Yes, same answer as question one above.
3. If the transfer is not approved, is Wiseburn USD willing to enter into a written MOU articulating an attendance agreement with the Lawndale SD and the Centinela Valley Union HSD to allow all students residing in the petition area the choice to enroll in Wiseburn USD schools?

Yes

4. Please provide any additional information or details regarding the proposed property swap from the Wiseburn USD to the Lawndale SD/Centinela Union HSD, in addition to the material previously provided by Wiseburn USD (see Attachment 1).

Wiseburn is fully and unequivocally committed to supporting the Choice Blocks. Beyond the willingness to accept every Choice Block student in Wiseburn schools, we are fully committed to back this action with unanimous Board support to swap commercial assessed valuation (AV) for bond purposes with an amount that is identical to the residential assessed valuation (AV) that Wiseburn would gain if the transfer is approved. See additional materials.

5. Please provide an assessment of the impact of the proposed transfer on the obligations of the Wiseburn USD under the Local Classroom Funding Authority JPA (among Wiseburn USD, Centinela Valley Union HSD, Hawthorne SD, Lawndale SD and Lennox SD), including any changes to the percentage assignment of revenue articulated thereunder.

No impact. The Wiseburn Board supports maintaining the status quo with regards to Measure CL. We propose that the percentages remain the same as they are now, with no modifications or disruptions.

6. Please provide an assessment of the impact of the proposed transfer on the obligations of the Wiseburn USD under the Local Public Schools Funding Authority JPA (among Wiseburn USD and Centinela Valley Union HSD), including any changes to the financial obligations articulated thereunder.

Wiseburn will continue to honor the current language in the Local Public Schools Funding Authority that places a cap of 450 students enrolling at Da Vinci Schools from Hawthorne, Lawndale and Lennox. In the current school year, there are 318 students attending Da Vinci Schools from Hawthorne, Lawndale, and Lennox, including 33 students from the Choice Blocks. I remain confident that Da Vinci will never exceed the enrollment cap of 450 and if that cap is ever exceeded, we will accept the consequences as per the MOU.

7. Please add any additional information you feel would be important for the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization to consider as it continues to evaluate this proposal.

None

Sincerely,

Tom Johnstone, Ed.D
Superintendent

Enclosure(s)
Existing Lawndale Parcels

- Area is defined as W 139th Street to Rosecrans Ave and La Cienega Blvd to Inglewood Ave
- 406 residential parcels
- Total assessed value: $104,853,660
- Average AV per parcel: $257,000
Existing Wiseburn Parcels

- Area is defined by triangle bordered by the 405 Freeway, Rosecrans Ave and the light rail train tracks
- Includes all properties currently under the taxing jurisdiction of Wiseburn School District with the exception of the Ayers Hotel
- 16 commercial and industrial parcels
- Total assessed value: $104,336,428
- Average AV per parcel: $6,500,000
## Land Swap Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wiseburn SD</th>
<th>Lawndale ESD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. Parcels</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Commercial / Industrial</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average AV</td>
<td>$6,521,027</td>
<td>$258,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total AV</td>
<td>$104,336,428</td>
<td>$104,853,260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi Tom,

We currently have 318 students residing within the CV boundaries, of which 33 live in the choice blocks. There is a lack of consistency with regard to how families designate their district of residence. When asked what is their district of residence, some respond with their elementary district and others with their high school DOR. This is how the data is broken down in PowerSchool:

CV - 125
Hawthorne - 164
Lawndale - 16
Lennox - 13

Total = 318; includes 33 students living in the choice blocks

Please let me know if there is anything else you need.

Thanks,
Carla

---

Hi Carla! We are trying to wrap up the Choice Block issue. The County has requested one last round of information. In 2014-15 you provided me with the enrollments of students from the Hawthorne, Lawndale and Lennox Elementary attendance areas (who live in the CVUHSD attendance area). I think the number that you gave me was 302 students. Can you give me the same information for this year? Can you keep the Choice Blocks separate or will they be included in the Lawndale number? Thanks Carla!
Hi Alison. Rather than wait for a month to go by, I thought that I would take a moment to review some information that the County Committee already has and provide the Committee with more factual information in response to today's meeting. First, Mr. Vinke shared that the average home in the Choice Blocks is valued at $500,000 and that the annual tax increase to these homeowners would be $450 per year. According to the 2014 tax roles, the 406 households in the Choice Blocks had a total assessed value of $104,853,660. If you do the math, this would indicate that the average household has an assessed value of $258,260. This is just over one-half of the $500,000 figure that Mr. Vinke shared with the Committee, so the actual tax increase would be about half of the $450 that he shared, according to his "tax expert". He is insulting the County Committee's intelligence by purposely trying to confuse assessed value, which is what we all pay taxes on, with the actual real estate value of the property. Please see the actual figures attached. In fact, there are only 11 of the 406 parcels that have an assessed value that is greater than $500,000.

Dr. Dougherty mentioned that the loss of Choice Block students to Wiseburn would have a severe fiscal impact on Lawndale. In 2014-15, there were 130 K-8 students attending Lawndale and Wiseburn from the Choice Blocks. Of these 130 students, 80 were enrolled in Wiseburn (62%) and 50 were enrolled in Lawndale. If the Choice Blocks were to become part of Wiseburn Unified School District, the potential loss in revenue to Lawndale would be from the 50 students currently attending Lawndale, assuming all of them would come to Wiseburn, which is highly unlikely, or they would already be here. The 80 students from the Choice Blocks who are attending Wiseburn already would not create a loss for Lawndale because they were never there in the first place. Lawndale is a great and academically successful school district. If they were to potentially lose 50 students to Wiseburn, they should do what other South Bay school districts like Torrance, Redondo Beach, Manhattan Beach, El Segundo, Culver City and Wiseburn do. They should accept 50 (or more) students on inter-district permits. There would be no fiscal impact to Lawndale.

Lastly, Dr. Dougherty continues to insist that the loss of the Choice Block assessed valuation would severely harm Lawndale tax payers because they would have to assume the same Lawndale tax burden with fewer tax payers. More than two years ago Wiseburn suggested an identical assessed valuation tax swap of Choice Block residential assessed value for Wiseburn Commercial assessed value. If Lawndale would accept this assessed valuation transfer, Lawndale taxpayers would be held completely harmless, and because there are no students living in the commercial areas, Lawndale would get the benefit of tax revenue for school bonds without gaining additional students. It is true that the Choice Block residents would see an increase in their property taxes in the short run, if they become part of Wiseburn, and they are fully aware of this and still support this reorganization because their community identity is Wiseburn, and given the Choice Block choice, they elect to send their children to Wiseburn schools. However, all Wiseburn schools are new from the ground up and there will not be a need for further school construction for several decades. On the other hand, Centinela Valley has a school construction Master Plan that was created in 2012 that called for $435 million to completely renovate Hawthorne, Lawndale and Leuzinger High Schools. After passing school construction bonds of $98 million twice in 2008 and 2010 ($196 million total), Centinela Valley is only 45% toward realizing their Master Plan. More CV bonds are imminent, at some point in the near future, and Choice Block residents, if they remain in Lawndale, would be on the hook to pay for these projects, even if their children are attending Wiseburn schools.

I hope this additional information gives the County Committee more clarity and a more comprehensive perspective on the information that was shared today. Thanks
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>address</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>fee</th>
<th>value</th>
<th>land</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123 Main St, Lawndale, IL 60442</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
<td>available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456 Elm Ave, Lawndale, IL 60442</td>
<td>commercial</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$630,000</td>
<td>for sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>789 Oak Dr, Lawndale, IL 60442</td>
<td>industrial</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$680,000</td>
<td>under contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 Pine St, Lawndale, IL 60442</td>
<td>multifamily</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>$510,000</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td>sold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- All properties are near Lawndale Elementary School District.
- Fees include property tax and insurance for each property.
- Values are estimated and subject to change.
- Status reflects current market conditions and availability.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Grade FFA</th>
<th>Grade FFA #</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Sales Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4808</td>
<td>6239 W 33rd St</td>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Landlord</td>
<td>7/1/2020</td>
<td>$19,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4804</td>
<td>6239 W 33rd St</td>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Landlord</td>
<td>7/1/2020</td>
<td>$19,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4803</td>
<td>6239 W 33rd St</td>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Landlord</td>
<td>7/1/2020</td>
<td>$19,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4802</td>
<td>6239 W 33rd St</td>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Landlord</td>
<td>7/1/2020</td>
<td>$19,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

104,853.660 / 406 = $258,1260

Only 10 parcels with an AV that exceeds $500,000.
January 6, 2016

To: The Staff of the LA County Committee on School District Organization
From: Ellen Dougherty, Ed.D., Superintendent of Lawndale Elementary School District

I am the superintendent of the Lawndale SD. I have spoken to you on several occasions in the past about the proposed transfer of the territory known as the Choice Blocks to the Wiseburn Unified SD from the Centinela Valley High SD and my district. I realize that at your meeting on July 1, 2015, you took a preliminary vote to approve this transfer. However, you cannot actually take action until the California Environmental Quality Act requirements have been satisfied. That has not yet happened and I will speak to you again when CEQA action is on your agenda.

In the past 2 months, we have received a number of questions from your staff (as have all other interested parties), and we have responded in full. It is important to us that our responses are provided to each of you and not merely summarized by staff or consultants. If you have not personally received our responses, I will leave one copy with you today. The administrative record in this matter needs to be complete.

At the time of your preliminary vote, there was discussion by Committee members about the impact of various school schedules on the ability of Choice Block students to participate in activities. However, there never was any evidence presented to you on the matter. And the individual impressions of Committee members about scheduling difficulties do not constitute evidence. I want to reiterate Lawndale's position: the Choice Block students already have the opportunity to participate in every activity that is associated with the school they elect to attend. It is absolutely not necessary to approve the territory transfer to make this happen.

We have told you of the adverse financial impact the transfer will have on Lawndale. This is real, not speculative. There is another impact that has not been addressed until now and I want you all to be aware of it: The Wiseburn district is heavily in debt through bond issues. If you approve the transfer petition, the burden of that debt will now fall on every property owner in the Choice Blocks, regardless of where their children attend school. Our expert property tax consultant has provided evidence that the increased annual tax of 7.6% translates to each home valued at $500,000 increase by $431. And the annual tax for every property owner in the remaining Lawndale School District will increase by 3.5%. I urge you not to impose that burden on residents who have no interest in supporting the transfer. [Attachment A].

Finally, I have been told by your staff on several occasions that any action your committee takes will be final, binding and not reviewable. Our reading of the law is different: this is a territory transfer reorganization and both the Lawndale and Centinela Valley boards have opposed it from the beginning. We believe this means that we have the right to appeal any adverse decision to the State Board of Education. Moreover, this is a matter that must go to the voters because of our opposition. We have repeatedly said that all of the residents of Lawndale should be allowed to
vote because of the financial impact on our programs, and the increase property taxes they will face if this transfer of territory is approved.

Therefore, I am asking that your staff be directed to inform us of any legal basis for contending that this matter cannot be appealed to the State Board and that the residents of the Choice Blocks will be denied the right to vote.

Students in the Lawndale Elementary School District who reside in the Choice Block area have a choice and are released to Wiseburn if they apply for a permit (and they need only apply once for their entire TK-8 education). I ask that you review the attached data and not the many erroneous statements from petitioners that are not substantiated by facts. [Attachment B].

If families already have choice, why would you transfer the territory to Wiseburn at a substantial fiscal cost to Lawndale and the taxpayers of both the Choice Block area and the residents of Lawndale?

Thank you for your attention to this matter,

Ellen Dougherty
Superintendent
## Lawndale Elementary School District

Current Tax Rates by TRA Within Proposed Land Exchange
Tax Rates Based on 2015-16 Published Rates

### Wiseburn USD Tax Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund No.</th>
<th>Tax Rate Levying Entity</th>
<th>2015-16 Tax Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>320.05</td>
<td>West Basin MWD 111</td>
<td>1.00000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>797.51</td>
<td>El Camino CCD DS 2005 Ref. Bonds</td>
<td>0.00432700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>797.52</td>
<td>El Camino CCD DS 2002 Series 2006B</td>
<td>0.00935400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>797.53</td>
<td>El Camino CCD DS 2002 Series 2012C</td>
<td>0.00162400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>797.54</td>
<td>El Camino CCD DS 2012 Ref Bonds</td>
<td>0.00211700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>986.52</td>
<td>Wiseburn USD SD DS 1997 Series 1999A</td>
<td>0.00431000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>986.55</td>
<td>Wiseburn USD SD DS 2000 Series 2001</td>
<td>0.01167200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>986.56</td>
<td>Wiseburn USD SD DS 2005 Series A Ref Bond</td>
<td>0.00391200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>986.57</td>
<td>Wiseburn USD SD DS 2007 Series 2007A</td>
<td>0.00467400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>986.58</td>
<td>Wiseburn USD SD DS 2007 2008 Series A</td>
<td>0.00560600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>986.59</td>
<td>Wiseburn USD SD DS 2010 2010 Series A</td>
<td>0.00958000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>986.60</td>
<td>Wiseburn USD SD DS 2010 2012 Series C</td>
<td>0.03368200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>986.61</td>
<td>Wiseburn USD SD DS 2010 2011 Series B</td>
<td>0.01530800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>986.62</td>
<td>Wiseburn USD SD DS 2010 2013 Series D</td>
<td>0.00547500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>986.67</td>
<td>Wiseburn-Centinela UHSD DS 2002 Ref Bond</td>
<td>0.00944300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>986.69</td>
<td>Wiseburn-Centinela UHSD DS 2004 Ref Bond</td>
<td>0.02152300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>986.70</td>
<td>Wiseburn-Centinela UHSD DS 2008 Series A</td>
<td>0.00370900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>986.71</td>
<td>Wiseburn-Centinela UHSD DS 2010 2011 Series A</td>
<td>0.00383200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>986.72</td>
<td>Wiseburn-Centinela UHSD DS 2010 2012 Series B</td>
<td>0.01535400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>986.73</td>
<td>Wiseburn-Centinela UHSD DS 2008 2013 Series B</td>
<td>0.02229800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Combined Tax Rate:** 1.2351950

Tax on Property Valued at $500,000 $ 6,175.98 ↑ 7.6%

Annual Tax Increase on Properties Moved from LESD to WUSD $ 436.41

### Lawndale ESD Tax Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund No.</th>
<th>Tax Rate Levying Entity</th>
<th>2015-16 Tax Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>320.05</td>
<td>West Basin MWD 111</td>
<td>1.00000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545.51</td>
<td>Lawndale Elementary SD DS 1898 Series B</td>
<td>0.00716300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545.52</td>
<td>Lawndale Elementary Debt Service 98 Series C</td>
<td>0.00348900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545.53</td>
<td>Lawndale Elementary 2010 Refunding Bonds</td>
<td>0.03268500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725.54</td>
<td>Centinela Valley Union HSD 2002 Ref Bond S-A</td>
<td>0.00944300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725.56</td>
<td>Centinela Valley Union HSD 2004 Ref Bond S-A</td>
<td>0.01353400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725.57</td>
<td>Centinela Valley Union HSD 2006 Series 1A</td>
<td>0.00870900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725.58</td>
<td>Centinela Valley Union HSD 2010 11 Series A</td>
<td>0.00632700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725.59</td>
<td>Centinela Valley Union HSD 2010 12 Series A</td>
<td>0.01535400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725.61</td>
<td>Centinela Valley Union HSD 2008 2013 Series B</td>
<td>0.02229800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>797.51</td>
<td>El Camino CCD DS 2005 Ref. Bonds</td>
<td>0.00432700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>797.52</td>
<td>El Camino CCD DS 2002 Series 2006B</td>
<td>0.00935400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>797.53</td>
<td>El Camino CCD DS 2002 Series 2012C</td>
<td>0.00162400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>797.54</td>
<td>El Camino CCD DS 2012 Ref Bonds</td>
<td>0.00211700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Combined Tax Rate:** 1.1479130

Tax on Property Valued at $500,000 $ 5,739.57

---

**Source:** HdL Core & Cone (HdLCC) was established in 1992 providing property tax data base management, analytical and auditing services to over 195 cities, redevelopment agencies, special districts, and counties.

**ATTACHMENT A**
Permits Granted to Students from the Choice Blocks to Attend Wiseburn Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Requested from Lawndale</th>
<th>Approved by Lawndale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above chart shows the permits that LESD granted to students living in the Choice Blocks. Beginning in 2011-12, NO students that live in the Choice Blocks have been denied a permit to go to Wiseburn Schools. In addition, once students are granted a permit, they never have to reapply for another permit to attend Wiseburn Schools. However, Wiseburn does not always accept the students that have been granted permits from Lawndale. Wiseburn also requires that the students reapply for a permit into the district yearly. In her response to the Supplemental Request for Information to the County Committee dated December 2015, Petitioner Shavonna Webber-Christmas states, “LESD has shown a lack of willingness to release all students residing within the Orphan Blocks for many years”. This is a false statement. Every student who applied for a permit was released to Wiseburn by Lawndale, but Wiseburn (for whatever reasons) does not accept all of the students released from the Choice Blocks.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), this Initial Study/Negative Declaration (IS/ND) has been prepared to inform the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) decision-makers, affected agencies and the public of any potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed transfer of territory from the Lawndale School District (SD) and Centinela Valley Union High School District (HSD) to the Wiseburn Unified School District (USD) (proposed project).

1.1 ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE REQUIREMENTS

Section 15063(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires the Lead Agency (LACOE) to prepare an Initial Study to determine if the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment. Specifically, an Initial Study is used as the basis for determining if an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) or Negative Declaration (ND) shall be prepared for a project. An EIR is prepared when the Initial Study concludes that a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the Initial Study concludes that a project would have less-than-significant effects on the environment, or less-than-significant effects with implementation of mitigation measures, a ND or MND is prepared.

The proposed project described herein meets the specific criteria for a ND under CEQA. This document alone does not determine whether the proposed project will be approved. Rather, it is a disclosure document aimed at equally informing all concerned parties and fostering informed discussion and decision-making regarding all aspects of the proposed project.

1.2 PROJECT INFORMATION

**Project Title:** Transfer of Territory from the Lawndale School District and Centinela Valley Union High School District to the Wiseburn Unified School District

**Lead Agency Name and Address:**
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Regionalized Business Services
Division of Business Advisory Services
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242-2890

**Contact Person and Phone Number:** Keith D. Crafton, Assistant Director
(562) 922-6336

**Chief Petitioners:** Ms. Shavonda Webber-Christmas and Mr. Bill Magoon
1.3 ORGANIZATION OF INITIAL STUDY

This Initial Study/Negative Declaration (IS/ND) is organized into the following four chapters:

1.0 Introduction. This chapter provides introductory information and identifies the Lead Agency and Chief Petitioners for the proposed project.

2.0 Project Description. This chapter discusses the background of the proposed project and provides a description of the proposed transfer territory and the surrounding land uses.

3.0 Initial Study Checklist and Evaluation. This chapter contains the complete Initial Study Checklist showing the level of impact under each environmental impact category. This chapter also includes a discussion of the environmental impacts associated with each category.

4.0 Persons and Sources Consulted. This chapter provides the list of sources, governmental agencies and project consultant team members that participated in the preparation of this IS/ND.
2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 BACKGROUND

On May 14, 2014, the LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to Education Code (EC) §35700(a) to transfer territory from the Lawndale School District (SD) and Centinela Valley Union High School District (HSD) to the Wiseburn Unified School District (USD). On June 20, 2014, the Office of the Los Angeles County Counsel (County Counsel) notified LACOE staff of the petition’s sufficiency, and the petition was forwarded to the chief petitioners for circulation on June 23, 2014. On October 15, 2014, the chief petitioners submitted signed petitions to the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools (County Superintendent). County Superintendent staff examined the petition and forwarded it to the Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk (Registrar-Recorder) for signature verification on October 15, 2014. On November 6, 2014, LACOE staff received notification from the Registrar-Recorder that there were insufficient signatures to move the petition forward. The chief petitioners were notified and stated that they would gather additional signatures. On December 4, 2014, the chief petitioners submitted additional signatures to the Registrar-Recorder. On December 22, 2014, the Registrar-Recorder notified LACOE staff that the additional signatures had been validated, and the petition had sufficient signatures to move forward. On January 7, 2015, the petition was presented to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee).

Pursuant to EC §35705, two public hearings were conducted in the Lawndale SD and Centinela Valley Union HSD, and in the Wiseburn USD, both on March 2, 2015. In addition to the public hearings, the County Committee received numerous mail and email messages from community members and stakeholders, all of which were forwarded to members for review. The County Committee also received responses to requests for information from the Lawndale SD, the Centinela Valley Union HSD, the Wiseburn USD, and the chief petitioners.

Pursuant to EC §35706 and conditions set forth in EC §35753, the petition was examined in accordance to the nine conditions that guide review of school district organization petitions to transfer territory. LACOE staff recommended that the County Committee, under EC §35706(b), suspend the statutory timeline for review under EC §35710 in order to conduct an environmental review required under the CEQA. This document has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of CEQA, and LACOE will consider the information contained in this environmental document in making a decision to approve or deny the proposed project.

2.2 PROJECT LOCATION

The proposed transfer territory is located within the City of Lawndale, the City of Hawthorne and unincorporated Los Angeles County within the boundaries of Lawndale SD and the Centinela Valley Union HSD. Specifically, as shown in Figure 2-1, the proposed transfer territory consists of four blocks bounded by Inglewood Avenue to the east, Rosecrans Avenue to the south, La Cienega Boulevard to the west and West 139th Street to the north. The proposed transfer territory is approximately 64 acres in size and contains 406 parcels, nearly all of which contain single-family homes. The proposed transfer territory is currently assigned to the Lawndale SD for K-8th grade education and Centinela Valley Union HSD for 9-12th grade education. The area surrounding the proposed transfer territory is a diverse, suburban area with single-family housing, and very limited multi-family housing, surrounded by many robust commercial areas.
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LEGEND:
- Proposed Transfer Territory
- Lawndale SD
- Wiseburn USD
- Centinela Valley Union HSD

SOURCE: City of Los Angeles, TAHA, 2016.
Lawndale School District (SD)

The proposed transfer territory is currently assigned to the Lawndale SD for K-8th grade education. According to the California Department of Education (CDE), the 2014-15 student enrollment for the Lawndale SD was 6,300. The Lawndale SD operates six elementary schools and two middle schools (Table 2-1). Figure 2-2 depicts the location of these schools in relation to the proposed transfer territory. As shown, the proposed transfer territory is located nearest to the Billy Mitchell Elementary School and the Jane Addams Middle School. However, students are permitted to attend any of the elementary or middle schools within the Lawndale SD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2-1: LAWNDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT SCHOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Anderson Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Green Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy Mitchell Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin D. Roosevelt Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Twain Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucille Smith Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIDDLE SCHOOLS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Addams Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Rodgers Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOURCE:</strong> TAHA, 2016.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Centinela Valley Union High School District (HSD)

The proposed transfer territory is currently assigned to the Centinela Valley Union HSD for 9-12th grade education. According to the CDE, the 2014-15 student enrollment for the Centinela Valley Union HSD was 7,878. The Centinela Valley Union HSD operates three comprehensive high schools, one continuation high school, two Independent Study/Community Day schools, and one Adult School (Table 2-2). As shown in Figure 2-2, the proposed transfer territory is located nearest to Lawndale High School and R.K. Lloyde Continuation High School. However, students are permitted to attend any of the high schools within the Centinela Valley Union HSD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2-2: CENTINELA VALLEY UNIFIED HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT SCHOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawndale High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leuzinger High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.K. Lloyde High School Continuation High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centinela Valley Independent Study School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Academy Community Day School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centinela Valley Adult School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOURCE:</strong> TAHA, 2016.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FIGURE 2-2
PROPOSED TRANSFER TERRITORY AND SCHOOLS

LEGEND:
☑ Proposed Transfer Territory  ● Elementary  □ Lawndale SD
■ High School  ▲ Wiseburn SD
▲ Middle School  ■ Centinela Valley Union HSD

SOURCE: City of Los Angeles, TAHA, 2016.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
Wiseburn Unified School District (USD)

The Wiseburn USD serves K-12th students within the City of Hawthorne, the City of El Segundo and along with portions of unincorporated Los Angeles County. According to the CDE, the 2014-15 student enrollment for the Wiseburn USD was 4,065. As shown in Table 2-3, the Wiseburn USD operates three elementary schools, one middle school and is aligned with three charter high schools to serve 9-12th grade students. The WUSD is also currently in the process of constructing a new high school. According to the construction timeline, the main high school building will be available for use by students in August 2017. Phase 2 (the gymnasium and pool) is expected to be completed by Spring 2018. The new high school would serve 1,200 students in grades 9 through 12 on a 13.71-acre site located at 201 North Douglas Street. The new high school would house Da Vinci Design and Science high schools.

| TABLE 2-3: WISEBURN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT SCHOOLS |
|---------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Schools                         | Location         | Distance from Transfer Territory (Miles) |
| **ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS**          |                  |                                |
| Juan de Anza Elementary School (K-5) | 12110 S. Hindry Avenue | 1.7                             |
| Juan Cabrillo Elementary School (K-2) | 5309 W. 135th Street | 0.8                             |
| Peter Burnett Elementary School (3-5) | 5403 W. 138th Street | 1.0                             |
| **MIDDLE SCHOOLS**              |                  |                                |
| Richard Henry Dana Middle School | 5504 W. 135th Street | 1.0                             |
| **HIGH SCHOOLS**                |                  |                                |
| Da Vinci Science                | 13500 Aviation Boulevard | 1.5                             |
| Da Vinci Design                 | 12501 S. Isis Avenue | 1.1                             |
| Da Vinci Communications         | 12501 S. Isis Avenue | 1.1                             |
| New High School (Under Construction) | 201 N. Douglas Street | 2.0                             |

*SOURCE: TAHA, 2016.*

2.3 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed transfer territory contains 406 parcels, nearly all of which contain single-family homes. According to the Report to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization concerning the Proposed Transfer of Territory prepared in July 2015, there are approximately 239 students currently living within the proposed transfer territory. Of those, 112 students currently attend Wiseburn USD schools on permits. The best estimate that can be made of student enrollment among transfer territory students is that 80 K-8th grade students from the Lawndale SD are enrolled in the Wiseburn USD as permit students and 32 transfer territory students are attending Da Vinci Charter High Schools on permits from the Centinela Valley Union HSD. Therefore, the change in student enrollment would add no more than 127 students to the Wiseburn USD (and result in a potential loss of that same amount to Lawndale SD and/or Centinela Valley Union HSD, should students enroll in its high schools) if the petition is approved.

Implementation of the proposed project does not include the demolition of any extant structures or the construction of any new schools or educational facilities, and the proposed transfer of territory would not result in any physical changes that would have a direct impact on the environment. However, the route and distance students travel to school would change. Figure 2-3 depicts the anticipated routes that students within the proposed transfer territory would take to get to Wiseburn USD elementary and middle schools and to the new Wiseburn High School that is currently under construction.
Figure 2-3: Routes to Wiseburn USD Schools

Legend:
- Proposed Transfer Territory
- Traffic Signals
- Elementary School
- Middle School
- High School
- Anticipated Routes:
  - Lawndale SD
  - Wiseburn SD
  - Centinela Valley Union HSD

Source: City of Los Angeles, TAHA, 2016.
As shown, students within the proposed transfer territory going to the Juan Cabrillo Elementary School and to the Richard Henry Dana Middle School would generally travel north on Ocean Gate Avenue and west on 135th Street to the signalized intersection at La Cienega Boulevard and 135th Street. Students would then proceed along 135th Street under the Interstate 405 (I-405) freeway underpass before arriving at the elementary and middle schools. This route is approximately 0.8 miles to the Juan Cabrillo Elementary School and 1.0 miles to Richard Henry Dana Middle School from the proposed transfer territory. It is estimated to take approximately 15 minutes to walk to these two schools. There are no bike lanes along the route; however there are sidewalks and crosswalks along the entire route.

Students within the proposed transfer territory going to the new Wiseburn High School would also generally travel the same direction as the students going to elementary and middle school. However, from the Richard Henry Dana Middle School students would continue traveling west along 135th Street though the signalized intersections at Aviation Boulevard. West of this intersection 135th Street turns into Utah Avenue. Students would travel west on Utah Avenue to the signalized intersection at Douglas Street, where students would then travel north to the new Wiseburn High School currently under construction at the intersection of Douglas Street and El Segundo Boulevard (201 North Douglas Avenue). This route is approximately 2.0 miles in length and estimated to take approximately 30-40 minutes to walk. Similar to the route to the Wiseburn USD elementary and middle schools, there are no bike lanes along the route; however, there are sidewalks and crosswalks along the entire route.
3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST AND EVALUATION

This chapter contains the complete CEQA Initial Study Checklist showing the level of impact under each environmental topic area. Below are the four impact categories as defined by CEQA. For each environmental topic area, the appropriate impact category will be determined as it relates to that topic area.

DEFINITION OF IMPACT CATEGORIES

No Impact. The designation for those environmental topics where the proposed project would have no effect.

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The designation for those environmental topics where a change may occur as a result of the proposed project; however, the change would not exceed established impact threshold levels.

Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The designation assigned to environmental topics for which adverse effects can be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of specific conditions and measures.

Potentially Significant Impact. The designation assigned to environmental topics for which adverse effects cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level by mitigation measures.
DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency):

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☒ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature: ___________________________  Date: April 25, 2016

Kevin Ferrier, Senior Planner  Los Angeles County Office of Education
Printed Name: ___________________________  For: ___________________________
3.1 AESTHETICS - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a-d) No Impact.** The proposed transfer territory is located within an urbanized area of the City of Lawndale, the City of Hawthorne and unincorporated Los Angeles County. It contains 406 parcels, nearly all of which are currently developed with single-family homes. The proposed transfer territory is not part of a scenic vista, nor is the proposed transfer territory located adjacent to or within view of a State Scenic Highway. Implementation of the proposed project does not include the construction of any new schools or educational facilities, and therefore would not result in any physical changes that would have a direct impact on the visual environment of the project area. Furthermore, the routes that students within the proposed transfer territory would take to get to Wiseburn USD elementary, middle and high schools would not result in any indirect impacts to the visual character of the surrounding area. Therefore, no impact related to aesthetics would occur.

3.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a-e) No Impact.** There are no agricultural uses within the proposed transfer territory or in the surrounding area. The proposed transfer territory is located within an urbanized area, and the properties within the proposed transfer territory are nearly all developed with single-family homes. Similarly, the surrounding area is also developed with single-family housing and limited multi-family housing, surrounded by commercial areas. No farmland, agriculturally zoned land, Williamson Act Contract land or forest and timberland would be impacted by the proposed project. Implementation of the
proposed project does not include the construction of any new schools or educational facilities, and therefore would not result in any physical changes that would have a direct impact agriculture or forestry resources. Furthermore, there are sidewalks and crosswalks along the routes that students within the proposed transfer territory would take to get to Wiseburn USD elementary, middle and high schools, so there would be no indirect impacts on agriculture or forestry land uses. Therefore, no impact related to agriculture or forestry resources would occur.

3.3 AIR QUALITY - Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? ☐ ☐ ☐ ✓

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? ☐ ☐ ☐ ✓

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? ☐ ☐ ☐ ✓

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? ☐ ☐ ☐ ✓

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? ☐ ☐ ☐ ✓

a-e) No Impact. The only source of air pollutant emissions associated with the proposed project would be increased vehicle miles traveled related to changes in student pick-up and drop-off routes. Section 3.16, Transportation and Traffic, below, includes a detailed discussion of anticipated changes in transportation modes (i.e., walking, biking, and driving). A very conservative air quality analysis has been completed assuming that all 127 students would be driven in separate vehicles. The analysis also assumed that each vehicle would travel 2.0 miles each way for pick-up and drop-off (i.e., 4 trips), which is the longest distance to a Wiseburn USD school. Emissions were estimated using light duty automobile rates from the California Air Resources Board EMFAC2014 model. The analysis was based on an average speed of 25 miles per hour. As shown in Table 3-1, emissions would be well below the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) significance thresholds. Based on the level of emissions, there would be no potential for the proposed project to interfere with air quality management plans, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or contribute to a cumulative impact. In addition, it is not anticipated that the proposed project would generate diesel emissions from passenger vehicles resulting in exposure to substantial pollutant concentrations, or new sources of odors. Therefore, no impact related to air quality would occur.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3-1: OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS</th>
<th>Pounds Per Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Source Emissions</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Significance Threshold</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceed Threshold?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:  

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?  

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?  

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?  

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?  

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance (e.g., oak trees or California walnut woodlands)?  

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?  

a-f) No Impact. The proposed transfer territory is not identified as critical habitat for threatened and endangered species and does not contain any candidate, sensitive, or special status species identified in local plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. In addition, there are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans in the project area, and the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. As previously discussed, the proposed transfer territory is located within an urbanized area, and the properties within the proposed transfer territory are nearly all developed with single-family homes. Similarly, the project area is also developed with single-family housing and limited multi-family housing, surrounded by commercial areas. Implementation of the proposed project would not modify any natural habitat for special status species as the proposed project does not include the construction of any new schools or educational facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any physical changes that would have a direct impact on the environment. Furthermore, there are sidewalks and crosswalks along the routes that students within the proposed transfer territory would take to get to Wiseburn USD elementary, middle and high schools, so there would be no indirect impacts on any biological resources. Therefore, no impact related to biological resources would occur.

### 3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a-d) No Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially alter or remove identified cultural resources. A cultural resources record search was conducted as part of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the new Wiseburn High School currently under construction at 201 North Douglas Avenue. The record search identified one historic period archaeological resource and two cultural resources within a one-mile radius of the new high school.² The EIR further stated that the project area is considered moderately sensitive for buried archaeological and paleontological resources. Nonetheless, the properties within the proposed transfer territory are nearly all developed with single-family homes, and implementation of the proposed project does not include any construction or demolition activates that would potentially impact historic, archaeological, paleontological resources or human remains. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any physical changes that would have a direct impact on cultural resources. Furthermore, there are sidewalks and crosswalks along the routes that students within the proposed transfer territory would take to get to Wiseburn USD elementary, middle, and high schools, so there would be no indirect impacts on cultural resources. Therefore, no impact related to cultural resources would occur.

### 3.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Be located on expansive soil as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
- [ ] Less-Than-Significant Impact
- [ ] No Impact

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
- [ ] Less-Than-Significant Impact
- [ ] No Impact

**a-e) No Impact.** A significant impact could occur if the proposed project would expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving seismic hazards. The proposed transfer territory is not within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone; however, as with all properties in the seismically active Southern California region, the proposed transfer territory is susceptible to ground shaking during a seismic event. The closest active fault to the proposed transfer territory is the Newport-Inglewood Fault that generally runs from Culver City to Newport Beach. The Charnock Fault is another nearby fault that runs parallel to the Newport-Inglewood Fault that classified as potentially active by the California Geological Survey.3 With respect to seismically induced hazards, such as strong ground shaking, ground failure and landslides, the proposed project would not increase exposure to hazards over the existing conditions as it does not include any construction activities and would not increase the number of people in the proposed transfer territory. The properties within the proposed transfer territory are nearly all developed with single-family homes. Similarly, the project area is also developed with single-family housing and limited multi-family housing, surrounded by commercial areas. Nonetheless, as no construction activities would occur, the proposed project would disturb or destabilize soils, expose soils to erosion processes, or place structures on unstable soils. Furthermore, there are sidewalks and crosswalks along the routes that students within the proposed transfer territory would take to get to Wiseburn USD elementary, middle, and high schools, so there would be no indirect impacts related to geology and soils. Therefore, no impact related to geology and soils would occur.

**3.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS - Would the project:**

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
- [ ] Less-Than-Significant Impact
- [ ] No Impact

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
- [ ] Less-Than-Significant Impact
- [ ] No Impact

**a-b) No Impact.** The only source of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with the proposed project would be increased vehicle miles traveled related to changes in student pick-up and drop-off routes. Section 3.16, Transportation and Traffic, below, includes a detailed discussion of anticipated changes in transportation modes (i.e., walking, biking, and driving). A very conservative air quality analysis has been completed assuming that all 127 students would be driven in separate vehicles. The analysis also assumed that each vehicle would travel 2.0 miles each way for pick-up and drop-off (i.e., 4 trips), which is the longest distance to a Wiseburn USD school. Carbon dioxide emissions were estimated using light duty automobile rates from the California Air Resources Board EMFAC2014 model. The analysis was based on an average speed of 25 miles per hour. The proposed project would generate

---

70 metric tons per year of carbon dioxide emissions. Emissions of other GHGs, including nitrogen oxides and methane, would be negligible.

The South Coast Air Quality Management District convened a GHG CEQA Significance Threshold Stakeholder Working Group beginning in April of 2008 to examine alternatives for establishing quantitative GHG thresholds within the district’s jurisdiction. Although a threshold has not been adopted for projects other than industrial facilities, the Working Group recommended a threshold of 3,000 metric tons per year for general development. The proposed project emissions of 32 metric tons per year would be well below the recommended threshold.

California Assembly Bill (AB) 32 requires the California Air Resources Board to develop and enforce regulations for the reporting and verification of Statewide GHG emissions, and directs California Air Resources Board to set a GHG emission limit, based on 1990 levels, to be achieved by 2020. The California Air Resources Board adopted the AB 32 Scoping Plan, which sets forth the framework for facilitating the State’s goal of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. The First Update of the AB 32 Scoping Plan was adopted on May 22, 2014. At this writing, the California Air Resources Board is drafting the next update of the Scoping Plan. The Second Update is expected to include strategies to meet a 2030 GHG reduction goal of 40 percent below 1990 levels. Neither AB 32 nor the updated AB 32 Scoping Plan establishes regulations implementing, for specific projects, the Legislature’s statewide goals for reducing GHGs. The AB 32 Scoping Plans outline a series of technologically feasible and cost-effective measures to reduce Statewide GHG emissions, including expanding energy efficiency programs, increasing electricity production from renewable resources (at least 33 percent of the statewide electricity mix), and increasing automobile efficiency, implementing the Low-Carbon Fuel Standard, and developing a cap-and-trade program. These measures are designed to be implemented by State agencies. The proposed project would not interfere with implementation of the AB 32 measures, and there is no potential for the student transfer to interfere with local GHG reduction plans. Therefore, no impact related to GHG emissions would occur.

### 3.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for the people residing or working in the area?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


a-h) **No Impact.** Impacts related to hazardous materials are primarily associated manufacturing and industrial uses or if the proposed project created a significant hazard to the public or environment due to a reasonably foreseeable release of hazardous materials. No commercial or industrial uses or activities occur within the proposed transfer territory that would result in the use or discharge of unregulated hazardous materials and/or substances, or create a public hazard through transport, use, or disposal. The properties within the proposed transfer territory are nearly all developed with single-family homes, and the project area is also developed with single-family housing and limited multi-family housing, surrounded by commercial areas. Hazardous material use and storage within the proposed transfer territory would be limited to common hazardous substances typical of those used in residential developments, including lubricants, paints, cleaning supplies, pesticides and other landscaping supplies, and vehicle fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. In addition, there is no risk wildland fires as there are no wildlands in the project area, and while there airstrips in the vicinity of the proposed transfer territory, implementation of the proposed project does not include the construction of any new schools or educational facilities, and the proposed project would not result in any physical changes that would have a direct impact on the environment. Furthermore, there are sidewalks and crosswalks along the routes that students within the proposed transfer territory would take to get to Wiseburn USD elementary, middle, and high schools, so there would be no indirect impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. Therefore, no impact related to hazards and hazardous materials would occur.

3.9 **HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY** - Would the project:

   a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned land uses for which permits have been granted)? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off site? 

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation
- Less-Than-Significant Impact
- No Impact

- ☑
- ☐
- ☐
- ☑

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation
- Less-Than-Significant Impact
- No Impact

- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☑

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation
- Less-Than-Significant Impact
- No Impact

- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☑

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood plain as mapped on federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation
- Less-Than-Significant Impact
- No Impact

- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☑

h) Place within a 100-year flood plain structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation
- Less-Than-Significant Impact
- No Impact

- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☑

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation
- Less-Than-Significant Impact
- No Impact

- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☑

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation
- Less-Than-Significant Impact
- No Impact

- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☑

a-j) **No Impact.** The proposed transfer territory is located in the Dominguez Watershed, which is in the southern portion of Los Angeles County and encompasses approximately 133 square miles. Since the entire watershed is highly urban, drainage within the Dominguez Watershed is primarily through an extensive network of underground storm drains. There are no waterways, including dams or levees, within the vicinity of the proposed transfer territory, and the proposed transfer area is not located within a floodplain. Drainage in the project area is primary via exiting streets, curbs and gutters that direct runoff into collection points where flows enter existing storm drains. Implementation of the proposed project does not include the construction of any new schools or educational facilities and would not place people or structures in a flood hazard or inundation zone. Furthermore, there are sidewalks and crosswalks along the routes that students within the proposed transfer territory would take to get to Wiseburn USD elementary, middle, and high schools, so there would be no indirect impacts related to hydrology and water quality. Therefore, no impact related to hydrology and water quality would occur.

### 3.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a-c) **No Impact.** As previously discussed, the proposed transfer territory consists of an established residential neighborhood, and the properties within the proposed transfer territory are nearly all developed with single-family homes. Similarly, the project area is also developed with single-family housing and limited multi-family housing, surrounded by commercial areas. According to the General Plan for unincorporated Los Angeles County, the proposed transfer territory area is primarily designated Residential 9 (H9) and zoned Single-family Residential (R-1). However, small portions of the proposed transfer area primarily fronting Inglewood Boulevard are designated General Commercial (CG) and are zoned Unlimited Commercial (C-3). As such, the proposed project would not conflict with any Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans. The proposed transfer territory is served by existing roadways, and no separation of uses or disruption of access between land use types would occur as a result of the proposed project. Implementation of the proposed project does not include the construction of any new schools or educational facilities, and therefore would not result in any physical changes that would have a direct impact related to land use and planning. Furthermore, there are sidewalks and crosswalks along the routes that students within the proposed transfer territory would take to get to Wiseburn USD elementary, middle, and high schools, so there would be no indirect impacts related to land use and planning. Therefore, no impact related to land use and planning would occur.

3.11 **MINERAL RESOURCES** - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a-b) **No Impact.** Oil production in the area has been an important part of the historic and cultural legacy area. However, the proposed transfer territory is located within an urbanized area, and the properties within the proposed transfer territory are nearly all developed with single-family homes. The proposed transfer territory area and the surrounding area is not located within a mapped mineral producing area as classified by the California Geological Survey, and there are no mining activities occurring in the project area. Implementation of the proposed project does not include the construction of any new schools or educational facilities, and therefore would not result in any physical changes that would have a direct impact on the environment. Furthermore, there are sidewalks and crosswalks along the routes that students within the proposed transfer territory would take to get to Wiseburn USD elementary, middle, and high schools, so there would be no indirect impacts to mineral resources. Therefore, no impact related to mineral quality would occur.

3.12 **NOISE** – Would the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

\[ \square \quad \square \quad \square \quad \checkmark \]

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

\[ \square \quad \square \quad \square \quad \checkmark \]

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

\[ \square \quad \square \quad \square \quad \checkmark \]

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airlstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

\[ \square \quad \square \quad \square \quad \checkmark \]

**a-f) No Impact.** The proposed project would change pick-up and drop-off routes and associated roadway noise. According to the California Department of Transportation Technical Noise Supplement, a doubling of traffic volume is typically needed to audibly increase mobile noise. A very conservative analysis assumes 127 hourly passenger vehicles spread throughout the roadway network leading to the Wiseburn USD schools. Assuming attendance is divided between the schools leads to 25 trips to each school. Existing conditions on roadways near each school include more than 25 vehicles per hour. Changes in vehicle circulation would not double hourly traffic volumes and audibly increase hourly noise levels. It is likely that a number of students would walk or bike to school. This typically involves communication between students and parents that generates audible noise. Pedestrian voices would be the other contribution to operational noise. In social situations, people often talk at distances of approximately three to thirteen feet. A typical voice level at 13 feet is approximately 50 dBA. This noise level is consistent with daytime ambient noise levels typical to residential communities. For example, most noise ordinances have limits in the 50 to 65 decibel range for residential areas. The proposed project would not significantly increase community noise. Therefore, no impact related to noise would occur.

3.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

\[ \square \quad \square \quad \square \quad \checkmark \]

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

\[ \square \quad \square \quad \square \quad \checkmark \]

c) Displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

\[ \square \quad \square \quad \square \quad \checkmark \]

---


a-c) **No Impact.** The proposed transfer territory consists of an established residential neighborhood and contains 406 parcels, nearly all of which are developed with single-family homes. Therefore, no substantial increase in population would occur. According to the Report to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization Concerning the Proposed Transfer of Territory, there are approximately 239 students currently living within the proposed transfer territory. Of those, 112 students currently attend Wiseburn USD schools on permits. The best estimate that can be made of student enrollment among transfer territory students is 80 K-8th grade students from the Lawndale SD are enrolled in the Wiseburn USD as permit students and 32 transfer territory students are attending Da Vinci Charter High Schools on permits from the Centinela Valley Union HSD. Therefore, the change in student enrollment would be no more than 127 additional students to the Wiseburn USD (and a potential loss of that same amount to Lawndale SD and/or Centinela Valley Union HSD, should students enroll in its high schools) if the petition is approved. Implementation of the proposed project does not include the construction of any new roads, schools or educational facilities and therefore would not result in any physical changes that would have a direct impact on population, and housing. No displacement of housing or people would occur. Furthermore, the routes that students within the proposed transfer territory would take to get to Wiseburn USD elementary, middle and high schools would not result in any indirect impacts to population and housing. Therefore, no impact related to population and housing would occur.

3.14 PUBLIC SERVICES - Would the project:

a) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

i) Fire protection? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

ii) Police protection? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

iii) Schools? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

iv) Parks? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

v) Other public facilities (including roads)? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

a.i-v) **No Impact.** As previously discussed, the proposed project would not increase the population of the area, and therefore would not increase demands on public services, which are already in place and serve the properties within the proposed transfer territory are nearly all developed with single-family homes. Implementation of the proposed project does not include the construction of any new schools or educational facilities, and therefore would not result in any physical changes that would have a direct impact on fire and police protection services or schools and parks. Furthermore, there are sidewalks and crosswalks along the routes that students within the proposed transfer territory would take to get to Wiseburn USD elementary, middle, and high schools, so there would be no indirect impacts to public services. Therefore, no impact related to public services would occur.
3.15 RECREATION - Would the project:

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

□ □ □ ☑

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

□ □ □ ☑

a-b) No Impact. There are no recreational facilities within the proposed transfer territory, and the proposed project would not increase the population in the area or increase demands on existing recreational facilities. In addition, the new Wiseburn High School that is currently under construction would provide additional athletic facilities, thereby adding to the number of available recreational facilities in the project area. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in any physical changes that would have a direct impact on the recreational facilities. Furthermore, there are sidewalks and crosswalks along the routes that students within the proposed transfer territory would take to get to Wiseburn USD elementary, middle, and high schools, so there would be no indirect impacts to recreational facilities. Therefore, no impact related to recreation would occur.

3.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

□ □ □ ☑

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

□ □ □ ☑

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

□ □ □ ☑

d) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

□ □ □ ☑

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

□ □ □ ☑

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

□ □ □ ☑
a-f) **No Impact.** As previously discussed, the properties within the proposed transfer territory are nearly all developed with single-family homes, and the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in the area. However, the route and distance that students within the proposed transfer territory travel to school would change. Figure 2-3, above, depicts the routes students within the proposed transfer territory would take to get to Wiseburn USD elementary and middle schools and to the new Wiseburn High School that is currently under construction.

According to the National Center for Safe Routes to School, there are no distance-related "targets" for walking or biking to school that can be applied to all schools. However, people (i.e., students) are generally willing to travel up to about 30 minutes to get somewhere. The typical walking rate for school-aged children is about 2.7 miles per hour (mph) or 1.35 miles per 30 minute-period. Assuming that students bike at a speed of eight mph and are similarly willing to bike up to about 30 minutes to get to school, a one-way trip length via biking is about four miles.\(^6\)

The elementary and middle schools nearest to the proposed transfer territory are the Billy Mitchell Elementary School located and the Jane Addams Middle School located within the Lawndale SD. The Billy Mitchell Elementary School located at 14429 Condon Avenue is approximately 0.7 miles from the proposed transfer territory, and the Jane Addams Middle School located at 4535 West 153rd Place is approximately 1.4 miles from the proposed transfer territory. The high school nearest to the proposed transfer territory is the Lawndale High School located at 14901 South Inglewood Avenue within the Centinela Valley Union HSD. This high school is approximately 0.9 miles within the project transfer territory.

Figure 2-3, above depicts that routes that students within the proposed transfer territory would generally take to get to Wiseburn USD elementary and middle schools and to the new Wiseburn High School. From the proposed transfer territory, it is approximately 0.8 miles to the Juan Cabrillo Elementary School and 1.0 miles to the Richard Henry Dana Middle School. The route to the new Wiseburn High School is approximately 2.0 miles in length.

Students going to the Juan Cabrillo Elementary School and to the Richard Henry Dana Middle School within the Wiseburn USD would generally travel north on Ocean Gate Avenue and west on 135th Street to the signalized intersection at La Cienega Boulevard and 135th Street. Students would then proceed along 135th Street under the I-405 freeway underpass before arriving at the elementary and middle schools. It is estimated to take approximately 15 minutes to walk to these two schools. There are no bike lanes along the route; however, there are sidewalks and crosswalks along the entire route. Students within the proposed transfer territory going to the new Wiseburn High School would also generally travel the same direction as the students going to elementary and middle school. However, from the Richard Henry Dana Middle School students would continue traveling west along 135th Street though the signalized intersections at Aviation Boulevard. West of this intersection 135th Street turns into Utah Avenue. Students would travel west on Utah Avenue to the signalized intersection at Douglas Street, where students would then travel north to the new Wiseburn High School currently under construction at the intersection of Douglas Street and El Segundo Boulevard (201 North Douglas Avenue). This route is estimated to take approximately 30-40 minutes to walk. Similar to the route to the Wiseburn USD elementary and middle schools, there are no bike lanes along the route; however, there are sidewalks and crosswalks along the entire route.

In addition to walking and biking, students within the proposed transfer territory would also be driven to school. As previously discussed, 112 of the approximately 239 students within proposed transfer territory, currently attend Wiseburn USD schools on permits. Therefore, the change in student enrollment would approximately no more than 127 additional students to the Wiseburn USD (and a potential loss of that same amount to Lawndale SD and/or Centinela Valley Union HSD, should

students enroll in its high schools) if the proposed project is approved. In regard to traffic, the minor increase in distance and the change in routes that students traveling to Wiseburn USD schools would be negligible. Therefore, no impact related to transportation and traffic would occur.

3.17 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resource, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the projects projected demand in addition to the providers existing commitments?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the projects solid waste disposal needs?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>g) Comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a-g) **No Impact.** The properties within the proposed transfer territory are nearly all developed with single-family homes, and utility service systems are already in place and serve the proposed territory transfer territory. Water, wastewater, stormwater drainage, and solid waste services would not be affected as a result of the proposed project as implementation of the proposed project does not include the construction of any new schools or educational facilities. The proposed project would not increase the population in the area or increase demands on existing utilities and service systems. Furthermore, there are sidewalks and crosswalks along the routes that students within the proposed transfer territory would take to get to Wiseburn USD elementary, middle, and high schools, so there would be no indirect impacts to utilities and service systems. Therefore, no impact related to utilities and service systems would occur.
3.18 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE - Would the project:

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?  

b) Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects).

c) Does the project have environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

a-c) No Impact. As discussed above, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any physical changes that would have a direct impact on the quality of the environment. Furthermore, there are sidewalks and crosswalks along the routes that students within the proposed transfer territory would take to get to Wiseburn USD elementary, middle, and high schools. The properties within the proposed transfer territory are nearly all developed with single-family homes. Therefore, no increase in population would occur as a result of the proposed project. Similarly, the project area is also developed with single-family housing and limited multi-family housing, surrounded by commercial areas. Although projects may be constructed in the project vicinity, the proposed project would not contribute to any substantial adverse impacts on human beings either directly or indirectly. Therefore, no impact would occur.
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Meeting Date: May 21, 2015

Item Title: Resolution #14/14-34: Establishing Criteria for Developing Trustee Area Boundaries

Item Type: Action

BACKGROUND:

The Board of Trustees of the Castaic Union School District was elected under an “at-large” election system where trustees were elected by voters of the entire District. Throughout the state of California, concerns have been raised that this form of election is a violation of the Federal Voting Rights Act (42 U.S.C. section 1973), which prohibits the use of any voting qualification, or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure, in a manner which results in a denial or abridgement of the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color. Therefore, the Governing Board is considering a change to “by trustee area” elections where each trustee must reside within the designated trustee area boundary and is elected only by the voters in that trustee area. In an effort to begin the transition process, the Board of Trustees will first establish criteria for developing trustee area boundaries.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:

Unknown at this time.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve item as submitted.

Submitted by: Janene Maxon, Interim Superintendent

Approved for Submission to Board of Trustees: Janene Maxon, Interim Superintendent
CASTAIC UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT

RESOLUTION #14/15-34

RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING CRITERIA FOR
DEVELOPING TRUSTEE AREA BOUNDARIES

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees ("Governing Board") of the Castaic Union School District ("District") was elected under an "at-large" election system where trustees were elected by voters of the entire District; and

WHEREAS, the Governing Board is considering a change to "by trustee area" elections; and where each trustee must reside within the designated trustee area boundary and is elected only by the voters in that trustee area; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Voting Rights Act (42 U.S.C. section 1973) prohibits the use of any voting qualification, or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure, in a manner which results in a denial or abridgement of the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color; and

WHEREAS, federal law and the Equal Protection Clause require that each trustee area be equal in population to ensure compliance with the "one person, one vote" rule; however, deviations (less than five percent [5%] greater than or less than the ideal, for a total of ten percent [10%] deviation) are presumptively constitutional under the Equal Protection Clause where required to meet an official criteria; and

WHEREAS, the Governing Board has instructed its demographer, and District staff to develop draft maps to create trustee areas that fully comply with legal requirements and wishes to provide official criteria for any needed deviations.

BE IT RESOLVED, the Governing Board of the District hereby adopts the following criteria to guide the establishment of trustee areas for the Governing Board:

- The boundaries of the trustee areas shall be established so that the trustee areas are at least as nearly equal in population as required by law.
- The boundaries of the trustee areas shall not be gerrymandered in violation of the principles established by the United States Supreme Court in Shaw v. Reno, 509 U.S. 630 (1993), and its progeny.
- The boundaries of the trustee areas shall be established so that the trustee areas do not result in a denial or abridgement of the right of any citizen to vote on account of race or color as provided in Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act.
- The boundaries of the trustee areas shall observe communities of interest, such as the District’s underlying elementary school attendance areas and elementary school “feeder” districts, high school attendance areas, rural or urban populations, municipalities, social interests, agricultural, industrial or service industry interests, and the like, insofar as practicable.
• The boundaries of the trustee areas may take into account visible features, such as topography and geography, including mountains, flat land, forest lands, man-made geographical features such as highways and canals, etc., insofar as practicable.

• The boundaries of the trustee areas shall be compact, insofar as practicable.

• The boundaries of the trustee areas shall be created to contain contiguous territory, insofar as practicable.

• The boundaries of the trustee areas may consider avoiding pairing two or more incumbents in a single district, insofar as this does not conflict with the constitution and laws of the State of California and the United States.

• To maintain a longer-term population balance, trustee areas known to be areas of higher-than-average population growth following redistricting may be under-populated within the population deviation amounts allowed by law.

• The boundaries of the trustee areas shall comply with such other factors which become known during the redistricting process and are formally adopted by the Board.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Superintendent or his/her designee shall be authorized to modify these general line drawing criteria so long as such changes are consistent with all requirements of law;

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Superintendent or his/her designee shall be authorized to take any additional acts needed to effectuate the purpose and intent of this resolution.

**APPROVED AND ADOPTED** this 21st day of May, 2015, by the Board of Trustees of the Castaic Union School District.

Ayes: 3

Nocs: 2

Absent: 0

Abstain: 0

[Signature]
President, Board of Trustees
Castaic Union School District
Meeting Date: May 21, 2015

Item Title: Resolution #14/14-35: Initiate Transition to a By-Trustee Area Election System

Item Type: Action

BACKGROUND:

The Board of Trustees of the Castaic Union School District was elected under an “at-large” election system where trustees were elected by voters of the entire District. Throughout the state of California, concerns have been raised that this form of election is a violation of the Federal Voting Rights Act (42 U.S.C. section 1973), which prohibits the use of any voting qualification, or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure, in a manner which results in a denial or abridgement of the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color. Since establishing the criteria for developing trustee area boundaries, the Board of Trustees will now initiate the transition to a by-trustee area election system in preparation for the 2017 Governing Board Election.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:

Unknown at this time.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve item as submitted.

Submitted by: Janene Maxon, Interim Superintendent

Approved for Submission to Board of Trustees: Janene Maxon, Interim Superintendent
CASTAIC UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT

RESOLUTION #14/15-35

A RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNING BOARD OF THE CASTAIC UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT TO INITIATE A TRANSITION TO A BY-TRUSTEE AREA ELECTION SYSTEM COMMENCING WITH THE 2017 GOVERNING BOARD ELECTION AND STATEMENT OF INTENT TO SEEK A WAIVER OF THE ELECTION REQUIREMENT FROM THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

WHEREAS, California Education Code sections 5019(a) & (c)(l) and 5030 authorize the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (“County Committee”), upon application of a school district's governing board, to change the method of election of governing board members in a school district under its jurisdiction.

WHEREAS, the California Voting Rights Act (Elections Code §§ 14025 et seq.) (“CVRA”) prohibits the use of an "at-large" election system for governing board members of a school district if the “at-large” elections impair the ability of a protected class to elect candidates of its choice, or its ability to influence the outcome of an election.

WHEREAS, Governing Board (“Board”) Members of the Castaic Union School District (“District”) are currently elected using an “at-large” election system (i.e., election system in which registered voters of the entire jurisdiction elect candidates to the governing board).

WHEREAS, the Board believes that starting with the 2017 Board elections, the public interest will be better served by the adoption of “by-trustee area” elections which will reduce the District’s exposure to litigation pursuant to the CVRA, which provides a successful plaintiff the right to reasonable attorneys’ fees and expert witness fees, creating substantial financial risk to any school district sued.

WHEREAS, the data from the recently completed federal 2010 Census will permit trustee areas to be drawn and implemented in the District using the most up-to-date demographic data available.

WHEREAS, although Education Code section 5020 normally requires that a County Committee’s resolution approving a change in the method of electing governing board members be submitted to the electorate for its approval at the school district’s next regular election, the Board intends to seek a waiver of the voter approval requirement as permitted by law. Education Code sections 33050-33053 authorize the State Board of Education to waive this voter approval requirement, which could reduce the costs and risks associated with a school district’s transition to a “by-trustee area” election system.

WHEREAS, the Board finds it appropriate to seek a waiver of the election requirement in Education Code section 5020, and portions of sections 5019, 5021, and 5030, to ensure the timely implementation of the “by-trustee area” election system commencing with the 2017 Governing Board election, to reduce costs for the District associated with placing an item on the ballot and to reduce any potential legal liability or financial risk to the District under the CVRA.
WHEREAS, the adoption of “by-trustee area” elections will not affect the terms of any sitting Board members, each of whom will serve out his or her current term.

WHEREAS, the Board, cognizant of its reduced operating revenues and need for fiscal responsibility, desires to implement this change in the manner of electing Board members in the most cost effective and efficient manner.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Governing Board of the Castaic Union School District does hereby resolve, order and determine as follows:

1. The above recitals are true and correct.

2. The Board hereby determines that the trustee area boundary lines shall be developed based on the federal 2010 Census data to provide for “by-trustee areas” elections commencing in 2017.

3. By this resolution, and pursuant to Education Code sections 5019(a) and 5030, the Board directs District staff to transmit this resolution and other appropriate documents to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization to apply to have the County Committee adopt a change in the method of electing members of the board from “at-large” elections [Education Code section 5030(a)] to “by-trustee area” elections [Education Code section 5030(b)] commencing with the 2017 Board elections.

4. Before submitting a final proposal to the County Committee for a trustee area plan using the federal 2010 Census data, one or more public hearings shall be scheduled to obtain public input on the draft proposals prepared.

5. The Board shall apply to the County Committee for establishment of trustee areas pursuant to Education Code section 5019(a) in a timely manner to have the 2017 elections for the Board conducted within the new trustee areas.

6. The Superintendent, or his designee, shall send a copy of this resolution to the County Committee for action in accordance with law.

7. The Superintendent, or his designee, is hereby directed to locate and secure proposals from demographer(s) to perform all necessary services to facilitate the transition to a “by-trustee area” election system and to make a recommendation to the Board for approval.

8. The Superintendent, or his designee, is hereby directed to prepare an additional Board resolution, and implement the applicable legal requirements in a timely manner, to seek a waiver from the State Board of Education of the election requirement imposed by Education Code section 5020.

9. The Superintendent, or his designee, shall consult with legal counsel to resolve all legal issues necessary to give effect to this resolution.
10. The foregoing resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

[Signature]
President of the Governing Board of
the Castaic Union School District

ATTEST:

[Signature]
Clerk of the Governing Board of
the Castaic Union School District

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Governing Board of the Castaic Union School District, Los Angeles County, California on the 21st day of May, 2015 at a duly noted meeting, by the following vote:

Ayes: 3
Noes: 2
Absent: 0
Abstain: 0

I, Victor Torres, Clerk of the Governing Board, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of a Resolution passed and duly adopted by the Governing Board at a regularly scheduled and conducted meeting held on this date.

CASTAIC UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT

By: [Signature]
Clerk of the Governing Board of
the Castaic Union School District
REPORT TO THE
LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE
ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION
CONCERNING A PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH TRUSTEE AREAS
AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING WITHIN THE
SAUGUS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT

MAY 4, 2016

Prepared by:
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Division of Business Advisory Services
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I. INTRODUCTION

On November 20, 2015, the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) received a petition submitted by the Saugus Union School District (SD), pursuant to Education Code (EC) §5019(c)(1), to establish trustee areas and trustee area voting within the Saugus Union SD (Appendix A). The petition was presented to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) on January 6, 2016.

The following report has been prepared by LACOE staff to provide the County Committee with an overview of relevant issues presented in the petition, to describe the events that led up to it, and to recount the public hearing process that followed its submission. In addition, the requirements and process to establish trustee areas and trustee area voting, and additional information concerning the Saugus Union SD, will be presented.

This report is provided for reference and descriptive purposes only. The report does not evaluate the claims of any party or comment on the quality of any aspect of the Saugus Union SD or the communities it serves. This report contains recommendations from staff to the County Committee. However, the Education Code does not provide specific guidance on which issues to review when considering trustee area petitions, thus the County Committee is free to consider any information presented to it and any criteria it deems relevant.

II. PROCESS TO ESTABLISH TRUSTEE AREAS PURSUANT TO THE EDUCATION CODE

EC §5019(a) provides that, except in a district provided for in the charter of a city or city and county, in any school district or community college district, the County Committee shall have the power to establish trustee areas; rearrange the boundaries of trustee areas; abolish trustee areas; and increase to seven or decrease to five the number of members of the governing board, or to adopt one of the alternative methods of electing governing board members specified in EC §5030.

Initiation of Proposal

Any such proposal may be initiated by:

a. the County Committee; or

b. a petition presented to the County Committee, in compliance with the guidelines of EC §5019:

5019. (a) Except in a school district governed by a board of education provided for in the charter of a city or city and county, in any school district or community college district, the county committee on school district organization may establish trustee areas, rearrange the boundaries of trustee areas, abolish trustee areas, and increase to seven or decrease to five the number of members of the governing board, or adopt one of the alternative methods of electing governing board members specified in Section 5030.
(b) The county committee on school district organization may establish or abolish a common governing board for a high school district and an elementary school district within the boundaries of the high school district. The resolution of the county committee on school district organization approving the establishment or abolition of a common governing board shall be presented to the electors of the school districts as specified in Section 5020.

(c) (1) A proposal to make the changes described in subdivision (a) or (b) may be initiated by the county committee on school district organization or made to the county committee on school district organization either by a petition signed by 5 percent or 50, whichever is less, of the qualified registered voters residing in a district in which there are 2,500 or fewer qualified registered voters, by 3 percent or 100, whichever is less, of the qualified registered voters residing in a district in which there are 2,501 to 10,000 qualified registered voters, by 1 percent or 250, whichever is less, of the qualified registered voters residing in a district in which there are 10,001 to 50,000 qualified registered voters, by 500 or more of the qualified registered voters residing in a district in which there are 50,001 to 100,000 qualified registered voters, by 750 or more of the qualified registered voters residing in a district in which there are 100,001 to 250,000 qualified registered voters, or by 1,000 or more of the qualified registered voters residing in a district in which there are 250,001 or more qualified registered voters or by resolution of the governing board of the district. For this purpose, the necessary signatures for a petition shall be obtained within a period of 180 days before the submission of the petition to the county committee on school district organization and the number of qualified registered voters in the district shall be determined pursuant to the most recent report submitted by the county elections official to the Secretary of State under Section 2187 of the Elections Code.

(2) When a proposal is made pursuant to paragraph (1), the county committee on school district organization shall call and conduct at least one hearing in the district on the matter. At the conclusion of the hearing, the county committee on school district organization shall approve or disapprove the proposal.

c. a resolution of the governing board of the district.

California Education Code, EC §5019 [Emphasis added.]

Public Hearing/County Committee Action

Following receipt of a petition that has been determined to be sufficient by the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools (County Superintendent), the County Committee shall call and conduct at least one public hearing on the proposal in the district. At the conclusion of the public hearing, the County Committee shall approve or disapprove the proposal.

In accordance with EC §5020, if the proposal is disapproved, the process is terminated.
Election Process

If the proposal is approved, the County Superintendent shall order an election to be held no later than the next election for governing board members of the district (i.e., November 2015). The order of election would include a single ballot measure consisting of two proposals. The two proposals would be stated as follows:

“For the establishment of trustee areas in the [Saugus Union School] District. - Yes/No”

“For the election of one member of the governing board of the [Saugus Union School] District residing in each trustee area elected by the registered voters of that particular trustee area. - Yes/No”

Both proposals must pass in order for either proposal to become effective. Please note that the requirement to hold an election to approve the implementation of trustee areas may be waived by the SBE. Additional information is presented below regarding relevant waivers submitted in relation to this petition.

The election of governing board members would also be operative at the next regular election date (i.e., November 2016) for any seats scheduled for election (either by rotation, every two years, or by specific identification as a result of the County Committee review of the trustee area petition). The election of any members of the Saugus Union SD governing board will be guided by a consolidated election order covering all regular school and community college elections held in Los Angeles County in November 2016.

Development of Trustee Area Boundary Maps

Should both proposals pass, the County Superintendent would develop multiple trustee area boundary maps for consideration by the County Committee. Trustee area maps shall be drawn in accordance with one or both of the methods specified in EC §5019.5(1) and EC §5019.5(2) which state:

“The population of each area is, as nearly may be, the same proportion of the total population of the district as the ratio that the number of governing board members elected from the area bears to the total number of members of the governing board.”

“The population of each area is, as nearly may be, the same proportion of the total population of the district as each of the other areas.”

The most recent decennial census data validated by the Population Research Unit of the Department of Finance shall be utilized in determining the population of the district and each trustee area (EC §5019.5[a]).

The County Committee would then establish trustee area boundaries for the district as authorized pursuant to EC §5019(c). The established trustee area boundaries would be utilized for the next succeeding governing board election (i.e., November 2016).
Please note that, for the present proposal, staff has included the trustee area boundary map developed by the Saugus Union SD governing board, in consultation with its attorneys, demographers, and district staff, and after solicitation of input from governing board members, the public and other parties relevant to the process of developing trustee areas (such as representatives from local municipal entities). The County Committee may consider adopting this map and trustee areas as submitted, or convene an additional process to develop additional maps with alternate trustee areas.

Transition of Incumbent Board Members

EC §5021 provides for the transition of incumbent governing board members in a school district where trustee areas are established. EC §5021 states:

“If a proposal for the establishment of trustee areas formulated under Section 5019 and 5020 is approved by a majority of the voters voting at the election, any affected incumbent board member shall serve out his or her term of office and succeeding board members shall be nominated and elected in accordance with Section 5030. In the event two or more trustee areas are established at such election which are not represented in the membership of the governing board of the school district, or community college district, the county committee shall determine by lot the trustee area from which the nomination and election for the next vacancy on the governing board shall be made.”

Subject to approval of the proposal by the electorate, as required, the County Committee would determine the applicable trustee areas for nomination and election no later than 120 days prior to the next regular scheduled governing board election (i.e., November 2016). The County Committee would make this determination following adoption of the trustee area boundaries for the district.

Please note that the requirement that the County Committee determine by lot which trustee areas with no current incumbents residing within them come up for election first, if necessary, may be waived by the SBE.

III. LOS ANGELES COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

There are 80 school districts in Los Angeles County as displayed on Reference Map 1.
Table 1 presents a summary of the governance characteristics of the school districts within Los Angeles County relating to trustee areas. Of the 80 school districts, 13 are organized into trustee areas and 67 do not have trustee areas. Of the districts that have trustee areas, two elect using an at-large methodology and the remaining 11 elect members by trustee area voting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Trustee Areas (Y/N)</th>
<th>Voting Method (Trustee Area or At Large)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC USD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acton Agua-Dulce USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alhambra USD</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope Valley Joint High SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcadia USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azusa USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin Park USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassett USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellflower USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hills USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonita USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burbank USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castaic Union SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Centinela Valley Union HSD</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter Oak USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compton USD</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covina-Valley USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver City USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Downey USD</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duarte USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Whittier City SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastside Union SD</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Monte City SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Monte Union High SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Rancho USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Segundo USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garvey SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendora USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorman SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacienda La Puente USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermosa Beach City SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes-Elizabeth Lakes Union SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td>Trustee Areas (Y/N)</td>
<td>Voting Method (Trustee Area or At Large)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inglewood USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keppel Union SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Canada USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lancaster SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>Y</strong></td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Virgenes USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawndale SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lennox SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Lake City SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long Beach USD</strong></td>
<td><strong>Y</strong></td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Los Angeles USD</strong></td>
<td><strong>Y</strong></td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Nietos SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell Joint SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynwood USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan Beach USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monrovia USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montebello USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhall SD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwalk-La Mirada USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmdale SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palos Verdes Peninsula USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramount USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pasadena USD</strong></td>
<td><strong>Y</strong></td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pomona USD</strong></td>
<td><strong>Y</strong></td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redondo Beach USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemead SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowland USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marino USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica-Malibu USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saugus Union SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pasadena USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Whittier SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sulphur Springs Union SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>Y</strong></td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple City USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrance USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valle Lindo SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Valley USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Covina USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Union SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittier City SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittier Union High SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>William S. Hart Union High SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>Y</strong></td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td>Trustee Areas (Y/N)</td>
<td>Voting Method (Trustee Area or At Large)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilsona SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiseburn SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County Totals</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11 = TA Voting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: California Department of Education

IV. BACKGROUND

A. Petition to Establish Trustee Areas and Trustee Area Voting Within the Saugus Union SD

On November 20, 2015, LACOE and the County Committee received a petition submitted by the Saugus Union SD, pursuant to Education Code (EC) §5019(c)(1), to establish trustee areas and trustee area voting within the district. This petition was submitted in the form of Resolution No. 15/16-29, adopted on November 17, 2015, Resolution No. 15/16-14, adopted on July 7, 2015, Resolution No. 14/15-58 adopted on May 5, 2015 (all approved by a majority vote of the members of the Saugus Union SD governing board), and an approved trustee area map.

B. Rationale of the Saugus Union SD as Petitioner

The rationale for this proposal, as stated in the Saugus Union SD’s petition submission, is as follows (in relevant part):

“The Board expressed its concern about potential violations of the California Voting Rights Act (Elections Code § 14025 et seq.). The Board believes that a transition to a by-trustee area election system will reduce the District’s risk of costly litigation, especially since a successful plaintiff under the California Voting Rights Act (“CVRA”) is entitled to reasonable attorneys’ fees and expert fees, creating great financial risk to any jurisdiction sued.”

C. Position of the Governing Board of the Saugus Union SD

The petition was submitted by the Saugus Union SD governing board, which approved it by a majority vote on May 5, 2015 (for approval of the initiation of the move to trustee areas), on July 7, 2015 (for approval of transitioning from odd year to even year elections) and November 17, 2015 (for approval of a final trustee area map), all by 5-0 votes. The petition contained the final trustee area map adopted by the Saugus Union SD governing board (Appendix B).

V. THE CALIFORNIA VOTING RIGHTS ACT

The CVRA has been tracked and discussed at great length among staff and the County Committee for more than four years. It is not clear if there is a CVRA violation in this case. The Saugus Union SD received a demand letter on May 22, 2015, challenging its use of the at-large voting system. The district decided to move to trustee areas and trustee area voting, determining that this
move is in the best interests of the district. Staff makes no judgment on the existence of any violation of the CVRA in this matter and has not investigated any such violation.

Below, staff has provided a review of the CVRA and relevant issues impacting districts in Los Angeles County and statewide, for the County Committee’s reference.

A. Description of the Law

The CVRA was enacted in 2002 with the intention of correcting situations that discouraged protected minorities from voting, running for office, and winning elections - this is often called “Racially Polarized Voting.” The CVRA states that at-large voting methods are in violation of it when they serve to promote racially polarized voting. The most basic form of review of a district, to check for compliance with the CVRA is to determine whether it has trustee areas and trustee area voting. If it does not have trustee areas and trustee area voting, the next best measure of review of the existence of racially polarized voting would be to determine who has been successful in getting elected and whether those individuals represent protected minority groups (which are like racial/ethnic or language groups, called “communities of interest”).

If a district receives notice of legal action under the CVRA, accompanied by a claim that it has racially polarized voting and must implement trustee area voting in order to address liability and to move into compliance, a district’s best practice is to study their demographics, election history and any other issues that may explain voter participation. Some districts have chosen to study their demographics and voting history prior to receiving any legal challenge.

B. The CVRA in Los Angeles County

Over the past four years, LACOE has provided all school and community college districts with updated information regarding the CVRA and the challenges that have occurred around the State. These updates included numerous news articles, reports, legal analyses, conference presentations, and information from bodies such as the Registrar-Recorder and California School Boards Association, and other agencies who have studied and deliberated on issues related to compliance under the CVRA. Staff has also created a library of related articles on the LACOE webpage for the County Committee, with all articles available for download. On March 2, 2015 and on February 29, 2016, LACOE partnered with local professionals and state/county agency officials to provide an additional workshop on navigating the CVRA, for school and community college staff and governing board members.

Throughout the period of CVRA activity over the past four years, LACOE has consistently advised all districts using the at-large method of governing board elections to study their communities to determine if racially polarized voting might exist. If racially polarized voting does exist, LACOE has advised districts to consider changing to trustee area voting methodologies as they remain liable for legal challenges for violation of the CVRA. Implementing trustee area voting is currently the only safe harbor from potential legal liability for a violation of the CVRA.

School Districts. In the past four years, nine school districts in Los Angeles County have implemented trustee area voting to replace current at-large voting schemes. In addition to the
current Saugus Union SD petition, Newhall SD, William S. Hart Union High SD, Lancaster SD, Pomona USD, Eastside Union SD, Sulphur Springs Union SD, and ABC USD recently presented petitions to the County Committee, which were approved. Several districts in Los Angeles County, are in negotiations and/or have received demand letters or other litigation actions related to trustee areas, or are studying the issue on their own.

Community Colleges. Community colleges are in a different policy climate than K-12 districts in that the California Community College Chancellor has promoted legislation designed to encourage community colleges to avoid liability under the CVRA and to move to trustee areas and trustee area voting. To that end, there was legislation passed in 2011 to streamline the process by which community colleges moving to implement trustee areas could secure waivers for certain parts of the process directly from the Chancellor’s Office rather than county committees and the State Board of Education. That legislation was successful and numerous community colleges have made the switch to trustee area election systems. In Los Angeles County, Cerritos Community College District (CCD), El Camino CCD, Compton College Center at El Camino CCD and Mount San Antonio CCD have implemented trustee area voting in recent years, joining six local community college districts that already had trustee area schemes. Several additional local community colleges are also studying the issue currently or are involved in litigation.

Cities. Activity related to CVRA claims against municipalities in Los Angeles County has increased significantly. Numerous cities in Los Angeles County have settled or remain in active litigation related to CVRA claims, including: Bellflower, Compton, Palmdale, Santa Clarita, and Whittier. In August 2014, the California Supreme Court refused to hear an appeal from the City of Palmdale contesting a verdict mandating that it pay $4.5 million in compensation for violating the CVRA (not including their own legal fees), as well as implement trustee areas and trustee area voting. In early 2015, the City of Whittier was charged with $1 million in attorneys’ fees for a CVRA case (awarded after plaintiffs’ charges were dismissed).

VI. ELECTIONS AND THE SAUGUS UNION SD

In an effort to develop its trustee area plan in full compliance with the CVRA, the Saugus Union SD hired Mr. David Ely of Compass Demographics to conduct a demographic analysis of the district. As a result of the district’s interest in moving to trustee areas and trustee area voting, the district voted to go forward and study the plans and analysis developed by Mr. Ely. A review of Mr. Ely’s demographic analysis and findings related to the map submitted by the Saugus Union SD is included in this study (Appendix C).

Utilizing district, state, county and U.S. Census information, Mr. Ely developed four preliminary trustee area maps, on which public input was sought. He determined that, based on U.S. Census population within the district of 101,731, each of the five trustee areas needed to be approximately 20,346 in size, within the federal margin of error. The maps contained different configurations of trustee areas.

The district held five public forums within its territory in September and October of 2015 to discuss the petition, the move to trustee areas, and the various map scenarios. The district also held two public hearings, and three community meetings. Each event had community members in
attendance. Total attendance for the five forums, two public hearings, and three community meetings was 340 people. The district also implemented an extensive public outreach program, including social media, emails, banner ads, news articles and editorials, online publications, letters home to parents, phone messages to parents, and notifications to bargaining units and school site councils. The outreach campaign included materials and messages in Spanish. According to the district, there was no public opposition offered at public forums.

In each configuration of the four original maps presented by Mr. Ely, all five trustee areas had one current incumbent residing within. These maps were called Options Red, Blue, Green, and Orange. The Saugus Union SD governing board selected the final trustee area map, Option Blue, on November 17, 2015, approving it by a vote of 5-0.

A. Description of the District and Students

**Geography and Residents:** The Saugus Union SD is best described as an elementary school district set in a suburban/rural setting, the boundaries of which contain large portions of territory with very sparse population. Its geography includes several somewhat concentrated population centers spread across wide canyon distances.

Mr. Ely has communicated that he had significant challenges in forming trustee areas that complied with federal and state law, as well as respected the communities of interest existing within the district. He was not able to construct a Hispanic-majority trustee area, based on the dispersal of these populations throughout the district. Mr. Ely was also challenged by the significant disparity between Hispanic populations in any of the trustee areas in the scenarios he studied with the Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP). For example, in the Blue scenario selected by the district, the trustee area that had a 31.2% Hispanic population had a total voting age population of 27.8%, but only had a 24.5% concentration of CVAP Hispanics. Thus, the ability to create Hispanic-majority voting age trustee areas was not possible. In addition, the Saugus Union SD does not have significant concentrations of Black or Asian residents, precluding a minority-plurality district (combining members of several minority groups to reach a majority) in additional trustee areas.

The demographic data on the trustee areas within the adopted map are contained in Attachment C.

**Students:** The Saugus Union SD currently serves 9,911 students, according to 2014-15 enrollment figures gathered by the CDE. Table 2 lists enrollment by ethnicity, compared to all of Los Angeles County and the State of California.
Table 2
Enrollment by Ethnicity
Saugus Union SD Students, 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino of Any Race</th>
<th>American Indian or Alaska Native, Not Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian, Not Hispanic</th>
<th>Pacific Islander, Not Hispanic</th>
<th>Filipino, Not Hispanic</th>
<th>African American, Not Hispanic</th>
<th>White, Not Hispanic</th>
<th>Two or More Races, Not Hispanic</th>
<th>Not Reported</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saugus Union</td>
<td>1964998</td>
<td>3,054</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>4,882</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>999,763</td>
<td>4,047</td>
<td>117,550</td>
<td>5,834</td>
<td>34,457</td>
<td>123,936</td>
<td>220,235</td>
<td>24,990</td>
<td>8,448</td>
<td>1,539,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>3,344,431</td>
<td>36,755</td>
<td>545,720</td>
<td>31,513</td>
<td>158,224</td>
<td>373,280</td>
<td>1,531,088</td>
<td>175,700</td>
<td>38,809</td>
<td>6,235,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data as of: 2015-03-13
Source: California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS)

B. Saugus Union SD Governing Board and Elections (2001 - 2013)

The Saugus SD governing board consists of five members. Table 3 below lists information about governing board elections within the Saugus Union SD. Data on raw votes and the number of registered voters within a district at the time of the election are included below, sourced from the Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk (Registrar-Recorder).

Between 2001 and 2013, three elections were held for school board, on odd years in November, with multiple candidates. During this same period, elections were not held in 2001, 2003, 2007, and 2009, at which members were appointed in lieu of election, as a result of filings for election from the same number of candidates as were seats available.

Between 2001 and 2013, the number of registered voters within the Saugus Union SD fluctuated from a low of 45,907 in 2005 to a high of 58,989 in 2013, the most recent competitive election for the governing board. The next election is scheduled for November of 2016.
Table 3
Saugus Union SD Governing Board Elections, 2001-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Election</th>
<th>Registered Voters</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Governing Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 seats up Appointed in Lieu of Election (no election held)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Governing Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 seats up Appointed in Lieu of Election (no election held)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Governing Board</td>
<td>45,907</td>
<td>3 seats up 4 candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Governing Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 seats up Appointed in Lieu of Election (no election held)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Governing Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 seats up Appointed in Lieu of Election (no election held)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Governing Board</td>
<td>52,526</td>
<td>2 seats up 3 candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Governing Board</td>
<td>58,989</td>
<td>3 seats up 5 candidates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk

In reviewing the available relevant data, staff to the County Committee was not able to determine the ethnicity of any candidate or elected board member. Some of the elections were competitive, with multiple candidates, except for those held in 2001, 2003, 2007 and 2009, at which all candidates running were appointed in lieu of election.

C. Election Data

Below is raw election data, sourced from the Registrar-Recorder, from 2001 to 2013:

**2001 Raw Data:**
[No election was held in 2001]

**2003 Raw Data**
[No election was held in 2003]

**2005 Raw Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Election</th>
<th>Registered Voters</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Governing Board</td>
<td>45,907</td>
<td>3 seats up 4 candidates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk
### 2007 Raw Data:

[No election was held in 2007]

### 2009 Raw Data:

[No election was held in 2009]

### 2011 Raw Data

As of Date: 11/18/2011 Time: 14:05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saugus Union School</th>
<th>Governing Board Member</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOTE FOR NO MORE THAN 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Koscielny</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>2,737</td>
<td>36.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen S Winkler</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>2,518</td>
<td>33.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose S Diaz</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td>29.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PRECINCTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGISTRATION</strong></td>
<td><strong>52,526</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2013 Raw Data

As of Date: 11/19/2013 Time: 13:58

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saugus Union School</th>
<th>Governing Board Member</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOTE FOR NO MORE THAN 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Egan Umeck</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,944</td>
<td>27.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul N de La Cerda</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,633</td>
<td>24.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas A Bryce</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,102</td>
<td>19.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Trunkey</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>18.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacie L Allegra</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>10.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PRECINCTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGISTRATION</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,989</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historically throughout California and nationwide, participation in school district elections is lower than participation in general (municipal, county, state or federal) elections. Because the majority of school district elections in Los Angeles County, including Saugus Union SD, are held on odd years, thus on a different cycle than most general elections, voter turnout in those school elections also tends to be significantly lower. Following approval of the trustee area plan, if granted, the Saugus Union SD will move its election to even years. The first election on this cycle will be November 2016.

VII. COUNTY COMMITTEE REVIEW OF THE SAUGUS UNION SD PETITION

On February 23, 2016, the County Committee held a public hearing within the Saugus Union SD, pursuant to EC §5019(c)(2). The County Committee heard presentations from the Saugus Union SD superintendent and governing board chair, as well as from Mr. Foster, the attorney hired by the district who presented on behalf of the demographer, Mr. Ely, who had designed the trustee areas and the trustee area map. The County Committee sought input from members of the public and other stakeholders during that public hearing.

Following the public hearing, the County Committee reviewed the information that the Saugus Union SD submitted, along with their trustee area petition. On May 4, 2016, the County Committee will have the opportunity to ask questions of the interested parties, including Saugus Union SD representatives, and the professionals it engaged to develop the trustee area plan and map, as well as any members of the public who would like to speak, either for themselves or as representatives from other entities relevant to this review.

The County Committee has the option to approve or disapprove the implementation of trustee areas and trustee area voting within the Saugus Union SD. In addition, the County Committee has the option to delay approval while it gathers additional information it deems relevant to its review of this petition.

The County Committee also has the option to accept or reject the trustee area map submitted by the Saugus Union SD. The County Committee may task staff to develop additional scenarios of the trustee area plan for the Saugus Union SD, resulting in the creation of other maps for review.

VIII. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff to the County Committee makes the following recommendations on the issues presented by the petition reviewed in this feasibility study. The County Committee may address the issues separately or in combination and, as stated earlier, may utilize any criteria it deems relevant to inform its decisions.

Trustee Areas. After reviewing the materials submitted by the Saugus Union SD, including the demographic analysis conducted on behalf of the district, a recounting of the public hearing process where input was sought on four trustee area maps, and the ultimate rationale behind the selection of the final trustee area map submitted, all of which represented an EC-compliant, well-intended, detailed and successful consensus process, **staff recommends that the**
County Committee approve the Saugus Union SD’s petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting within the district.

**Trustee Area Map.** After reviewing the thorough process that the Saugus Union SD engaged in, guided by highly-qualified demographic and legal professionals, in consultation with relevant stakeholders, to develop a board and community supported final trustee area map, **staff recommends that the County Committee adopt the final map and described trustee area plan as submitted by the district in the Blue Option.**

**Election to Approve Implementation of Trustee Areas Voting and Trustee Area Map.** Under EC §5020, if the County Committee approves a petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting, the matter is presented to the voters within the district at an upcoming election. However, the Saugus Union SD has secured a waiver from the SBE to stay the requirement of this approval election. The waiver does not impact the election of any candidates for any trustee areas within the Saugus Union SD, and the district’s next regular election (November 2016) should be held. This waiver was sought only to waive an election question approving the implementation of trustee areas and trustee area voting. To date, the California Department of Education (CDE) has reviewed more than 100 waiver requests to the SBE from districts seeking to waive the requirement to hold an election approving the implementation of trustee areas and/or trustee area voting. All of these requests have been approved by the SBE. Thus, **staff recommends that the County Committee concur that no election approving the implementation of trustee areas and trustee area voting be held.**
IX.
FEASIBILITY STUDY APPENDICES
November 20, 2015

To Whom It May Concern,

Enclosed is the following documentation related to the By-trustee Area Election System:

- Resolution 2014-15 # 58, a resolution of the Governing Board of the Saugus Union School District to initiate a transition to By-trustee Area Election System commencing with the 2017 Governing Board Election and statement of intent to seek a waiver of the election requirement from the State Board of Education.

- Settlement Agreement and Release (Claim No. 15-16-2)

- County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors approval of the change to an even year election.

- Resolution 2015-16 # 29, a resolution of approving and adopting a final trustee area plan for the District’s transition to a By-trustee Area Election System; a plan of election from those areas; and recommending that the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization approve the District’s establishment of a By-trustee Area Election System and adopted Trustee Voting Area Plan.

Please feel free to contact me if you require any additional information.

Sincerely,

Joan M. Lucid, Ed.D.

Enclosures

cc: Saugus Union School District Board of Trustees
RESOLUTION 2014-15 # 58

A RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNING BOARD OF THE SAUGUS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT TO INITIATE A TRANSITION TO A BY-TRUSTEE AREA ELECTION SYSTEM COMMENCING WITH THE 2017 GOVERNING BOARD ELECTION AND STATEMENT OF INTENT TO SEEK A WAIVER OF THE ELECTION REQUIREMENT FROM THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

A. California Education Code sections 5019(a) & (c)(l) and 5030 authorize the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization ("County Committee"), upon application of a school district's governing board, to change the method of election of governing board members in a school district under its jurisdiction.

B. The California Voting Rights Act (Elections Code §§ 14025 et seq.) ("CVRA") prohibits the use of an "at-large" election system for governing board members of a school district if the "at-large" elections impair the ability of a protected class to elect candidates of its choice, or its ability to influence the outcome of an election.

C. Governing Board ("Board") Members of the Saugus Union School District ("District") are currently elected using an "at-large" election system (i.e., election system in which registered voters of the entire jurisdiction elect candidates to the governing board).

D. It is considered the view of the Board that starting with the 2017 Board elections, and with the benefit of the 2010 Federal Census data, that with "by-trustee area" elections the District will be in compliance with CVRA and will reduce the District's exposure to litigation.

E. Although Education Code section 5020 requires that a County Committee's resolution approving a change in the method of electing governing board members be submitted to the electorate for its approval at the school district's next regular election, the Board intends to seek a waiver of the voter approval requirement as permitted by law. Education Code sections 33050-33053 authorize the State Board of Education to waive this voter approval requirement, which could reduce the costs and risks associated with a school district's transition to a "by-trustee area" election system.

F. The Board finds it is appropriate to seek a waiver of the election requirement in Education Code section 5020, and portions of sections 5019, 5021, and 5030, to ensure the timely implementation of the "by-trustee area" election system commencing with the 2017 Governing Board election, to reduce costs for the District associated with placing an item on the ballot and to reduce any potential legal liability or financial risk to the District under the CVRA.

G. The adoption of "by-trustee area" elections will not affect the terms of any sitting Board members, each of whom will serve out his or her current term.

H. The Board, cognizant of its reduced operating revenues and need for fiscal responsibility, desires to implement this change in the manner of electing Board members in the most cost effective and efficient manner.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Governing Board of the Saugus Union School District does hereby resolve, order and determine as follows:
1. The above recitals are true and correct.

2. The Board hereby determines that the trustee area boundary lines shall be developed based on the Federal 2010 Census data to provide for "by-trustee areas" elections commencing in 2017.

3. By this resolution, and pursuant to Education Code sections 5019(a) and 5030, the Board directs District staff to transmit this resolution to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization to apply to have the County Committee adopt a change in the method of electing members of the board from "at-large" elections [Education Code section 5030(a)] to "by-trustee area" elections [Education Code section 5030(b)] commencing with the 2017 Board elections.

4. Before submitting a final proposal to the County Committee for a trustee area plan using the Federal 2010 Census data, one or more public hearings shall be scheduled to obtain public input on the draft proposals prepared.

5. The Board shall apply to the County Committee for establishment of trustee areas pursuant to Education Code section 5019(a) in a timely manner to have the 2017 elections for the Board conducted within the new trustee areas.

6. The Superintendent, or her designee, shall send a copy of this resolution to the County Committee for action in accordance with law.

7. The Superintendent, or her designee, is hereby directed to prepare an additional Board resolution, and implement the applicable legal requirements in a timely manner, to seek a waiver from the State Board of Education of the election requirement imposed by Education Code section 5020.

8. The Superintendent, or her designee, shall consult with legal counsel to resolve all legal issues necessary to give effect to this resolution.

9. The Superintendent, or her designee, shall immediately seek proposals from demographers to create "by-trustee area" maps and make a recommendation of the demographer at the next Board meeting.

10. The foregoing resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.
President of the Governing Board of
the Saugus Union School District

ATTTEST:

Judy Egan Umeck
Clerk of the Governing Board of
the Saugus Union School District
I, Judy Egan Umek, Clerk of the Governing Board of the Saugus Union School District, hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was duly and regularly adopted by said Board at a regular meeting held on the 5th day of May 2015 and passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. De La Cerda, Mrs. Koscielny, Dr. Powell, Mr. Trunkey and Mrs. Umek

Noes: None

Absent: None

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 5th day of May 2015.

Judy Egan Umek
Clerk of the Governing Board of
the Saugus Union School District

00175-00103/762016.1
SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND RELEASE

This Settlement Agreement and Release (the "Settlement Agreement") is made and entered into by and between: Jim Soliz ("Plaintiff") and the Saugus Union School District ("District") (collectively the "Parties").

Recitals

A. Plaintiff claims that the District's current at-large election system violates the California Voting Rights Act, Cal. Elec. Code §§14025, et seq. Specifically, Plaintiff alleges that the at-large system for electing members of the District's Board prevents Latino residents from electing candidates of their choice or influencing the outcome of the District Governing Board's ("Board") elections, as more fully described in Plaintiff's Complaint, filed in the Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC580046 ("Suit"). The District has, at all times, disputed and continues to dispute each and all of the claims and allegations made by Plaintiff in the Suit.

B. The Parties desire to enter into this Settlement Agreement in order to provide for certain actions in full settlement and discharge of all claims which have, or might have, been made, or might be made by reason of the events described in Recital A above and which were, or could have been alleged, in the Suit, upon the terms and conditions set forth below.

Agreement

The Parties agree as follows:

1.0 Release and Discharge

1.1 In consideration of the actions set forth in Section 2, Plaintiff hereby completely releases and forever discharges Defendant from any and all past, present or future claims, demands, obligations, actions, causes of action, rights, damages, costs, losses of services, expenses and compensation of any nature whatsoever, whether based on a tort, contract or other theory of recovery, which the Plaintiff now has, or which may hereafter accrue or otherwise be acquired, on account of, or may in any way arise of the incident described in Recital A above.

1.2 This Settlement Agreement is inclusive of all liens, costs and attorney's fees.

1.3 This release and discharge, as set forth in Section 1.1, shall apply to the District's past, present and future officers, directors, board members, attorneys, agents, servants, representatives, employees, subsidiaries, affiliates, partners, predecessors and successors in interest, and assigns and all other persons, firms or corporations with whom any of the former have been, are now, or may hereafter be affiliated.

1.4 This release, on the part of Plaintiff, shall be a fully binding and complete settlement between the Plaintiff and Defendant, and their heirs, assigns and successors.

1.5 Plaintiff expressly waives and assumes the risk of any and all claims for damages, within the scope of released claims described in paragraph 1.1, which exist as of this date, but of which the Plaintiff does not know or suspects to exist, whether through ignorance, oversight, error, negligence, or
otherwise, and which, if known, would materially affect Plaintiff's decision to enter into this Settlement Agreement. Plaintiff further agrees that Plaintiff will accept the consideration specified herein as a complete compromise of matters involving disputed issues of law and fact.

1.6 Plaintiff hereby waives any and all rights based upon the provisions of California Civil Code Section 1542 which reads as follows:

"A general release does not extend to claims which the creditor does not know or suspect to exist in his or her favor at the time of executing the release, which if known by him or her must have materially affected his or her settlement with the debtor."

2.0 Actions and Payment Required

For valuable consideration, including the release set forth above and the further mutual promises set forth below, the Parties agree as follows:

2.1 The Board shall pass a resolution withdrawing its Order of Elections for the next regularly scheduled Board election, currently scheduled for November 3, 2015. The District will furnish copies of this resolution to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools, and the Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk, as appropriate, explaining the rationale for the resolution and requesting withdrawal of the District's prior order to call an election.

2.2 The Board will pass and submit a resolution to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Education Code section 10404.5, requesting the District's Governing Board elections be consolidated from odd-year to even-year elections, commencing in November 2016 coinciding with the Statewide General election. Trustees whose terms were scheduled to expire in December 2015 will expire in December 2016, and the election to choose those trustees' successors will be conducted in November 2016, instead of November 2015. Trustees whose terms were scheduled to expire in December 2017 will expire in December 2018, and the election to choose their successors will be conducted in November 2018, instead of November 2017.

2.3 Since the Board passed a resolution initiating the transition from the at-large election system to the by-trustee area election system, the District shall proceed with the process of transitioning to the by-trustee area election system as proscribed by the California Voting Rights Act, the Education Code, the Elections Code and all other applicable laws and/or regulations. The District shall retain Compass Demographics for the purpose of drawing the trustee-areas within the territory of the District.

2.4 The Parties will execute and present for judicial approval a stipulated order reflecting the pertinent terms of this agreement.

2.5 The process of transitioning to the by-trustee area election system shall be completed no later than March 2016. The District will ensure that transition has been made and that the new trustee areas will be implemented for the election held in November 2016.
2.6 Plaintiff shall provide Defendant with a signed copy of this Settlement Agreement, together with an executed stipulated judgment, which shall close out the matter and terminate the action between the parties. Plaintiff shall not be able to file any other actions against Defendant on the grounds of the underlying suit, or any alleged violation of the California Voting Rights Act, with the exception of Plaintiff bringing an action to enforce the stipulated judgment. The parties will execute and file any and all additional documents, if any, required to close out the matter. Plaintiff shall also provide a completed W-9 for all payees under this Settlement Agreement.

2.7 The District will make payment in full satisfaction of this Settlement Agreement in the amount of Eighty-Five thousand Dollars ($85,000.00), representing Plaintiff’s attorneys’ fees and costs, within thirty (30) days of the receipt of all documents outlined in sections 2.1 through 2.6 above:

2.7 All payment drafts shall be delivered to:

Shenkman & Hughes
28905 Wight Rd.
Malibu, California

2.8 The obligation of the District to make Payment shall be discharged upon the mailing of a valid check in the amount indicated and to the address designated in Sections 2.6 through 2.7 of this Settlement Agreement.

2.9 The District makes no representations regarding the federal or state tax consequences of any payments or benefits under this Agreement and all tax reporting and payments required by law remains the responsibility of the payees under this Settlement Agreement.

3.0 No Admission of Liability

It is understood and agreed to by the Parties that this settlement is a compromise of a disputed claim, and that the actions and payments to be undertaken by Defendant under this Settlement Agreement are not to be construed as an admission of liability on the part of the Defendant, by whom liability is expressly denied.

4.0 Attorney’s Fees

4.1 Except as set forth in Section 2.7, each party hereto shall bear all attorney’s fees and costs arising from the actions of its own counsel in connection with this Settlement Agreement, the matters and documents referred to herein, and all related matters.

4.2 In the event of a breach of any provision of this Settlement Agreement, which requires litigation, the prevailing party will be entitled to recover its reasonable attorney's fees, costs and pre-judgment interest for judicial enforcement of any of said provisions.
5.0 Liens

Plaintiff shall bear full and sole responsibility for and agree to discharge any and all liens and/or other claims that any third party or organization might have or assert against him and to defend, indemnify and hold Defendant harmless against any such liens or claims.

6.0 Additional Representations of the Parties

6.1 In entering into this Settlement Agreement, the Parties represent that they have relied upon the advice of their attorneys, who are the attorneys of their own choice, concerning the legal consequences of this Settlement Agreement; that the terms of this Settlement Agreement have been completely read and explained to the Parties by their attorneys; and that the terms of this Settlement Agreement are fully understood and voluntarily accepted by the Parties.

6.2 Plaintiff represents and warrants that no other person or entity has, or has had, any interest in the claims, demands, obligations, or causes of action referred to in this Settlement Agreement, except as otherwise set forth herein; that Plaintiff has the sole right and exclusive authority to execute this Settlement Agreement and receive the sums specified in it; and that Plaintiff has not sold, assigned, transferred, conveyed or otherwise disposed of any of the claims, demands, obligations or causes of action referred to in this Settlement Agreement. Plaintiff further represent and warrant that no other party, nor any agent or attorney of any other party has made any promise, representation or warranty whatsoever, express or implied, not contained herein, concerning the subject matter hereof, to induce Plaintiff or their attorneys, or any other party hereto, to execute this Settlement Agreement and Release, and Plaintiff acknowledge that this Settlement Agreement and Release has not been executed in reliance upon any such promise, representation or warranty not contained herein.

6.3 The Parties execute this Settlement Agreement and undertake the obligations stated herein knowingly and voluntarily, in the total absence of any fraud, mistake, duress, coercion, or undue influence and after careful thought and reflection upon the Settlement, the Settlement Agreement, and the obligations thereunder and accordingly, by signing this document and any other document referred to herein, the Parties signify full understanding, acceptance and agreement.

6.4 The Parties have investigated the facts pertaining to the Settlement and Settlement Agreement and all matters pertaining thereto as they each deem necessary. The Parties assume the risk that the facts or law, which are in dispute in this case, may be other than the Parties believe.

7.0 Confidentiality

7.1 The Parties agree that neither they nor their attorneys nor representatives shall hereafter publicly reveal, other than as may be mutually agreed to in writing or otherwise required by law, any of the terms of this Settlement Agreement or any of the amounts, numbers, terms or conditions of any sums payable to any payee hereunder.
7.2 The Parties, including Plaintiff's attorneys and Defendant's attorneys, expressly agree that this settlement will not be disclosed to any media of any type or nature, including, but not limited to, professional publications, attorney or any other web/internet site postings, Verdicts and Settlements of the local journal publications, local journals, research publications or similar settlement/verdict reporting services, or any radio, television or other media, unless required to do so by law.

7.3 Exception to confidentiality. In the event of inquiry from any media, press, or third parties including future potential employers, Plaintiff, the District and its representatives will limit any remarks to the contents of the statement set forth in Exhibit 1 to this Settlement Agreement. Furthermore, notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein, in the event that disclosure of this Settlement Agreement to a court or public agency is required in order to give effect to this Settlement Agreement, such disclosure is not prohibited. Notwithstanding anything herein to the contrary, the Parties and their attorneys may also praise the District’s decision to resolve this matter, but in no event shall the Parties or their attorneys disparage one another.

8.0 Binding Effect

The settlement between the Parties and this Settlement Agreement and all documents referred to herein, shall bind and inure to the benefit of each of the parties hereto and their respective successors in interest. Except as expressly provided herein, this Settlement Agreement is not for the benefit of any person not a Party hereto or specifically identified as a beneficiary herein or specifically identified herein as a person or entity released hereby, and is not intended to constitute a third party beneficiary contract. A person or entity shall be deemed specifically identified as a person or entity released hereby if such person or entity is identified by name (e.g. “John Smith”) or category (e.g. “heirs”).

9.0 Additional Documents

All Parties agree to cooperate fully and execute any and all supplementary documents and to take all additional actions which may be necessary or appropriate to give full force and effect to the basic terms and intent of this Settlement Agreement.

10.0 Ambiguities or Uncertainties

This Settlement Agreement shall be equally and fairly interpreted and construed without reference to the identity of the Party or Parties preparing the document, on the express understanding and agreement that the Parties participated equally in the negotiation and preparation of the Settlement Agreement or have had equal opportunity to do so. Accordingly, the Parties waive the benefit of California Civil Code section 1654 and any successor or amended statute which provides that, in cases of ambiguity or uncertainty, language of a contract should be interpreted most strongly against the Party who caused the ambiguity or uncertainty to exist.

11.0 Governing Law

This Settlement Agreement shall be construed and interpreted in accordance with the laws of the State of California.

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND RELEASE
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[Signatures]
12.0 Entire Agreement

This Settlement Agreement contains the ENTIRE AGREEMENT and COMPLETE understanding concerning this subject matter among the Parties and supersedes and replaces all prior negotiations and proposed agreements, written and oral.

13.0 Court Jurisdiction for Enforcement

All parties agree that this agreement is a court-approved settlement pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6, and may be enforced by motion or other procedure permitted by California law. The Parties agree that the Court may retain jurisdiction for purposes of enforcing this Settlement Agreement pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6 until performance in full of the terms hereunder. The Parties agree that, if such a motion is filed, the prevailing party is entitled to recover reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs.

14.0 Severability

In the event that any provision of this Settlement Agreement shall be deemed to be void, voidable or unenforceable, the remaining portions hereof shall remain in full force and effect, except where to do so would be contrary to the intent or spirit of the Settlement Agreement.

15.0 Waiver, Modification and Amendment

No breach of this Settlement Agreement or of any provision herein can be waived except by an express written waiver executed by the waiving Party. Waiver of any one such breach shall not be deemed a waiver of any other breach of the same or other provisions of the Settlement Agreement. This Settlement Agreement may be amended, altered, modified or otherwise changed in any respect only by a writing duly executed by all Parties hereto.

16.0 Captions

Section, paragraph and other captions or headings contained in this Settlement Agreement are inserted as a matter of convenience and for reference, and in no way define, limit, extend, or otherwise describe the scope of the intent of this Settlement Agreement or any provision hereof and shall not affect in any way the meaning or interpretation of this Agreement.

17.0 Photocopy and/or Facsimile, Counterparts and Possession of Original

The Parties agree that a true, accurate and complete photocopy or facsimile of this Settlement Agreement and/or the signatures of the Parties thereto shall have the same force and effect as the original and shall be sufficient to bind the Parties to this Settlement Agreement. The Parties agree that the Settlement Agreement may be executed in counterparts and that the sum of the executed signatory pages shall constitute the whole of this Settlement Agreement as if the entirety of the necessary signatures were contained within the same original document. The original shall remain in the possession of the District, the District’s attorneys or its joint powers authority.

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND RELEASE
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18.0 **Effectiveness**

This Settlement Agreement shall become effective immediately following execution by each of the Parties and ratification by the Saugus Union School District Board of Education as required by Education Code section 17604.

PLAINTIFF:
Jim Soliz

________________________________________

Date: _________________________

DEFENDANT:
Saugus Union School District

By: ____________________________

Duly Authorized Representative

Title: __________________________

Superintendent

Date: __________________________

October 29, 2015

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND CONTENT:

Attorneys for Plaintiff:
Shenkman & Hughes

Date: ____________________________

By: ____________________________

Kevin Shenkman, Esq.

R. Rex Parris Law Firm

Date: ____________________________

By: ____________________________

R. Rex Parris, Esq.
Attorneys for Defendant:

FAGEN FRIEDMAN & FULFROST, LLP

Date: ___________________________ By: ___________________________

Peter K. Fagen, Esq.
Milton E. Foster III, Esq.
Exhibit 1

The case has been resolved through a no fault mutual settlement. Pursuant to the settlement, the parties cannot discuss the details of the case including the allegations of the complaint and any other pleadings, communications between the parties, liability and settlement. I can provide that Plaintiff and the District mutually decided that it was in the best interest of all parties, including the citizens residing in the Saugus Union School District and the children educated by the Saugus Union School District, to resolve the matter and convert to by-trustee area elections rather than engaging in protracted litigation.
November 4, 2015

Joan M. Lucid, Ed.D., Superintendent  
Saugus Union School District  
24930 Avenue Stanford  
Santa Clarita, CA 91355

Dear Dr. Lucid:

At its meeting held November 3, 2015, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors approved the Saugus Union School District’s request to change its election date to November of even numbered years and consolidate these elections with the Statewide General Election conducted by the County, effective November 2016.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Patrick Ogawa  
Acting Executive Officer

PO:cl

c: Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk
RESOLUTION 2015-16 # 29

RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNING BOARD OF SAUGUS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT

A RESOLUTION APPROVING AND ADOPTING A FINAL TRUSTEE AREA PLAN FOR THE DISTRICT’S TRANSITION TO A BY-TRUSTEE AREA ELECTION SYSTEM; A PLAN OF ELECTION FROM THOSE AREAS; AND RECOMMENDING THAT THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION APPROVE THE DISTRICT’S ESTABLISHMENT OF A BY-TRUSTEE AREA ELECTION SYSTEM AND ADOPTED TRUSTEE VOTING AREA PLAN

A. On May 5, 2015 the Governing Board (“Board”) for the Saugus Union School District (“District”) passed Resolution 2014-15 # 58 initiating the process for the District to transition from an “at-large” election system to a “by-trustee area” election system.

B. In approving Resolution 2014-15 # 58 the Board expressed its concern about potential violations of the California Voting Rights Act (Elections Code § 14025 et seq.). The Board believes that a transition to a by-trustee area election system will reduce the District’s risk of costly litigation, especially since a successful plaintiff under the California Voting Rights Act (“CVRA”) is entitled to reasonable attorneys’ fees and experts fees, creating great financial risk to any jurisdiction sued.

C. The District retained Compass Demographics (“Consultant”) to prepare proposed trustee area boundary plans for consideration by the District, Board, and community. The Consultant has extensive experience working with school districts and local jurisdictions regarding electoral demographics, taking into consideration the CVRA, the Federal Voting Rights Act, and related election system choices.

D. All of the proposed trustee area boundary plans prepared by Consultant were drawn with all applicable laws and regulations in mind, including the CVRA and federal election law.

E. The District conducted public forums to consider community input and comment regarding the proposed trustee area boundary plans on October 14, 2015 at Tesoro del Valle, October 15, 2015 at Skyblue Mesa Elementary, October 21, 2015 at Emblem Academy, conducted public hearings at Board meetings on September 29 and November 3, 2015, and made plans available for public review and comment on the District’s website from September 25, 2015 until final adoption on November 17, 2015.

F. With thoughtful consideration of all public input received on the draft trustee area plans and applicable state and federal legal criteria, the Board desires to adopt the trustee area plan and demographic information described as the "Trustee Plan Blue" (attached hereto as Exhibit “A”) as the final trustee area plan establishing the boundaries for the new trustee areas, and to request timely approval from the County Committee of the trustee area plan and the District’s transition to a by-trustee area election system commencing with the 2016 Governing Board election.
G. The County Committee has indicated that it will consider the District's establishment of trustee areas upon the District’s request.

H. In order to complete the transition to by-trustee area elections in a timely and cost effective manner, and to ensure that the new by-trustee area process will be in place in time to elect new governing board members at the Board’s next regularly scheduled election, the District has sought a waiver of certain portions of the Education Code from the State Board of Education. The District's request for waiver was submitted to the State Board of Education for approval.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Governing Board of Saugus Union School District does hereby resolve, order and determine as follows:

1. The above recitals are true and correct.

2. The Board hereby adopts the trustee area plan and demographic information described as the "Scenario Blue" (attached hereto as Exhibit “A”) as the final trustee area map for the District’s transition to a by-trustee area election system commencing with the 2016 Governing Board election.

3. That the District will hold by-trustee area elections in trustee area numbers 3 and 4 for seats that should come up at its November 2016 election, assuming timely approval by the County Committee. That the District will hold by-trustee area elections in trustee area numbers 1, 2 and 3 for seats that should come up at its November 2018 election. Current area 5 appointed seat will be up for election in 2016 in order to complete the term of office.

4. That by this resolution and contingent upon the approval by the County Committee of the District’s change to a by-trustee area election system, the Board hereby applies to the County Committee to timely approve the Board’s adopted trustee area plan for implementation commencing with the 2016 Governing Board election, or at the earliest possible election, as conditioned upon approval of the Education Code waiver request submitted to the State Board of Education.

4. The Board hereby authorizes and directs District staff to transmit this resolution, the final trustee area plan adopted, and any additional required documentation to the County Committee and to take any other necessary action to effectuate the purposes of this resolution and complete the District’s transition to a by-trustee area election system for the 2016 Governing Board elections.
5. The foregoing resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

Rose Koscielny
President of the Governing Board of the
Saugus Union School District

ATTEST:

Judy Egan Umneck
Clerk of the Governing Board of the
Saugus Union School District
I, Judy Egan Umeck, Clerk of the Governing Board of the Saugus Union School District, hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was duly and regularly adopted by said Board at a regular meeting held on the 17th day of November 2015 and passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. De La Cerda, Mrs. Koscialny, Dr. Powell, Mr. Trunkey and Mrs. Umeck

Noes: None

Absent: None

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 17th day of November 2015.

[Signature]

Judy Egan Umeck
Clerk of the Governing Board of the
Saugus Union School District
EXHIBIT "A"

(Final Trustee Area Plan and Demographic Information)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population</th>
<th></th>
<th>Voting Age Pop</th>
<th></th>
<th>Citizen Voting Age Pop</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>% Latino</td>
<td>% White</td>
<td>% Latino</td>
<td>% White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101731</td>
<td>20346</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20350</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20575</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20297</td>
<td>-49</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20145</td>
<td>-201</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20364</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Blue Option
# Demographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population</th>
<th></th>
<th>Voting Age Pop</th>
<th></th>
<th>Citizen Voting Age Pop</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% Latino</td>
<td>% White</td>
<td>% Latino</td>
<td>% White</td>
<td>% Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101731</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20346</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% Latino</td>
<td>% White</td>
<td>% Latino</td>
<td>% White</td>
<td>% Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-49</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-201</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT
ORGANIZATION (COUNTY COMMITTEE)
LEGISLATIVE REVIEW – MAY 2016

BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR:
Assembly Bill 278 / Hernandez

INTRODUCTION DATE:
02/11/15

LAST ACTIVITY/DATE:
02/18/16: Author amended bill; has been resubmitted to Elections Committee for review.

DESCRIPTION OF BILL
This bill would enable the legislative body of any city to adopt an ordinance, without voter approval, for the election of the members of the legislative body to be by district.

POTENTIAL IMPACT OF BILL ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE, SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION PROCESS AND/OR LOS ANGELES COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS
It is not yet clear how this bill would impact Los Angeles County school districts. It may trigger increased activity related to the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA).

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

May 2016

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 19, 2016.

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 2016

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 19, 2016.

PETITION FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING, WITHIN THE CASTAIC UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT (SD)

The Castaic Union SD submitted a petition on March 10, 2016, to establish trustee areas and trustee area voting. It is being presented to the County Committee on May 4, 2016. The County Committee will schedule a public hearing which will be held in the district, and a feasibility study will be conducted which will be presented to the County Committee at a later date.

*Status: Public hearing to be scheduled after presentation of petition
Status Date: April 19, 2016

PETITION FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING, WITHIN THE SAUGUS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT (SD)

On November 20, 2015, a board resolution was received from the district to implement its trustee area plan. On January 6, 2016, the resolution was presented to the County Committee, which held its public hearing in the district on February 23, 2016. The Secretary and staff will present a feasibility study related to the petition to establish trustee areas and trustee area voting in the Saugus Union SD. The County Committee will review the petition and presentations from the district and the public, and vote on the matter. (Attachment 4)

*Status: Feasibility study to be presented to the County Committee
Status Date: April 19, 2016
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-Christmas 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 that 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 did have 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, as well as an environmental review. Supplemental requests for information were sent to the impacted districts and to the chief petitioners, with replies received from all parties. The supplemental information, as well as the results of a CEQA consultant’s review of the petition’s environmental impact will be presented to the County Committee.

*Status: Additional information and CEQA study to be presented to the County Committee
Status Date: April 19, 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.
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 petitioner 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. Staff is informed that a joint committee appointed by both the district and the City of Malibu is studying the implications of this petition.

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.

Please note that 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 choose to 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 that 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 will need to collect approximately 7,000 valid signatures in order 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 that 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

- *Glendale USD to La Canada USD/April 2016
- Monrovia USD to Arcadia USD/September 2015
- Pasadena USD to La Canada USD/April 2013
- Temple City USD to Arcadia USD/March 2012

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Malibu USD (Santa Monica-Malibu USD)/August 2015

Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

- *Glendale USD / April 2016
- *Lawndale SD / April 2016
- *Snowline Joint USD / April 2016
- *El Monte Union HSD / March 2016
- Walnut USD / January 2016
- Pomona USD / June 2015

* = indicates activity since last meeting

This document was prepared by staff to the County Committee.