April 25, 2017

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

FROM: Keith D. Crafton, Secretary

SUBJECT: Regular Meeting of the County Committee-Wednesday, May 3, 2017

The next regular meeting of the County Committee will be held at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, May 3, 2017, in the Board Room of the Los Angeles County Office of Education, 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 3, 2017.

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

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 3, 2017
9:30 a.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER – 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 March 8, 2017, will be submitted for approval. (Enclosure)

IV. ADMINISTRATION OF OATH OF OFFICE – Mr. Ogaz

The Chairperson will administer the oath of office to the re-elected County Committee member for the Fifth supervisorial district, Mr. Joel Peterson.

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

The Secretary may apprise the Committee of any pertinent informational correspondence or newspaper articles.
VII. PETITION TO ESTABLISH TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING, WITHIN THE CASTAIC UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT (SD) – Secretary Crafton

The Secretary will update the committee on the petition for the Castaic Union SD’s process to establish trustee areas and trustee area voting.

VIII. PETITION TO ESTABLISH TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING IN THE LAWNDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT (SD) – Secretary Crafton

The Secretary and staff will present a feasibility study on the petition to establish trustee areas and trustee area voting within the Lawndale SD. (Attachment 1)

IX. PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORY FROM THE GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (USD) TO THE LA CANADA USD – Secretary Crafton

The Secretary and staff will present the committee with a feasibility study on the petition to transfer territory from the Glendale USD to the La Canada USD. (Attachment 2)

X. UPDATE ON THE CALIFORNIA VOTING RIGHTS ACT (CVRA), TRUSTEE AREA AND ELECTION ISSUES – Secretary Crafton

The Secretary will provide an update on CVRA activities and election changes in Los Angeles County.

XI. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE – Secretary Crafton

There are no current bills to report.

XII. UPDATE ON COUNTY COMMITTEE WEBSITE – Secretary Crafton

The Secretary will provide an update on the County Committee website.
XIII. UPDATE ON REVIEW OF COUNTY COMMITTEE POLICIES – Mr. Ogaz

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

XIV. 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 3]

XV. 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 4]

XVI. ADDITIONAL COMMUNICATIONS, CONCERNS, OR ITEMS FOR NEXT AGENDA

XVII. ADJOURNMENT
The Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) met on Wednesday, March 8, 2017, at the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) in Downey. The meeting was called to order at 9:35 a.m., by Chairperson, Frank Ogaz.

### Members Present
- Frank Bostrom
- Maria Calix
- Ted Edmiston
- Owen Griffith
- John Nunez
- Frank Ogaz
- Suzan Solomon
- AJ Willmer

### Members Absent
- Susan Andriacchi
- Nicole Kluft
- Joel Peterson

### Staff Present
- Keith D. Crafton, Secretary
- Jeff Young, Staff
- Allison Deegan, Staff
- Eric Hass, Staff
- Anna Heredia, Staff

Chairperson Ogaz called the meeting to order.

Chairperson Ogaz led the flag salute.

It was **MOVED** by Mr. Frank Bostrom and **SECONDED** by Mr. John Nunez that the minutes of the regular meeting held on January 4, 2017 be approved. Motion carried. Votes are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Frank Bostrom</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Maria Calix</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ted Edmiston</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. AJ Willmer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Owen Griffith</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John Nunez</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Frank Ogaz</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Suzan Solomon</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The oath could not be administered due to Mr. Joel Peterson’s absence at the meeting.

Two members of the public spoke on the petition to transfer territory from the Glendale Unified School District (USD) to the La Canada USD.
Secretary Keith D. Crafton stated there are several communications in the folders. He stated there is a summary chart regarding SB 415, which is the legislation under which districts are moving to even year elections. He also stated there are several articles regarding the California Voting Rights Act and other School District Organization issues, and also LAFCO correspondence.

Secretary Crafton reported this morning we received the Castaic SD map and final resolution for their proposed trustee area plan. The next step is to schedule a public hearing in the district and then move into a feasibility study and a final presentation of the petition before the Committee. A list of potential hearing dates will be circulated.

Secretary Crafton stated that staff is finalizing the feasibility study relating to this petition and it should be heard at the next meeting.

Secretary Crafton reported staff is continuing to review environmental options on this petition. Several weeks ago we were informed that the Glendale USD and the La Canada USD had resumed negotiations to settle the issue, possibly in the form of their own joint district petition. In order to give these parties time to see if a possible solution can be reached, staff consulted with Chairman Ogaz and he agreed to delay review of this petition. All parties were notified of this delay.

Secretary Crafton reported that despite AB 350, which limits damages for CVRA claims, we are still seeing activity around the state. Many districts are also moving to even-year election dates. Included in the folder is a listing of the districts that have moved so far. Staff is monitoring activity with the Registrar-Recorder’s office.

Secretary Crafton stated there are no current bills to report on, however, the Committee and staff have consulted with LACOE’s Legislative Director regarding a clean-up bill. Staff has also been in contact with Senator Ben Allen’s office.

Secretary Crafton stated that the website continues to be updated, we also have a complete map set available and will update those maps as districts make changes, such as the addition of trustee areas.

Secretary Crafton stated that General Counsel, Viviana Andrade continues to review policies. She could not attend today’s meeting, but would be willing to meet via telephone conference with members of the committee, Mr. Bostrom and Mr. Willmer.
Secretary Crafton stated there are no updates to report.

Secretary Crafton stated there are no updates to report, however, we are expecting something from the Santa Monica-Malibu USD soon, but we have nothing official.

Discussion occurred regarding Joel Peterson’s ability to vote due to the accusations that have been made. All accusations have been taken under consideration and it was determined there is no reason that would keep him from voting on the Petition to Transfer Territory from the Glendale USD to the La Canada USD.

Discussion occurred regarding future CVRA workshops, it was determined there is not a need at this time.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:25 a.m.
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I.  INTRODUCTION

On December 13, 2016, the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) received a petition submitted by the Lawndale Elementary School District (SD), pursuant to Education Code (EC) §5019(c)(1), to establish trustee areas and trustee area voting within the Lawndale Elementary SD (Appendix A). The petition was presented to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) on January 4, 2017.

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 Lawndale Elementary 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 Lawndale Elementary 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 2018). 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 [Lawndale Elementary School] District. - Yes/No”

“For the election of one member of the governing board of the [Lawndale Elementary 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 2018) 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 Lawndale Elementary 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 2018.

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 2018).

Please note that, for the present proposal, staff has included the trustee area boundary map developed and approved by the Lawndale Elementary 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 2018). 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.
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 Union 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 HSD</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><strong>Glendale USD</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>TA</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 Elementary 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><strong>Newhall SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>Y</strong></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><strong>Saugus Union SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>Y</strong></td>
<td>TA</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 HSD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>William S. Hart Union HSD</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 USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County Totals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13 = 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 Lawndale Elementary SD

On December 13, 2016, LACOE and the County Committee received a petition submitted by the Lawndale Elementary 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.10, 2016-2017, adopted on October 16, 2016 (approved unanimously by the members of the Lawndale Elementary SD governing board), and an approved trustee area map.

B. Rationale of the Lawndale Elementary SD as Petitioner

The rationale for this proposal, as stated in the Lawndale Elementary SD’s petition submission, is (in relevant part) that the board determined that trustee areas/trustee area elections are not vulnerable to challenges under the CVRA and that settling its issues with MALDEF by implementing trustee areas and trustee area voting would avoid the cost, expense and uncertainty associated with allegations of violations of the CVRA.

C. Position of the Governing Board of the Lawndale Elementary SD

The petition was submitted by the Lawndale Elementary SD governing board, which approved it by a unanimous vote on October 16, 2016, approving a final trustee area map. The petition contained the final trustee area map adopted by the Lawndale Elementary 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 five years. It is not clear if there is a CVRA violation in this case. The Lawndale Elementary SD received a demand letter from the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) on March 26, 2016, challenging its use of the at-large voting system. The district decided to move to trustee areas and trustee area voting after negotiating with MALDEF, 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.

Under recent legislation, potential settlement costs are limited to $30,000 if districts agree to move to trustee areas and trustee area voting within a short timeframe after notification of any potential violation of the CVRA.

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 five 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 five years, 10 school districts in Los Angeles County have implemented trustee area voting to replace current at-large voting schemes. In addition to the current Lawndale Elementary SD petition, Downey USD, Newhall SD, William S. Hart Union HSD, Lancaster SD, Pomona USD, Eastside Union SD, Saugus 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, Mount San Antonio CCD, Santa Clarita CCD and Glendale 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.

**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). Across California, dozens of cities, and other governmental districts, have made the move to trustee areas and trustee area voting.

**VI. ELECTIONS AND THE LAWNDALE ELEMENTARY SD**

In an effort to develop its trustee area plan in full compliance with the CVRA, the Lawndale Elementary SD hired Dr. Douglas Johnson of National 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 Dr. Johnson. A review of Dr. Johnson’s demographic analysis and findings related to the map submitted by the Lawndale Elementary SD is included in this study (Appendix C).

Utilizing district, state, county and U.S. Census information, Dr. Johnson 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 48,139, each of the five trustee areas needed to be approximately 9,627, within the federal margin of error. The maps contained different configurations of trustee areas.

The district held five public forums within its territory in August and September of 2016 to discuss the petition, the move to trustee areas, and the various map scenarios. The district also held two public hearings on October 4 and October 18 of 2016. Each event had community members in attendance. Total attendance for the five forums, two public hearings, and three community
meetings was 792 people. The district also implemented an extensive public outreach program, including social media, emails, 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. There was no opposition expressed during the one public hearing that County Committee staff attended.

In three configurations of the four original maps presented by Dr. Johnson, all five trustee areas had one current incumbent residing within. In one map, Map A, one trustee area had two incumbents and one trustee area was uninhabited by incumbents. These maps were called Map A, Map B, Map C and Map D. The Lawndale Elementary SD governing board selected the final trustee area map, Map B, on October 16, 2016, approving it by a vote of 5-0.

A. Description of the District and Students

Geography and Residents: The Lawndale Elementary SD is best described as an elementary school district set in a suburban/urban setting, the boundaries of which contain single and multi-family dwellings and commercial/industrial properties. Its geography includes a fully built out environment with some open space in the form of parks and golf courses.

Dr. Johnson 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, given the small geographic size of the district. He was able to construct multiple Hispanic-majority trustee areas, based on the dispersal of these populations throughout the district. Dr. Johnson was also mindful of the Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) when composing trustee areas, as well as the district’s articulated goals for the new election plan, which included that each trustee’s territory overlap with at least three school attendance territories, to better align each trustee with stewardship over the entire district, rather than just their slice of the whole pie.

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

Students: The Lawndale Elementary SD currently serves 6,028 students, according to 2016-17 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
Lawndale Elementary SD Students, 2016-17

<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>Lawndale Elementary</td>
<td>196491</td>
<td>4,599</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>984,792</td>
<td>3,522</td>
<td>115,650</td>
<td>5,072</td>
<td>33,284</td>
<td>114,953</td>
<td>213,310</td>
<td>31,693</td>
<td>9,078</td>
<td>1,511,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>3,378,344</td>
<td>33,369</td>
<td>559,159</td>
<td>29,384</td>
<td>153,670</td>
<td>350,339</td>
<td>1,470,499</td>
<td>207,170</td>
<td>46,302</td>
<td>6,228,236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data as of: 2016-17. Source: California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS)

B. Lawndale Elementary SD Governing Board and Elections (2001 - 2015)

The Lawndale SD governing board consists of five members. 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 2015, two elections were held for school board, on odd years in November, with multiple candidates. During this same period, elections were not held in 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2013 and 2015, 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.

In 2001, the Registrar-Recorder reported that the Lawndale Elementary SD had 17,451 registered voters. In the most recent information available from the Registrar-Recorder, the Lawndale Elementary SD currently contains 14,296 registered voters. The next election is scheduled for November of 2018, following the approval by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors of a resolution by the Lawndale SD board to consolidate its elections with state election dates in even years.

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 listed above where the number of seats open matched the number of candidates who filed to run.

C. Election Data

Below is raw election data, sourced from the Registrar-Recorder, available for the competitive elections held in 2001 and 2003:
2001 Raw Data:

As of Date: 11/16/2001 Time: 14:11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAWNDALE SCHOOL</th>
<th>GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER</th>
<th>VOTE FOR NO MORE THAN</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHIRLEY RUDOLPH</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>28.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANN M PHILLIPS</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>27.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BONNIE J CORONADO</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>27.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD FUENTES</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>17.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL PRECINCTS 10
REGISTRATION 17,451

2003 Raw Data

As of Date: 11/24/2003 Time: 13:43

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAWNDALE SCHOOL</th>
<th>GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER</th>
<th>VOTE FOR NO MORE THAN</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRAIG W BURRIS</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>27.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIRLEY A BENNETT</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>22.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIAN SCHATZ</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>18.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD FUENTES</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>17.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAIG A PARKS</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>13.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL PRECINCTS 10
REGISTRATION 16,506

[No elections were held in 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2013 or 2015]

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 Lawndale Elementary 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 Lawndale Elementary SD will move its election to even years. The first election on this cycle will be November 2018.

VII. COUNTY COMMITTEE REVIEW OF THE LAWNDALE ELEMENTARY SD PETITION

On February 15, 2017, the County Committee held a public hearing within the Lawndale Elementary SD, pursuant to EC §5019(c)(2). The County Committee heard presentations from the Lawndale Elementary SD superintendent and governing board chair, as well as from Dr. Justin Levitt, one of the demographers from National Demographics who worked on the Lawndale
Elementary SD petition, who presented 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 Lawndale Elementary SD submitted, along with their trustee area petition. On May 3, 2017, the County Committee will have the opportunity to ask questions of the interested parties, including Lawndale Elementary 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 Lawndale Elementary 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 Lawndale Elementary SD. The County Committee may task staff to develop additional scenarios of the trustee area plan for the Lawndale Elementary 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 Lawndale Elementary 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 Lawndale Elementary SD’s petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting within the district.

Trustee Area Map. After reviewing the thorough process that the Lawndale Elementary 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 Map B 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 Lawndale Elementary 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 Lawndale Elementary SD, and the district’s next regular election (November 2018) 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
THE LAWNDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT  
OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA  
RESOLUTION NO. 10, 2016-2017  

A Resolution by the Board of Trustees of the Lawndale Elementary School District initiating the process for changing its election methodology to the by-trustee area method; adopting a map of proposed trustee areas; and recommending that the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization approve and establish trustee areas from which Lawndale Elementary School District governing board members will be elected in a by-trustee area election process.  

WHEREAS, the Lawndale Elementary School District ("District") currently uses an at-large system of electing its governing board members; and  

WHEREAS, at-large electoral systems such as the District's are subject to challenge under the California Voting Rights Act of 2001, codified at sections 14025-14032 of the California Elections Code ("CVRA"); and  

WHEREAS, "by-trustee area" electoral systems are not vulnerable to challenge under the CVRA; and  

WHEREAS, in a by-trustee area system of election, candidates for the District's Governing Board (the "Board") must reside within a specific geographic subarea of the District called a "trustee area" and candidates are elected only by the voters of that trustee area; and  

WHEREAS, it is the Board's intent and desire to change its election methodology from an at-large system to a by-trustee area method of election as described in Education Code section 5030(b); and  

WHEREAS, one method of transitioning from an at-large electoral system to a by-trustee area electoral system is for the school district board of trustees to petition the local county committee on school district organization by resolution to initiate the transition under California Education Code section 5019(c)(1); and  

WHEREAS, this Resolution shall serve as the District's proposal to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization ("Committee") pursuant to Education Code section 5019(c)(1); and  

WHEREAS, to avoid the cost, expense and uncertainty associated with allegations of violations of the CVRA, the District has proceeded expeditiously to change its current at-large election system; and  

WHEREAS, the District, retained a demographer who prepared draft maps that were presented to the public during community meetings held on September 12, 2016 at 3:30 p.m. at William Anderson Elementary School, 4130 154th Street, Lawndale, CA 90260; on September 12, 2016 at 5:00 p.m. at Will Rogers Middle School, 4110 West 154th Street, Lawndale, CA 90260; and on September 19, 2016 at 4:30 p.m. at the William Green Elementary School, 4520 168th Street, Lawndale, CA 90260.
WHEREAS, meetings were well attended and many valuable comments were made by the public; at least 70 individuals attended the three community meetings and there were 8 different speakers at the meetings; and

WHEREAS, during the Board’s regular meeting of October 4, 2016, the Board held the first public hearing required by Elections Code section 10010. During that public hearing, Dr. Douglas Johnson, the District’s demographer, and Dr. Ellen Dougherty, the District’s Superintendent, presented a summary of the input received at the community meetings. Further community and Board input was received during the public hearing; and

WHEREAS, at the Board’s meeting of October 4, 2016, the Board unanimously voted to identify Maps A and B as the maps to be considered for final adoption at the Board’s regular meeting of October 18, 2016; and

WHEREAS, during the Board’s regular meeting of October 18, 2016, the Board held the second public hearing required by Elections Code section 10010. During the second public hearing, Dr. Douglas Johnson, the District’s demographer, and John Vinke, the District’s Deputy Superintendent, presented a summary of the input received at the community meetings and first public hearing. Further community and Board input was received during the public hearing; and

WHEREAS, the Board has considered all such public input and comment on the maps; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to adopt Map B and hereby recommends Map B to the County Committee for its consideration based upon the findings, and analysis contained in the documents attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit “1”; and

WHEREAS, in order to complete the transition to by-trustee area elections in a timely and cost effective manner, and to guarantee 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 must obtain a waiver of the election process as set forth in Education Code sections 5019, 5020, 5021 and 5030 from the State Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, the District has submitted Resolution No. 6, 2016-2017 to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors requesting consolidation of the election date for members of the governing board with the date of the California statewide general election held in November of each even-numbered year [Elec. Code § 1001] pursuant to Elections Code section 1302(b); and

WHEREAS, the request for consolidation of election was approved by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors on October 18, 2016, changing the date of the next scheduled governing board election to the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November of 2018, and each subsequent board member election shall be held two years thereafter in November of even-numbered years in conjunction with the statewide general election; and

WHEREAS, because the request for consolidation of election was approved, the term of office of current governing board members expiring in December 2017 shall be extended to December 2018 and the term of governing board members expiring in December 2019 shall be extended to December 2020.
NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Governing Board of the Lawndale Elementary School District as follows:

1. That the above recitals are true and correct.

2. That the Board hereby adopts Map B and recommends Map B to the Committee for consideration and adoption.

3. That at the District's next election in 2018, seats in trustee areas 1, 2, and 4 will be up for election, and in November 2020, seats in trustee areas 3 and 5 will be up for election.

4. That the Superintendent or designee may take all actions necessary to notify the County Committee of the Board’s determination herein and provide whatever assistance may be required by the Committee to complete the process, including the holding of at least one Committee meeting in the District.

ADOPTED, SIGNED AND APPROVED this 18th day of October, 2016.

[Signature]
President of the Board of Trustees for the Lawndale Elementary School District

I, Cathy Burris, Clerk of the Governing Board of the Lawndale Elementary School District, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Governing Board of said District at a meeting of said Board held on the 18th day of October 2016, and that it was so adopted by the following vote:

AYES: 5

NOES: 0

ABSTAIN: 0

ABSENT: 0

[Signature]
Clerk of the Board of Trustees of the Lawndale Elementary School District
APPENDIX B
Lawndale Elementary Districting 2016
Draft B Borders on Attendance Zone Map

Attendance zones shown have been adjusted to follow Census Block borders. This is not a map of official attendance zones.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Pop</td>
<td>9,937</td>
<td>9,387</td>
<td>10,042</td>
<td>9,478</td>
<td>9,295</td>
<td>48,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from Ideal</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-241</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>-150</td>
<td>-333</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Deviation</td>
<td>3.21%</td>
<td>-2.50%</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
<td>-1.56%</td>
<td>-3.40%</td>
<td>7.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hispanic</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian-American</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total % Hispanic</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian-American</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting Age Pop</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>6,928</td>
<td>7,207</td>
<td>6,822</td>
<td>6,852</td>
<td>35,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hispanic</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian-American</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Voting Age Pop</td>
<td>5,614</td>
<td>4,902</td>
<td>6,073</td>
<td>4,730</td>
<td>5,346</td>
<td>26,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hispanic</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian/ Natl.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total % Hispanic</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian/ Natl.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter Registration (Nov 2014)</td>
<td>4,647</td>
<td>4,254</td>
<td>4,554</td>
<td>3,846</td>
<td>3,758</td>
<td>21,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Latino</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian/ Natl.</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Filipino/ Natl.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total % Latino</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian/ Natl.</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Filipino/ Natl.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total % Latino</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter Turnout (Nov 2014)</td>
<td>3,742</td>
<td>3,531</td>
<td>2,619</td>
<td>2,232</td>
<td>2,110</td>
<td>14,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Latino</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian/ Natl.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Filipino/ Natl.</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Natl. Am.</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS Pop, Est.</td>
<td>10,442</td>
<td>9,687</td>
<td>10,661</td>
<td>10,030</td>
<td>8,593</td>
<td>49,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>14-19</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>age 20-64</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>age 65+</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>naturalized</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-naturalized</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language spoken at home</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Facility</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>little</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>less than very well</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>graduation</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child in Household</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work (percent of pop age 16+)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households Income</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-25K</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-50K</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-75K</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75-200K</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more than 200K</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Status</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>occupied</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rented</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>owned</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total and Voting Age population data from the 2010 Decennial Census. Voter Registration and Turnout data from the California Secretary of State database. Citizens Voting Age Pop, Age, Immigration, and other demographics from the 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-year data.
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UPDATE:

In March of 2017, the Glendale Unified School District (USD) reached out to staff and indicated that it intended to reopen negotiations with the LaCanada USD, with a goal of reaching a mutually-agreeable resolution to this petition, culminating in a joint district petition to transfer the subject territory. Glendale USD assured staff that both the LaCanada USD and the chief petitioners were informed of these efforts and requested that the County Committee Chair delay review of the petition.

Because staff were currently undertaking the preliminary steps of the statutorily required environmental review of the petition, which would need to be performed should the County Committee approve it, the timelines to complete review by the County Committee were suspended. In that climate, the County Committee Chair delayed review of the petition so that the parties might provide additional information, and possible present a new petition endorsed by both school districts.

An item was agendized for the May 3, 2017 meeting, to provide the districts and the chief petitioners a forum to provide the County Committee with an update on any progress. However, in late April, superintendents at both the Glendale USD and the LaCanada USD informed staff that their negotiations had ended and did not produce any agreement among the districts. Thus, the petition was agendized for review at the May 3, 2017 meeting, with staff prepared to present the feasibility that was completed preliminarily in February 2017, with no additional changes to recommendations.

A package of additional materials, including two documents from the chief petitioners and a collection of emails from the public, were also distributed to the County Committee along with this update to facilitate review of the petition on May 3, 2017, joining the materials previously distributed on flash drives.
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I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On November 23, 2015, the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) received a request for a petition pursuant to Education Code (EC) §35700(a) to transfer certain territory from the Glendale Unified School (USD) to the La Canada USD. The request was submitted by chief petitioners Mr. Nick Karapetian and Ms. Nalani Lasiewicz (and Mr. Tom Smith, who later resigned as a chief petitioner). The territory in question consists of approximately 900 parcels, 783 of which are residential, referred to as the Sagebrush area of the City of La Canada, all currently within the Glendale USD, as highlighted in the map included in the petition (Attachment A).

After gathering sufficient signatures, the petition was presented to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) on September 6, 2016. Pursuant to EC §35705, two public hearings were conducted in the La Canada USD on October 26, 2016, and in the Glendale USD on November 2, 2016.

Pursuant to EC §35706 and conditions set forth in EC §35753, Table 1 provides a summary of the nine statutory conditions that guide examination of school district organization petitions to transfer territory, along with staff’s findings. The following report provides findings and analysis of each condition to be considered by the County Committee in its evaluation of the petition, and concludes with staff’s recommendations.

As indicated in the following report, County Committee staff’s analysis of this petition indicates that the proposal to transfer certain territory from the Glendale USD to the La Canada USD would substantially meet Conditions (1), (4), (6) and (8) of EC §35753. The analysis indicates that Conditions (2), (3), (5), (7) and (9) of EC §35753 would not be substantially met. The information in this report was developed through many discussions and meetings with the impacted parties and numerous members of the public, as well as the review of thousands of pages of materials submitted to the County Committee and to the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE).

Staff’s recommendation is that the Committee deny this petition to transfer territory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Adequacy in number of students.</td>
<td>Substantially Met</td>
<td>Each of the impacted districts would continue to maintain enrollment of at least 1,501 students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Community identity.</td>
<td>Not Substantially Met</td>
<td>There is no evidence that the subject territory has a more substantial community identity with the La Canada USD than with the Glendale USD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Equitable division of assets and liabilities.</td>
<td>Not Substantially Met</td>
<td>Reorganization would not require a division of assets or liabilities; however, it is not possible to determine the financial impact of an alteration of bonding capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Will not promote ethnic discrimination or segregation.</td>
<td>Substantially Met</td>
<td>Reorganization would not affect student enrollment or attendance significantly in any of the impacted districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Will not substantially increase costs to the state.</td>
<td>Not Substantially Met</td>
<td>Reorganization would impact state funding significantly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Will not significantly disrupt educational programs in either district.</td>
<td>Substantially Met</td>
<td>Reorganization would not require substantial changes to educational program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Will not result in a significant increase in school housing costs.</td>
<td>Not Substantially Met</td>
<td>Reorganization would impact school housing costs substantially.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Proposal is not primarily designed to substantially increase property values.</td>
<td>Substantially Met</td>
<td>While property values will likely go up as a result of the proposed transfer, there is no evidence that a desire to increase property values is the primary motive for the reorganization request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Will not affect the fiscal management or status of the affected districts.</td>
<td>Not Substantially Met</td>
<td>Reorganization would lead to a significant impact to both districts’ fiscal management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

On November 23, 2015, the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) received a request for a petition pursuant to Education Code (EC) §35700(a) to transfer certain territory from the Glendale Unified School District (USD) to the La Canada USD. The request was submitted by chief petitioners Mr. Nick Karapetian and Ms. Nalini Lasiewicz (and by Mr. Tom Smith, who later resigned as a chief petitioner). The territory in question consists of approximately 900 homes, all currently within the Glendale USD and the City of La Canada, as highlighted in the map included in the petition (Attachment A). On January 4, 2016, staff submitted the petition to the Office of the Los Angeles County Counsel (County Counsel) to review it for compliance with relevant code. On January 13, 2016, County Counsel notified staff of the petition’s sufficiency and it was forwarded to the chief petitioners for circulation on January 15, 2016.

On June 29, 2016, the chief petitioners submitted signed petitions to the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools (County Superintendent). Staff to the County Superintendent examined the petition and forwarded it to the Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk (Registrar-Recorder) for signature verification on June 30, 2016. On July 18, 2016, staff received notification from the Registrar-Recorder that there were sufficient signatures to move the petition forward.

At its regular meeting on September 7, 2016, 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 La Canada USD on October 26, 2016, and in the Glendale USD on November 2, 2016. In addition to the public hearings, the County Committee received numerous document submissions from both districts and the chief petitioners, as well as a large volume of mail and email messages from community members and stakeholders, all of which were forwarded to County Committee members for review. In light of the volume of material submitted prior to the completion of its feasibility study, staff did not issue Requests for Information (RFI) to any of the impacted parties seeking additional information.

Pursuant to EC §35706 and conditions set forth in EC §35753, this petition was examined in accordance to the nine conditions that guide review of school district organization petitions to transfer territory. The following report provides findings and analysis of each condition to be considered by the County Committee in its evaluation of the petition, and concludes with staff’s recommendations.

III. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL AREA

The proposed transfer area consists of approximately 900 parcels, 783 of which are residential homes located in the City of La Canada and the Glendale USD. Attachment A contains a map of the area proposed for transfer. The petitioners have identified this area as “the Territory” and parties speaking and sending messages as part of the outreach process have called it what it is known colloquially, the Sagebrush area. This report identifies it as the petition area.
IV. DESCRIPTION OF IMPACTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

GLENDALE USD

The Glendale USD serves K-12 students in the City of Glendale and part of the City of La Canada, along with portions of unincorporated Los Angeles County. The district operates twenty elementary schools, four middle schools, four high schools, and a continuation high school. The 2015-16 student enrollment for the Glendale USD was 26,117, according to the California Department of Education (CDE). The area supported by the Glendale USD is a diverse urban and suburban area with both single-family housing and multi-family housing, surrounded by many robust commercial areas.

LA CANADA USD

The La Canada USD serves K-12 students within a portion of the City of La Canada. The district operates three elementary schools, one combined junior/senior high school and one small high school for students with special needs. The 2015-16 student enrollment for the La Canada USD was 4,093, according to the CDE. The area supported by the La Canada USD is a suburban area with single-family housing, and very limited multi-family housing, surrounded by many robust commercial areas. It also includes a large area of forest lands.

V. PETITIONERS’ RATIONALE

The rationale for petitioning for the transfer of territory as stated by the chief petitioners in their petition (Attachment A), is summarized as follows:

"Note that as referred to in this petition, the Territory proposed to be transferred specifically excludes the GUSD owned lot used for accessing Mountain Avenue Elementary school. Reference Assessor Parcel 5870-013-901, or situs address 4921 Ocean View Blvd., La Cañada Flintridge, California 91011.

SEE ATTACHED MAP

This petition seeks to unite and strengthen a fractured community by granting all La Cañada Flintridge (LCF) residents the same opportunity to attend their hometown public schools and to benefit from the same social and educational resources currently enjoyed by the other 90% of LCF families. This transfer would resolve definitively and equitably a deeply emotionally-charged conflict that has festered for more than 50 years as evidenced by multiple petitions, legislative proposals and lawsuits that have pitted neighbor against neighbor with negative consequences to students and their families. Furthermore, GUSD could avoid significant financial expenditures and staff time from continuous negotiations and litigation.

The following are the reasons for petitioning for this change and the undersigned demonstrate their support for the proposed transfer by affixing their signature to this Petition:
1. To nurture and promote student achievement. LCUSD has intentionally forged deep partnerships with the City of LCF, the local business community, its school families, and non-school families including seniors. The result of this long-term community outreach is a deeply vested civic interest in its children focused on student achievement. This “community of trust” has created a sense of family, inspired an immense amount of pride in its expansive civic and educational experience and engendered a passionate following in ways most communities rarely see. Sociologists refer to this phenomenon as “community and social capital”, which has been shown by researchers to produce positive results for student achievement and helps children to excel in school. This environment and culture in which the “village”, as well as the family, takes ownership of its children has resulted in unique dedicated resources, educational programs, partnerships, internships, and scholarships, which unfortunately are not currently available to all LCF residents. Also, compared to GUSD, LCUSD offers students:

a. Smaller middle and senior high school campuses;

b. Lower class sizes;

c. No split classes; and

d. Significantly more counselors per student.

2. To eliminate educational disparity and inequality. Territory residents, a 10% minority of LCF families, are consigned to a neighboring school district due to an 1880s survey that ignored prominent well-defined natural land features. This arbitrary invisible boundary had little relevance until the mid-1950s when ample water supply was attained and housing development followed. Since the formation of LCUSD in 1961, Territory residents have fought for equal rights, duties and privileges enjoyed by the 90% majority of La Cañadans.

3. To upgrade school and public safety. Local law enforcement, emergency and operational planning would be simplified, unified, streamlined and better coordinated between the City of LCF and LCUSD by removing a layer of bureaucracy. This is especially true since the Territory is located fully within the boundaries of the City of LCF and within the administrative “sphere of influence” [as determined by the Local Agency Formation Commission for the County of Los Angeles] of the City of LCF.

4. To strengthen local control, civic participation and self-governance. Territory residents would join the 90% of our fellow LCF residents as fully participating members of our hometown LCUSD schools including all related opportunities and privileges that are currently denied. Most notable of these is the ability to fully and directly participate in the governance of LCUSD schools, which is so integral to the greater LCF community.

5. To improve local government responsiveness, efficiency and transparency. Uniting all LCF residents with our hometown school district would enhance communication, coordination and procedures between the City of LCF and
LCUSD, thereby increasing public involvement and active participation in local government decision-making for all LCF residents.

6. **To respect and honor the voice of LCF residents.** LCF residents have demonstrated overwhelming support to unify the city with its local school district for decades:

   a. In May 2014, **90% of Territory respondents** to a GUSD-sponsored survey said they definitely (85%) or probably (5%) **supported the transfer** proposal being discussed by the two school districts;

   b. In the same survey, **Territory residents supported a territory transfer over open enrollment by a margin of five to one**, confirming their feelings of being marginalized and disenfranchised by GUSD;

   c. In April 1997, **84% of Territory respondents** to a survey commissioned by the City of LCF **supported making the Territory part of LCUSD**;

   d. In November 2013, the City Council of LCF unanimously approved a resolution “to petition…that the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization commence the process” to transfer the Territory into LCUSD jurisdictional boundaries; and

   e. In January 2014, LCUSD unanimously reaffirmed its support of the Territory transfer following the election of three new board members.”

### VI. POSITIONS OF THE GOVERNING BOARDS

#### GLENDALE USD

At its regular meeting on November 1, 2016, the Glendale USD Governing Board adopted Resolution No. 15 (Attachment B) opposing the petition to transfer territory from the Glendale USD to the La Canada USD.

At the public hearings held on October 26, 2016 and November 2, 2016, Glendale USD Superintendent Winfred Roberson expressed the Governing Board’s opposition to the proposed transfer.

#### LA CANADA USD

At its regular meeting on October 24, 2016, the La Canada USD Governing Board adopted Resolution No. 5-16-17 (Attachment C) supporting the petition to transfer territory from the Glendale USD to the La Canada USD.

At the public hearings held on October 26, 2016 and November 2, 2016, La Canada USD Superintendent Wendy Sinnette expressed the Governing Board’s support for the proposed transfer.
VII. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

**Parcels.** The petition area is located within territory in the City of La Canada and the Glendale USD. Per the Registrar-Recorder’s office, the petition area contains approximately 900 parcels, 783 of which contain single family homes. This area has been part of the Glendale USD since the school district’s formation in 1936. During the incorporation of the La Canada USD in 1961, the petition area was deliberately excluded from the school district. When the City of La Canada Flintridge (City of La Canada) was formed in 1976, it included the petition area, spreading the city’s territory across two different school districts (Glendale USD and La Canada USD). This is an entirely usual circumstance as nearly all cities in Los Angeles County cross school district lines, and nearly all school districts include territory from multiple cities, with some also including unincorporated territory in the county. For example, the ABC USD includes territory from seven different cities. Likewise, the City of Temple City includes territory from four different school districts. School district boundaries and city boundaries are rarely coterminous in Los Angeles County.

**Petition Area Enrollment.** According to information submitted by the Glendale USD and the La Canada USD, there is an averaged number of 387 identified students living in the petition area, with the Capitol Advisors Group (Capitol Advisors), hired by both districts to conduct an independent analysis of the fiscal impact of the proposed transfer of territory, arriving at a number of 364. A copy of that report is included and will be referred to in further sections (Attachment D). The districts differ slightly in their reporting of how many students live in the area, so their reported figures were averaged. Some of the students living in the petition area are not enrolled in either Glendale USD or La Canada USD schools, due to their attendance in charter schools, private schools, participation in home schooling or other arrangements. Similarly, the districts reported different figures for the number of students who attend their schools on permits from the petition area. The best averaged estimate that can be made of student enrollment among petition area students is that 75 K-12 students from the Glendale USD are enrolled in the La Canada USD as permit students. Capitol Advisers estimated the number at 58 students.

**Permit Process and Agreements.** Both the Glendale USD and the La Canada USD stated in materials submitted to the County Committee and at public hearings that they facilitate the permit process for students in the petition area seeking to transfer out of the Glendale USD into the La Canada USD. They do not have any formal transfer agreement with one another specifically impacting the petition area, and instead request that students seeking permits go through the standard process developed by each district. Both the La Canada USD and the Glendale USD stated that they will continue to honor permit assess (both release and enrollment) of petition area students. One of the chief petitioners stated to staff that his children are currently enrolled in La Canada USD schools on permits.

**Past Petition Attempts.** There have been several attempts in the past to transfer the petition area from the Glendale USD to the La Canada USD. Those petitions have not been successful, either at the County Committee level or on review by the State Board of Education (SBE). While numerous parties in this petition review process have alluded to prior decisions and review of earlier petitions, categorizing them as relevant to the instant petition, the fact remains that a transfer
of the petition area has never been approved in its final form by any body with authority to do so. Those prior partial decisions are not controlling on the County Committee and it is not bound by any prior decision, charged as it is with examining the current petition on its own merit, relating it to circumstances present at the time of its review.

VIII. ANALYSIS OF MANDATED CONDITIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

EC §35753 identifies nine conditions which must be reviewed by the County Committee as part of the decision-making process related to proposed school district reorganizations. The County Committee must determine if these conditions are substantially met.

The County Committee may vote to approve a proposal to transfer territory when the conditions contained in EC §35753(a)(1) through (10) are substantially met. However, the Education Code does not mandate that the County Committee approve petitions where any, a majority or all of the conditions are substantially met. Likewise, the Education Code does not mandate that the County Committee deny a petition where all, many or some of the conditions are not substantially met. The Education Code provides the County Committee with broad authority to analyze factors it deems relevant and to assign to those factors the requisite weight they choose to determine how to vote on the petitions that come before it.

The County Committee has the option to disapprove a proposal to transfer territory even when the conditions are substantially met, if it determines that the proposal is not in the best overall interests of those affected; if there is no compelling reason for a change; if the proposal will not improve the effectiveness and/or the efficiency of the delivery of educational services to students; or for any other reason(s) the County Committee deems relevant.

The County Committee may also approve a proposal to transfer territory if it determines it is not practical or possible to apply the EC §35753 conditions literally and circumstances with respect to the proposal present an exceptional situation sufficient to justify approval of the proposal.

| CONDITION 1 |
| The reorganized districts will be adequate in terms of number of pupils enrolled. |

The County Committee may approve a proposal for reorganization of districts if the new district is adequate in terms of the number of students enrolled. Section 18573(a)(1)(a) of Title V, California Administrative Code (CAC), specifies that a unified district must have a projected enrollment of at least 1,501 students.

FINDINGS

According to the CDE, the 2015-16 student enrollment for the Glendale USD was 26,117, and for the La Canada USD was 4,093.
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Because the petition area contains so few students (approximately 387) compared to the total enrollments of the impacted districts, approval of this proposal would not substantially reduce the number of students enrolled in the Glendale USD. In addition, should the petition be approved, the permanent transfer of all of the petition area students to the La Canada USD would not negatively impact the enrollment at the Glendale USD to the point that it would not maintain a minimum enrollment above 1,501 students, the standard for a unified school district. Therefore, it is recommended that the County Committee deem this condition to be substantially met.

CONDITION 2

The districts are each organized on the basis of a substantial community identity.

The CAC, Title V, Section 18573(a)(2)(A-G), provides that community identity should be determined using criteria such as: isolation; geography; distance between social centers; distance between school centers; topography; weather; community, school, and social ties; and other circumstances peculiar to the area. The County Committee may determine which aspects of community life and description constitute relevant community identity for its review purposes.

FINDINGS

The petition area, historically a part of the Glendale USD, borders the La Canada USD and is part of the City of La Canada. The chief petitioners have provided extensive narrative about how the petition area “feels” a part of the La Canada USD community, citing many aspects of commonality, including location within the City of La Canada.

However, an examination of the petition area does not indicate a substantially stronger community identity with the La Canada USD than with the Glendale USD. Geographically, it is often difficult to glean the physical boundaries between the two school districts, both in residential and commercial areas. While it is clear that the petitioners and their supporters feel a sense of community identity, the region in general shares the same transportation arteries, commercial, recreational, shopping and entertainment centers and, most importantly, students. There is a long tradition of students crossing school district borders to attend other high and elementary schools, charter schools and magnet schools, and even private schools. In fact, students in the petition area currently enroll in La Canada USD schools on permit, including one of the chief petitioner’s own children. The notion that petition area students are being excluded from their true school district, and all that they could avail themselves from it, is not supported. In fact, it is not their school district. They live in the Glendale USD because their homes are located in that district. As stated above, school district boundaries and city boundaries are rarely coterminous in Los Angeles County, and in much of California, and the County Committee has never been charged with reconciling these disparate borders.

Though the chief petitioners and many of their supporters who spoke at public hearings and sent materials and messages to the County Committee described many incidents of social and
community isolation based on what they believe is their unique status (living in one city but attending a school district that is largely in another city), their situations are not unique. They are the norm for tens of thousands of students in Los Angeles County. Further, the isolation that the chief petitioners and their supporters recounted does not come from the Glendale USD, their assigned school district. Residents of the petition area may take advantage of anything the Glendale USD has to offer. Some are even able to take advantage of the offerings of the La Canada USD if they enroll there on permits, or if they participate in city-wide programs that involve the school district.

Issues such as distance from one school to the petition area, alignment of local sports opportunities, perceived neighborhood culture, and other factors have been highlighted to establish a stronger community identity with La Canada USD than with Glendale USD. There is no evidence that these sentiments are not genuinely felt by the petitioners and their supporters. They displayed significant emotion when recounting their family perceptions to the County Committee and the veracity of those sentiments is not doubted or minimized. However, it appears that the chief petitioners, and the homeowners they represent, have expressed a sense of a stronger community identity with the La Canada USD because they have sought to build that relationship, based in part on the fact that their territory and homes are in the City of La Canada and many students in the petition area currently – and assume historically – attend La Canada USD schools. In short, they want to be part of that community because they want to, not because they are. The very depth with which the petitioners and their supporters stated that they already feel a part of the La Canada USD community demonstrates that they are able to enjoy ‘cross-border’ community alignment based on their location within this broader region without taking the drastic step of upending permanent school district boundaries.

Many of the instances of perceived exclusion or discrimination reported by the petitioners and their supporters come at the hands of other entities, such as a local Chamber of Commerce that awards scholarships only to La Canada USD students, thus excluding eligibility of its own city residents who attend other schools in other districts, or certain reported participation rules for local sports teams and clubs. One resident very movingly recounted the exclusion of her child when local student achievements were reported in the area newspaper, attributing it to the fact that they did not attend La Canada USD schools. Those eligibility rules and decisions about what community events to highlight in the news have been developed, and apparently are enforced, by other entities, not the school districts. Thus, the source of petitioners’ and their supporters’ sense of isolation does not have a remedy from the school districts and, as a further result, there is no remedy available to them to resolve these issues from the County Committee’s review of the school district organization process. Any sense of exclusion by petitioners from the La Canada USD is entirely reasonable, as their homes are not in that district and thus their students do not live in it.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Residents of the petition area, like all residents of Los Angeles County, likely share a strong community identity with their locality in general (including the cities of La Canada and neighboring City of Glendale and other surrounding areas), as well as with whatever school district their children are enrolled in, because that is where they live near. Because the petition area neighborhood borders a number of districts and cities, community identity becomes an amalgam rather than a specific, definable sentiment or status. It is reasonable to like or feel a part of any broader locality when one lives in or near any border. It is clear that the petitioners and their
supporters feel otherwise, to the point of claiming La Canada USD as their true district, but their impressions are not determinative here. While boundary areas in any city or district will always have some elements in common with the areas they border, community identity must consider the city and the school district independent entities.

The chief petitioners and the residents living within the petition area do not evidence greater community identity with the La Canada USD than they do with the Glendale USD. Proximity to school sites does not, in and of itself, establish community identity. Exclusion from local clubs or events in their own city cannot be remedied by another entity such as a school district.

In their petition, the chief petitioners alluded to other issues related to community identity, such as safety, access to emergency services and a unique geographic composition of the petition area. Staff found no evidence that Glendale USD is more dangerous, or less well served by emergency services, than La Canada USD. Further, the canyonland areas of the region, including the composition of the petition area, are not unique in Los Angeles County. Many school districts encompass areas with geographic barriers such as canyons, hills, mountains and even freeways and waterways. Nevertheless, school districts and other civic service providers operate efficiently and provide equal services to all, no matter where their official boundaries are.

Petitions to transfer territory are requests for changes to permanent boundaries. They should only be undertaken based on evidence of a compelling reason to make such changes related to educational reasons and guided by the mandated nine conditions of review. No such compelling reason has been presented in this case that cannot be mitigated by the current collaborative practices of the districts in question, specifically in the offering of permits. Other issues of complaint, such as exclusion from local city activities and opportunities, need to be presented in a different forum than this one. The chief petitioners’ main claim is that this transfer should take place because it is what they want, because they feel more a part of the district they prefer, one they do not live in. There is no process to remedy those sentiments in the school district organization process. Therefore, it is recommended that the County Committee deem this condition to not be substantially met.

CONDITION 3

The proposal will result in an equitable division of property and facilities of the original district or districts.

The division of real and personal property, funds, and obligations, except bonded indebtedness, shall be determined as provided in EC §§35560(a), 35561, 35564, 35565, and 35736.

FINDINGS

Real Property

No real or personal public school property of the Glendale USD is located within the boundaries of the area proposed for transfer.
Bonded Indebtedness and Tax Rate

EC §35575 states that “[w]hen territory is taken from one school district and annexed to another school district and the area transferred contains no public school property or buildings, the territory shall drop any liability for outstanding bonded indebtedness in the district of which it was formerly a part [Glendale USD] and shall automatically assume its proportionate share of the outstanding bonded indebtedness of the district of which it becomes a part [La Canada USD].” Since there are no school facilities and/or property located in the area proposed for transfer, the bonded indebtedness provisions of EC §35575 would apply.

Any territory transferred from Glendale USD into La Canada USD would inherit the bonded indebtedness of La Canada USD. The influx of new territory and new ratepayers would necessarily lower the cost of existing bonded indebtedness to individual property owners within La Canada USD as it would enlarge the pool of property available to cover the bonds. Subsequently, any property owners within Glendale USD would remain responsible for the current bonded indebtedness and would have to pay those obligations from a smaller pool of property owners if the transfer removed those homes in the petition area into La Canada USD.

The impact of this shift in property is difficult to determine. The Glendale USD assessed the change to be an increase of 1.84% for property owners in their district if such a transfer were approved, as a result of fewer remaining ratepayers needing to shoulder the responsibilities for outstanding bonds. In addition, they stated that they would lose bonding capacity of $560,570,650, based on the assessed valuation of the petition area. The La Canada USD would have an increase in bonding capacity, presumably of the same amount, with the inclusion of the petition area into its territory. The La Canada USD did not contradict the Glendale USD’s claim that the territory transfer would result in a decrease to Glendale’s assessed valuation as a district.

Student Body Funds

EC §35564 specifies that “[i]f there is in the school an organized student body, the property, funds, and obligations of the student body shall be divided as determined by the County Committee, except that the share shall not exceed an amount equal to the ratio which the number of students leaving the school bears to the total number of pupils enrolled. The ownership of the property, funds, and obligations which is a proportionate share of each segment of the student body, shall be transferred to the student body of the school or schools in which the pupils are enrolled after the reorganization.”

If students who reside in the petition area attend schools within the Glendale USD that have an organized student body, EC §35564 would require the distribution of a proportionate share of those student body funds to the La Canada USD, if this petition is approved.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Because no school facilities are located within the transfer area and fewer than 400 students currently reside in the petition area (many of whom already attend La Canada USD schools), a division of property, funds or obligations (except bonded indebtedness) of the school districts would not be required should this proposal be approved.
Pursuant to EC §35736, all property, funds, and obligations, other than real property and bonded indebtedness, shall be divided pro rata between the districts based on the number of affected students as a percentage of the Glendale USD’s total student population in order to result in an equitable division of the property, funds, and obligations of the districts. In this petition, those calculations are complicated by differing perceptions among the impacted districts and parties. The Glendale USD stated that the transfer would place it at a fiscal disadvantage due to loss of assessed valuation and enrollment-based student funds, and that these factors are the rationale for its lack of support for the petition.

The La Canada USD stated that it supported the petition, and would not be disadvantaged in terms of loss of enrollment-based funding or loss of assessed valuation. However, La Canada USD stated in both public hearings that it would be negatively impacted fiscally if it were required to house all of the students residing in the petition area immediately, as would be required under the Education Code should the transfer be approved. This issue will be discussed in greater detail under Conditions 5 and 9. Therefore, given the uncertainty surrounding the financial impact to the districts should the petition be approved, it is recommended that the County Committee deem this condition to be not substantially met.

**CONDITION 4**

The reorganization of the districts will preserve each affected district’s ability to educate students in an integrated environment and will not promote racial or ethnic discrimination or segregation.

The CAC, Title V, Section 18573(a)(4)(A-E), states that:

“To determine whether the new districts will promote racial or ethnic discrimination or segregation, the effects of the following factors will be considered:

- The current number and percentage of pupils in each racial and ethnic group in the affected districts and schools in the affected districts, compared with the number and percentage of pupils in each racial and ethnic group in the affected districts and schools in the affected districts, if the proposal or petition is approved.

- The trends and rates of present and possible future growth or change in the total population in the districts affected, in each racial and ethnic group within the total district, and in each school of the affected districts.

- The school board policies regarding methods of preventing racial and ethnic segregation in the affected districts and the effect of the proposal or petition on any desegregation plan or program of the affected districts, whether voluntary or court ordered, designed to prevent or alleviate racial or ethnic discrimination or segregation.
The effect of factors such as distance between schools and attendance centers, terrain, and geographic features that may involve safety hazards to students, capacity of schools, and related conditions or circumstances that may have an effect on the feasibility of integration of the affected schools.

The effect of the proposal on the duty of the governing board of each of the affected districts to take steps, insofar as reasonably feasible, to alleviate segregation of minority students in schools regardless of its cause.”

As a matter of County Committee policy, the County Committee may also consider:

• participation in extracurricular activities;

• equipment of affected school districts;

• state of facilities of affected school districts;

• perception of staff, administrators, and community regarding whether schools are segregated; and,

• racial/ethnic make-up of staff and administration.

FINDINGS

Table 2 below displays the 2015-16 district-wide student enrollment by racial/ethnic categories for the Glendale USD as provided by the CDE. As shown, the district’s enrollment is comprised of 55% White students, 23% Hispanic students, 18% Asian students (Asian, Pacific Islander or Filipino), and 1% African American students (not accounting for non-reporting students and those declaring two or more ethnicities).

**TABLE 2**  
Glendale USD Racial/Ethnic Distribution*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</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>Glendale USD</td>
<td>6004</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3051</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>14,470</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>126,117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: CDE, Enrollment in California Public Schools for 2015-2016.

Table 3 below displays the 2015-16 district-wide student enrollment by racial/ethnic categories as provided by the CDE. As shown, the district’s enrollment is comprised of 51% White students, 29% Asian students (Asian, Pacific Islander or Filipino), 12% Hispanic students and 1% African American students (not accounting for non-reporting students and those declaring two or more ethnicities).
Both school districts have a majority of students reporting White as their ethnicity. The balance of ethnicity in each of the districts is similar but differ somewhat when reviewing non-White categories. La Canada USD has 12% Hispanic students while Glendale USD has 23%. La Canada USD has 29% Asian students while Glendale USD as 18%. Both districts have 1% African American students. It is projected that, should the petition be approved, it would not shift the racial/ethnic balance of either district substantially even if all of the petition students transfer from Glendale USD to La Canada USD. There is no evidence that there is any ethnic or racial motive for petitioning for this transfer of territory.

If the petition is approved, all of the students in the petition area would be added to totals for the La Canada USD (except for those students who choose to enroll in Glendale USD, via permit, if approved and those who choose educational options other than La Canada USD, such as charter or private schools). The resulting new enrollment total would not alter the ethnic/racial makeup of the La Canada USD, nor would the loss of those students alter the ethnic/racial makeup of the Glendale USD.

**CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

The potential shift of the students from the petition area within the Glendale USD to the La Canada USD would not have a discernable impact on the ethnic or racial distribution of either district. Because there are so few students, and the districts have similar ethnic/racial makeups, percentage distribution across ethnic categories would remain very similar for both following transfer resulting from approval of this petition. Further, many of the students residing in the petition area already enroll in La Canada USD schools. If the petition is approved, those students in the petition area who currently enroll in Glendale USD schools could choose to continue those enrollments via permit. It is concluded that the proposed petition, if approved, would not promote racial or ethnic discrimination in any of the impacted school districts. Therefore, it is recommended that the County Committee deem this condition to be substantially met.

**CONDITION 5**

*Any increase in costs to the state as a result of the proposed reorganization will be insignificant and otherwise incidental to the reorganization.*

This petition area contains approximately 387 students. Of those, an averaged number of 75 currently attend the La Canada USD on permits. Thus, there would be a change in student
enrollment of up to 312 additional students to the La Canada USD (and a potential loss of that same amount to Glendale USD) should all of the students in the petition area enroll in La Canada USD schools if the petition is approved. It should be noted that this is the best estimate of students at this time. Students could graduate, new students could move into the district(s) and housing stock (and potential students living in it) can expand and contract. The Glendale USD has stated that the loss of these enrollment-based funds would be significant to its overall budget, a claim disputed by petitioners and, in part, by the La Canada USD. It appears that Glendale USD’s concern about loss of enrollment-based funds is one calculated over time (loss of annual funds over a number of years). Again, they are entitled to make those calculations about potential fiscal losses because a transfer of territory would represent a permanent loss of funds they could have received each year.

The La Canada USD stated in public forums and in its materials that, while it supports the transfer petition, it does not have the facilities to house all of the potential students residing in the petition area. On multiple occasions, the La Canada USD alluded to a phase-in process, whereby petition area students would be enrolled into the district over a number of years. No such phase-in aspect is included in this petition nor was any requested. Thus, this option is not available. If the petition were approved, all of the petition area students would be assigned to La Canada USD schools and could be expected to enroll. This would trigger increased costs to the state in the form of necessary facilities funding for La Canada USD. Whether this required portable facilities, the building of new facilities, or the remodeling of existing facilities, state funding (along with likely increase in bonded indebtedness) would be required and budgetary increases would be needed.

FINDINGS

While the potential loss of enrollment-based funding to the Glendale USD may not seem significant given the number of students in the petition area and the district’s overall enrollment, the district stated in detail (and provided evidence for) that it would present a hardship for them over time. In addition, the La Canada USD cannot currently house all of the students in the petition area, should they enroll following an approval of this petition. New facilities would have to be imported, constructed or remodeled, increasing costs to the state. At a minimum, existing permit holders in La Canada USD (beyond those from the petition area who currently hold permits) would have to be rescinded to accommodate some of the new students should the transfer be approved.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Should this proposal be approved, additional facilities would be required by the La Canada USD causing significant additional cost to the state. Funding based on enrollment would be lost to the Glendale USD and they would need to seek additional funding to cover shortfalls. Therefore, it is recommended that the County Committee deem this condition to be not substantially met.
CONDITION 6

The proposed reorganization will continue to promote sound education performance and will not significantly disrupt the educational programs in the districts affected by the proposed reorganization.

Condition 6 considers the effect of the proposed transfer of territory on educational programs of the districts affected by the reorganization.

FINDINGS

There was much testimony about the impact on educational programs if the transfer petition is approved. Most of these issues centered on class size and the potential impact on the Mountain Avenue School. The Glendale USD stated emphatically that educational quality is robust throughout the district, and those statements were supported by acclaim awarded to the district and its schools, and on its certification historically as making adequate academic progress. The same assessment can be made about the La Canada USD. Staff did not find any legitimate assessment that spoke to academic insufficiency in any of the schools in Glendale USD nor in La Canada USD.

The Mountain Avenue school is a very high performing school that fields many outstanding programs. Located in the petition area, many of the supporters of the petition currently send their children there. While some supporters criticized this school based on class size and other classroom arrangements, an additional number expressed to staff that they wanted their children, post-transfer, to remain at Mountain Avenue (meaning they supported the transfer of their homes into La Canada USD but wanted their children to remain at Mountain Avenue, in Glendale USD, at least up until high school). Like much of the anecdotal information presented in this petition review process, deep veracity cannot be attributed to all of it. Support for this petition seems to be a multi-faceted perception to residents. What is more clear is that the educational programs on offer from the Glendale USD, at all of its schools, are within or exceed state requirements and guidelines and many have achieved significant acclaim. Stating that the programs offered by the Glendale USD are inadequate are not supported.

Glendale USD assured staff and the public that educational programs at the Mountain Avenue School were excellent and would continue to be so, and that petition area students zoned to attend that school would continue to have access to them. Given La Canada’s substantial space shortage (based on its stated inability to accommodate all of the petition area students should the transfer be approved), those limitations may impact its educational programs. Because that is presumptive, it is assumed that, following a transfer, each district would continue to provide an educational program appropriate for the students they serve.

The Glendale USD has indicated that the schools which serve the petition area have been recognized as providing educational programs that meet the highest standards. The La Canada USD has indicated the same.
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

As this petition would not require that either district modify or discontinue any portion of its current curriculum, it is concluded that the educational programs of the districts would not be disrupted and that the districts would continue to promote sound educational performance. Therefore, it is recommended that the County Committee deem this condition to be substantially met.

CONDITION 7

Any increase in school facilities costs as a result of the proposed reorganization will be insignificant and otherwise incidental to the reorganization.

FINDINGS

As stated above, the La Canada USD informed the County Committee during the two public hearings held in connection with this petition that it could not currently house all of the petition area students, should the petition be approved. The district stated that it was supportive of the petition and requested that the transfer be accomplished over a phase-in period. That phase-in aspect is not a part of this petition. Thus, based on the La Canada USD’s stated inability to house additional students at this time, there would be increased facilities costs associated with this proposal. Whether the district utilizes portable facilities, builds new facilities or remodels existing facilities, it will need additional funding from the state (and presumably would seem additional bond funds).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Because of the inability of the La Canada USD to accommodate all of the petition area students following approval of this petition, there would necessarily be increased facilities-related costs to the state. Therefore, it is recommended that the County Committee deem this condition to be not substantially met.

CONDITION 8

The proposed reorganization is primarily designed for purposes other than to significantly increase property values.

By policy, to evaluate this condition, the County Committee should analyze the rationale presented in the petition for transfer. In addition, if the proposed reorganization creates a significant change in local property values, the County Committee should consider whether increasing property values is the primary reason for the petition.
FINDINGS

The complete rationale for the petition to transfer territory, as stated by the chief petitioners, is included in the petition (Attachment A). Nothing in the petition language indicated a motive to increase real estate values. While staff cannot determine with certainty what the petitioners’ motives are for the petition beyond their stated intent, it is important that the County Committee be apprised of several facts that may contribute to its deliberations.

One of the original chief petitioners, Mr. Tom Smith, resigned his position because he no longer lives in the district, having sold his home over the past summer. Staff can only conclude that, during at least some portion of the process of proposing the petition, gathering signatures for it and working with fellow chief petitioners, Mr. Smith’s home was listed for sale. Staff was able to locate a real estate listing that touted the potential increase in home values in the transfer area following presumed approval of the petition, as well as others lauding the La Canada USD schools’ worth beyond those of the Glendale USD (meaning that purchasing real estate that would soon be part of La Canada USD would provide access to better schools). While staff, and the Glendale USD, disagree with this assessment and assert the educational adequacy and high achievement of the Glendale USD, presumptions of school quality are often associated with increased real estate value. Finally, staff located a recent article in the Wall Street Journal attesting to the lengths that parents would go to relocate their families into La Canada USD boundaries in order for their children to have access to those schools they perceive as better than others (Attachment E).

Certainly, these instances of advertising hyperbole and parents who are not part of the petition expressing their perceptions of the quality of the school districts cannot be mistaken for incontrovertible evidence of a real estate-based motive for the petition. However, they contribute to a conclusion that real estate is more valuable in general within La Canada USD than in Glendale USD (based on values gleaned from real estate listings). If that has motivated the petitioners, others who signed the petition and their supporters, it is impossible to determine with certainty. The chief petitioners stated that community identity with the La Canada USD and concerns about safety and the educational sufficiency of the programs of the Glendale USD, including class size, as motives for the petition.

Property Value Analysis

Tables 4 and 5 below contain comparisons of properties currently for sale within the petition area (and both City of La Canada and Glendale USD) and others in the City of La Canada but located in the La Canada USD, near the petition area, gathered from the Multiple Listing Service via the Realtor.com website. Examining only a subset of listings, these tables compare single family homes and land for sale. The sample size is small because there are few sales to compare in this area of established neighborhoods with low turnover, especially in the petition area and the City of La Canada. Real estate listing searches were conducted utilizing petition area and the City of La Canada as limiting factors.
At the time that data was gathered for this study (January-February 2017), there were only 6 properties for sale in the petition area, located in both the Glendale USD and the City of La Canada. Those properties are listed below, with their descriptive characteristics and listing price. While it is not possible to reconcile buyers’ and sellers’ perception of value based on location, esteem of neighborhood, esteem of school district, closeness to freeways and other major landmarks, inclusion of hillside areas that make parcels seem large but are not usable/buildable, and other factors, staff presents the listings below as representative in that they are in the petition area and are the only properties for sale at the time the analysis was conducted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>List Price</th>
<th>Bedrooms</th>
<th>Baths</th>
<th>Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Lot Size</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2237 San Gorgonio Road</td>
<td>$1,275,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>.31 acre</td>
<td>Glendale USD</td>
<td>La Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5413 Rock Castle Dr.</td>
<td>$1,060,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2537</td>
<td>9583</td>
<td>Glendale USD</td>
<td>La Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4617 ½ Rockland Pl. (land)</td>
<td>$788,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18,043</td>
<td>Glendale USD</td>
<td>La Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4547 Rockland Pl.</td>
<td>$819,700</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td>6467</td>
<td>Glendale USD</td>
<td>La Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4600 Ocean View Blvd.</td>
<td>$1,388,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>.64 acre</td>
<td>Glendale USD</td>
<td>La Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2119 Lyons Dr.</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2234</td>
<td>.35 acre</td>
<td>Glendale USD</td>
<td>La Canada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the time that data was gathered for this study (January-February 2017), there were 54 properties for sale in the City of La Canada that were not in the petition area, and thus they are located in the La Canada USD. The representative properties listed below, with their descriptive characteristics and listing price, are intended to compare to the six properties currently for sale in the petition area. While it is not possible to reconcile buyers’ and sellers’ perception of value based on location, esteem of neighborhood, esteem of school district, closeness to freeways and other major landmarks, inclusion of hillside areas that make parcels seem large but are not usable/buildable, and other factors, staff presents the listings below as representative in that they are as near to the petition area as possible in the City of La Canada and they are as close in size/value as was available at the time the analysis was conducted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>List Price</th>
<th>Bedrooms</th>
<th>Baths</th>
<th>Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Lot Size</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4643 Hillard Ave.</td>
<td>$1,650,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>.39 acre</td>
<td>La Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4449 La Granada Way</td>
<td>$959,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1512</td>
<td>6033</td>
<td>La Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1035 Fairview Dr. (land)</td>
<td>$1,450,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.6 acre</td>
<td>La Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4352 Vista Pl.</td>
<td>$945,700</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1433</td>
<td>6988</td>
<td>La Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Hildale Dr.</td>
<td>$1,349,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3436</td>
<td>7764</td>
<td>La Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4214 La Tour Way</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2060</td>
<td>6668</td>
<td>La Canada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

EC §35753(a)(8) does not state that transfers should be denied if property value increases are projected. This section states that a proposal may be approved if “... the proposed reorganization is primarily designed for purposes other than to significantly increase property values ...” [emphasis added.]

It can be reasonably projected that the chief petitioners and all residents of the petition area could benefit from an increase in housing values should the petition be approved (and their homes be zoned within the La Canada USD), but there is no evidence that a significant increase in property values represents the primary motive for the petition. Therefore, it is recommended that the County Committee deem this condition to be substantially met.

**CONDITION 9**

The proposed reorganization will continue to promote sound fiscal management and not cause a substantial negative effect on the fiscal status of the proposed district or any existing district affected by the proposed reorganization.

By policy, the County Committee should consider financial trends of the affected districts and revenue gains and/or losses that may result from the proposed reorganization. This information will be used to evaluate the proposal’s effect on the viability of the reorganized districts to operate educational programs and to assess any negative impact to the fiscal management or status of the reorganized district(s).
FINDINGS

Based on the number of potential students in the transfer area, the Glendale USD has stated that it would lose enrollment-based funds, assessed valuation for bonding capacity, and current property owners would have to pay additional bond funds due to the shrinkage of their pool of rate payers should the transfer be approved. These impacts would be permanent and Glendale USD and its residents would feel them going forward, not just for one year. The La Canada USD has stated that it does not have capacity to house all of the students residing in the transfer area and, should they need to enroll immediately following approval of this petition; housing them would come with additional costs to the district and the state, and to the residents in the form of additional bonded indebtedness for facilities (if sought).

It should be noted that the two impacted school districts spent considerable time and resources attempting to negotiate a transfer agreement that would eliminate any financial penalty to each entity. Over the course of approximately three years, including the commission of an independent financial analysis by Capitol Advisors (Attachment D), they concluded that there was not a pathway to support a transfer that would not negatively impact one or both districts. During their negotiations, the districts considered mechanisms to convey real property to Glendale USD to compensate it for its potential financial losses and costs. They also considered proposing changes to state legislation and discussed options similar to those employed in the creation of the Wiseburn USD, such as departing properties continuing to be held liable for bond funding obligations of their former district, and other solutions. In the end, these advisors could not recommend a pathway that would not negatively impact either district. If they had, the districts themselves would have presented a joint petition asking for the transfer. Their goal in studying, negotiating and commissioning independent analysis was to formulate such a joint petition. They could not solve those issues and thus did not petition. The advent of the petitioners gathering signatures has not changed any of the fiscal issues that the two districts, over many years of earnest effort, were not able to solve.

Though an agreement with Glendale USD could not be reached, the La Canada USD still supported the transfer once submitted by the petitioners, asking for an unavailable accommodation that would allow students to transfer in during a phased-in period over a number of years. This is tantamount to not being able to support the petition since they could not support it on its face.

These significant fiscal impacts, determined by highly competent educational entities that are entitled to make such assessments about their own fiscal health and projections, and the well-respected financial advisors they hired to examine them in greater detail, indicate that this petition would injure both districts if it is approved. Further, the ability of each district to maintain a statutory reserve for economic uncertainties could also be affected should the proposal be approved.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

It is concluded that this transfer would negatively affect the fiscal management or status of both of the affected districts. Therefore, it is recommended that the County Committee deem this condition to be not substantially met.
IX. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

After examining an extensive amount of data related to this reorganization petition, both provided by or gathered by the relevant parties and from local or state sources and public events, staff finds that four of the nine conditions have been substantially met (Conditions 1, 4, 6 and 8). Staff finds that five conditions (Conditions 2, 3, 5, 7 and 9) have not been substantially met.

Under the EC, the number of conditions met does not determine what recommendation or decision staff or the County Committee will make. The County Committee may find all, a majority or some of the conditions met and still vote to deny the petition. Similarly, the County Committee may find that none, few or some of the conditions are met, yet still has authority to vote to approve the petition. The County Committee’s authority lies in its assessment of what is best for this specific situation and petition.

In light of the significant authority vested in the County Committee by the EC, staff has examined the implications of both approval and denial of the current petition. The implications relate to the elements of the chief petitioners’ original petition, which were based on asserting a strong community identity with the La Canada USD and a critique of the educational programs of the Glendale USD and safety issues. Subsequently, the Glendale USD asserted potential negative fiscal impacts and described the sufficiency and even the esteem of its educational programs. Likewise, La Canada USD, while supporting the petition, described negative fiscal impacts should it be approved.

Staff is informed and believes that resident students in the petition area have access to enrollment in La Canada USD schools via permit should there be space available. Though that may be insufficient to some parents and homeowners, they are bound to attend the schools within the district where their property is located and any permit granting is within the sole discretion of the receiving district (and within the joint discretion of the home district to grant releases). Those are the terms for all Los Angeles County students and homeowners/residents. There is no unequal or more harsh treatment being meted out onto residents of the petition area; they merely prefer to attend a different district than the one in which they reside. Many residents of the County likely identify with or wish for inclusion in districts they perceive as better for their children. However, school boundaries are necessarily permanent and intended both to define overlapping and distinct communities and impart to districts the ability to manage their fiscal and enrollment affairs with as much certainty as possible, but also to honor the civic decisions made by authorities who mapped out and populated our County long before it was nearly fully built out, as it is today.

Staff’s understanding of petition area residents’ perceptions of their community is not bounded by any definitive information, nor is that of the petitioners. These perceptions are subjective and petitioners are entitled to hold them. What they are not entitled to is to make demands for transfer of their homes and school district because they would like something different, something they perceive as better. Boundaries are clearly illuminated at the time of home purchase and they currently reside in a highly lauded district with a long record of student achievement. That it does not meet their preference is a typical situation that is remedied by moving into the preferred district. Making pleas for relief and casting aspersions on a high performing district, and potentially visiting fiscal damage to one or both districts, is not the remedy here.
Staff recommends that the petition be denied. There is no need to change the permanent boundaries of two school districts to accommodate the preferences of residents of the petition area, especially since both districts could not agree on a damage-free pathway to do so. In addition, given the lack of certainly about the potential fiscal impact on the bonded indebtedness of the districts, the availability of enrollment-based funds, and potential facilities costs should the petition be approved and the petition area be relocated to the La Canada USD, there is too much risk for no reasonable rationale.

Environmental Review. If the County Committee moves to approve the petition, staff recommends that such approval be categorized as a preliminary approval only. Staff has already begun examining documents related to the required environmental review. After any such preliminary approval, staff recommends that the County Committee, under EC §35706(b), commence its required environmental review required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The review of environmental factors suspends the statutory timeline for completion of the County Committee’s review of the petition, under EC §35710. After conclusion of any required CEQA review, staff recommends that the County Committee reconvene and vote on the petition, either to approve or deny it.

After discussion on the petition, the County Committee will vote on each of the nine conditions.
ATTACHMENTS

(Please note that attachments to this feasibility study were examined in addition to more than 3000 pages of other materials submitted to the County Committee by the Glendale USD, the La Canada USD, the chief petitioners and members of the public and other stakeholders. All of those materials were distributed to the County Committee for their review prior to their receipt of this study.)
ATTACHMENT ‘A’
PETITION FOR TRANSFER OF TERRITORY FROM THE
GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (USD)
TO THE LA CANADA USD
EDUCATION CODE §35700 et seq

"This petition is for the purpose of transferring certain territory from Glendale Unified School District (GUSD) to La Cañada Unified School District (LCUSD). The proposal would transfer the area (the "Territory") more specifically defined in the attached maps.

Note that as referred to in this petition, the Territory proposed to be transferred specifically excludes the GUSD-owned lot used for accessing Mountain Avenue Elementary school. Reference Assessor Parcel 5870-013-901, or situs address 4921 Ocean View Blvd., La Cañada Flintridge, California 91011.

SEE ATTACHED MAP

This petition seeks to unite and strengthen a fractured community by granting all La Cañada Flintridge (LCF) residents the same opportunity to attend their hometown public schools and to benefit from the same social and educational resources currently enjoyed by the other 90% of LCF families. This transfer would resolve definitively and equitably a deeply emotionally-charged conflict that has festered for more than 50 years as evidenced by multiple petitions, legislative proposals and lawsuits that have pitted neighbor against neighbor with negative consequences to students and their families. Furthermore, GUSD could avoid significant financial expenditures and staff time from continuous negotiations and litigation. The following are the reasons for petitioning for this change and the undersigned demonstrate their support for the proposed transfer by affixing their signature to this Petition:

1. To nurture and promote student achievement. LCUSD has intentionally forged deep partnerships with the City of LCF, the local business community, its school families, and non-school families including seniors. The result of this long-term community outreach is a deeply vested civic interest in its children focused on student achievement. This "community of trust" has created a sense of family, inspired an immense amount of pride in its expansive civic and educational experience and engendered a passionate following in ways most communities rarely see.

Sociologists refer to this phenomenon as "community and social capital", which has been shown by researchers to produce positive results for student achievement and helps children to excel in school.

This environment and culture in which the "village", as well as the family, takes ownership of its children has resulted in unique dedicated resources, educational programs, partnerships, internships, and scholarships, which unfortunately are not currently available to all LCF residents. Also, compared to GUSD, LCUSD offers students:
   a. Smaller middle and senior high school campuses;
   b. Lower class sizes;
   c. No split classes; and
   d. Significantly more counselors per student.

2. To eliminate educational disparity and inequality. Territory residents, a 10% minority of LCF families, are consigned to a neighboring school district due to an 1880s survey that ignored prominent well-defined natural land features. This arbitrary invisible boundary had little relevance until the mid-1950s when ample water supply was attained and housing development followed. Since the formation of LCUSD in 1961, Territory residents have fought for equal rights, duties and privileges enjoyed by the 90% majority of La Cañadans.
3. To upgrade school and public safety. Local law enforcement, emergency and operational planning would be simplified, unified, streamlined and better coordinated between the City of LCF and LCUSD by removing a layer of bureaucracy. This is especially true since the Territory is located fully within the boundaries of the City of LCF and within the administrative “sphere of influence” [as determined by the Local Agency Formation Commission for the County of Los Angeles] of the City of LCF.

4. To strengthen local control, civic participation and self-governance. Territory residents would join the 90% of our fellow LCF residents as fully participating members of our hometown LCUSD schools including all related opportunities and privileges that are currently denied. Most notable of these is the ability to fully and directly participate in the governance of LCUSD schools, which is so integral to the greater LCF community.

5. To improve local government responsiveness, efficiency and transparency. Uniting all LCF residents with our hometown school district would enhance communication, coordination and procedures between the City of LCF and LCUSD, thereby increasing public involvement and active participation in local government decision-making for all LCF residents.

6. To respect and honor the voice of LCF residents. LCF residents have demonstrated overwhelming support to unify the city with its local school district for decades:
   a. In May 2014, 90% of Territory respondents to a GUSD-sponsored survey said they definitely (85%) or probably (5%) supported the transfer proposal being discussed by the two school districts;
   b. In the same survey, Territory residents supported a territory transfer over open enrollment by a margin of five to one, confirming their feelings of being marginalized and disenfranchised by GUSD;
   c. In April 1997, 84% of Territory respondents to a survey commissioned by the City of LCF supported making the Territory part of LCUSD;
   d. In November 2013, the City Council of LCF unanimously approved a resolution “to petition...that the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization commence the process” to transfer the Territory into LCUSD jurisdictional boundaries; and
   e. In January 2014, LCUSD unanimously reaffirmed its support of the Territory transfer following the election of three new board members.”

Prepared: 12/21/15
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TO THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA:
In accordance with §35700(a) of the Education Code (EC), State of California, we, the undersigned, who are twenty-five percent of the qualified registered voters residing in the proposed transfer area, do hereby present a proposal to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization, Los Angeles County, State of California, to transfer certain territory from the Glendale USD to the La Canada USD. This proposal may be presented to the electors of the district at the next succeeding election, before which the County Committee shall conduct one or more public hearings on the proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (AS REGISTERED)</th>
<th>RESIDENCE ADDRESS, CITY, ZIP</th>
<th>FOR COUNTY USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. PRINT NAME BELOW</td>
<td>STREET ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN NAME BELOW</td>
<td>DATE BELOW</td>
<td>CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATEZIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PRINT NAME BELOW</td>
<td>STREET ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN NAME BELOW</td>
<td>DATE BELOW</td>
<td>CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATEZIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PRINT NAME BELOW</td>
<td>STREET ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN NAME BELOW</td>
<td>DATE BELOW</td>
<td>CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATEZIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PRINT NAME BELOW</td>
<td>STREET ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN NAME BELOW</td>
<td>DATE BELOW</td>
<td>CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATEZIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PRINT NAME BELOW</td>
<td>STREET ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN NAME BELOW</td>
<td>DATE BELOW</td>
<td>CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATEZIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PRINT NAME BELOW</td>
<td>STREET ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN NAME BELOW</td>
<td>DATE BELOW</td>
<td>CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATEZIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA:
In accordance with §35700(a) of the Education Code (EC), State of California, we, the undersigned, who are twenty-five percent of the qualified registered voters residing in the proposed transfer area, do hereby present a proposal to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization, Los Angeles County, State of California, to transfer certain territory from the Glendale USD to the La Canada USD. This proposal may be presented to the electors of the district at the next succeeding election, before which the County Committee shall conduct one or more public hearings on the proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (AS REGISTERED)</th>
<th>RESIDENCE ADDRESS, CITY, ZIP</th>
<th>PRECINCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. PRINT NAME BELOW</td>
<td>STREET ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN NAME BELOW</td>
<td>DATE BELOW CITY</td>
<td>STATEZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. PRINT NAME BELOW</td>
<td>STREET ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN NAME BELOW</td>
<td>DATE BELOW CITY</td>
<td>STATEZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. PRINT NAME BELOW</td>
<td>STREET ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN NAME BELOW</td>
<td>DATE BELOW CITY</td>
<td>STATEZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. PRINT NAME BELOW</td>
<td>STREET ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN NAME BELOW</td>
<td>DATE BELOW CITY</td>
<td>STATEZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. PRINT NAME BELOW</td>
<td>STREET ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN NAME BELOW</td>
<td>DATE BELOW CITY</td>
<td>STATEZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. PRINT NAME BELOW</td>
<td>STREET ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN NAME BELOW</td>
<td>DATE BELOW CITY</td>
<td>STATEZIP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOR COUNTY USE
TO THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA:
In accordance with §35700(a) of the Education Code (EC), State of California, we, the undersigned, who are twenty-five percent of the qualified registered voters residing in the proposed transfer area, do hereby present a proposal to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization, Los Angeles County, State of California, to transfer certain territory from the Glendale USD to the La Canada USD. This proposal may be presented to the electors of the district at the next succeeding election, before which the County Committee shall conduct one or more public hearings on the proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (AS REGISTERED)</th>
<th>RESIDENCE ADDRESS, CITY, ZIP</th>
<th>PRECINCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. PRINT NAME BELOW</td>
<td>STREET ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN NAME BELOW</td>
<td>DATE BELOW CITY</td>
<td>STATEZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. PRINT NAME BELOW</td>
<td>STREET ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN NAME BELOW</td>
<td>DATE BELOW CITY</td>
<td>STATEZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. PRINT NAME BELOW</td>
<td>STREET ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN NAME BELOW</td>
<td>DATE BELOW CITY</td>
<td>STATEZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. PRINT NAME BELOW</td>
<td>STREET ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN NAME BELOW</td>
<td>DATE BELOW CITY</td>
<td>STATEZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. PRINT NAME BELOW</td>
<td>STREET ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN NAME BELOW</td>
<td>DATE BELOW CITY</td>
<td>STATEZIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. PRINT NAME BELOW</td>
<td>STREET ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN NAME BELOW</td>
<td>DATE BELOW CITY</td>
<td>STATEZIP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepared: 12/21/15
TO THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA:

In accordance with §35700(a) of the Education Code (EC), State of California, we, the undersigned, who are twenty-five percent of the qualified registered voters residing in the proposed transfer area, do hereby present a proposal to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization, Los Angeles County, State of California, to transfer certain territory from the Glendale USD to the La Canada USD. This proposal may be presented to the electors of the district at the next succeeding election, before which the County Committee shall conduct one or more public hearings on the proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (AS REGISTERED)</th>
<th>RESIDENCE ADDRESS, CITY, ZIP</th>
<th>PRECINCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. PRINT NAME BELOW</td>
<td>STREET ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN NAME BELOW</td>
<td>DATE BELOW CITY, STATE ZIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. PRINT NAME BELOW</td>
<td>STREET ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN NAME BELOW</td>
<td>DATE BELOW CITY, STATE ZIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. PRINT NAME BELOW</td>
<td>STREET ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN NAME BELOW</td>
<td>DATE BELOW CITY, STATE ZIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. PRINT NAME BELOW</td>
<td>STREET ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN NAME BELOW</td>
<td>DATE BELOW CITY, STATE ZIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. PRINT NAME BELOW</td>
<td>STREET ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN NAME BELOW</td>
<td>DATE BELOW CITY, STATE ZIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. PRINT NAME BELOW</td>
<td>STREET ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN NAME BELOW</td>
<td>DATE BELOW CITY, STATE ZIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepared: 12/21/15
The undersigned proponent(s) of this petition are registered voter(s) in said district.

1. **Thomas G. Smith**  
   Printed Name  
   5524 Ocean View Blvd.  
   Residence Address  
   La Canada Flintridge, California 91011  
   City or Town and Zip Code  
   Signature and Date

2. **Nalini Lasiewicz**  
   Printed Name  
   4634 Leir Dr.  
   Residence Address  
   La Canada Flintridge, California 91011  
   City or Town and Zip Code  
   (818) 249-9691  
   Phone Number

3. **Nick P. Karapetian**  
   Printed Name  
   2229 Canaleta Dr.  
   Residence Address  
   La Canada Flintridge, California 91011  
   City or Town and Zip Code  
   (310) 266-7088  
   Phone Number

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.
ATTACHMENT ‘B’
RESOLUTION NO. 15
OPPOSING THE PROPOSED TRANSFER OF TERRITORY TO THE
LA CAÑADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

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

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

WHEREAS, approximately 356 students now attending Glendale public schools reside in the affected area, including 159 at Mountain Avenue Elementary, 41 at Rosemont Middle School, and 114 at Crescenta Valley High School, and 7 at other campuses in the school district; and

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

WHEREAS, if approved, the transfer would create a number of negative impacts for the District including: (1) A potential reduction of up to 28% of the student population at Mountain Avenue Elementary School; (2) Disruption of students attending affected schools resulting from redrawing attendance boundaries after transfer of the Sagebrush area to replace lost student enrollment; (3) Operating fiscal impacts; (4) The potential closure of a District school; and (5) Unfair bonded indebtedness increase of $11.6 million to be shouldered by the remaining District residents; and

WHEREAS, petitioners have implied that all current students in the affected area would be guaranteed the option of remaining in the Glendale Schools when, in reality, no such commitment has been made by the District due to the uncertainties involved in the proposal; and

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Education of the Glendale Unified School District goes on public record as opposing the proposed transfer of territory to the La Cañada Unified School District, as having significant negative impacts upon the students of the Glendale Unified Schools and the School District; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board is justly proud of the achievements of Mountain Avenue Elementary School, Rosemont Middle School, and Crescenta Valley High School—all recognized as National Blue Ribbon Schools, California Distinguished Schools, and California Gold Ribbon Schools—and believes strongly that the quality of education, student services, and community involvement supporting these three campuses are among the finest quality anywhere in California.

Adopted this 1st day of November 2016 by the Governing Board of the Glendale Unified School District.

Dr. Armina Gharghoyan, President

Nayiri Nahabedian, Vice President

Jennifer Bremon, Member

Gregory S. Kararian, Clerk

Christine Walters, Member
ATTACHMENT ‘C’
RESOLUTION 5-16-17
A RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNING BOARD
OF LA CAÑADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
REGARDING THE COMMUNITY’S REQUEST CALLING FOR THE
"TERRITORY TRANSFER" OF CERTAIN SPECIFIED AREAS OF THE CITY
INTO THE LA CAÑADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT BOUNDARIES

WHEREAS, the La Cañada Unified School District (LCUSD) was incorporated as a K-12 school district in 1961
serving the general public educational needs of the unincorporated communities of La Cañada and Flintridge; and

WHEREAS, the City of La Cañada Flintridge (the City) was incorporated as a general law city on November 30,
1976; and

WHEREAS, the City’s incorporation brought together two unincorporated communities of Los Angeles County, La
Cañada and Flintridge, and united them into one community and municipality; and

WHEREAS, at the time of the City’s incorporation, the jurisdictional boundaries of the City encompassed a small
section of the La Cañada community that was served by the Glendale Unified School District (GUSD), generally,
that area west of Rosебank Drive to the City’s western border at Pickens Canyon (the “Subject Area”), which is the
only area of the City that does not attend LCUSD schools; and

WHEREAS, the Governing Board affirms that its foremost duty and responsibility is to provide the safest and most
effective learning environment possible for the children of LCUSD; and

WHEREAS, the Governing Board recognizes that since the time of the City’s incorporation there has been an
ongoing call to truly unite the City and achieve alignment between the educational jurisdiction and the municipal
jurisdiction of the community so as to strengthen the safety and education of the community’s children; and

WHEREAS, the District was asked by the community to support the “Territory Transfer” of the Subject Area from
GUSD’s jurisdiction in order to bring about improved children’s safety and strengthen the potential for children’s
educational outcomes through simplifying jurisdictional coordination and aligning and reinforcing family and
community interactions with children’s’ education; and

WHEREAS, research supports that community cohesiveness strengthens social capital and has been found to
produce positive results for student achievement and helps children to excel in school;

WHEREAS, strengthening ties between families and within a community, allowing people greater involvement and
engagement with each other in civic activities which are aligned with school activities, have a direct and positive
effect on student academic achievement;

WHEREAS public and school safety will materially improve when LCUSD, City and local law enforcement,
emergency, and operational planning is simplified, unified and streamlined;

WHEREAS, the Governing Board of the La Cañada Unified School District recognizes the magnitude and intensity
of the community’s desire to unite the City and strengthen school safety and school-community alignment, as
evidenced by the number of “Territory Transfer” petitions submitted since the formation of LCUSD in 1961, and
supports the community’s current petition for the reasons stated below;

WHEREAS, the Governing Board will collaborate with the City of La Cañada Flintridge and the Subject Area
citizens to develop a financial mitigation strategy that will relieve the impacts to the LCUSD as a result of the
Territory Transfer related to student housing, facilities, and personnel as required to avoid any material disruptions
to the District.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that, the Governing Board of the La Cañada Unified School District hereby gives
its unanimous support for the community’s petition, to include a feasibility plan which is consistent with the duties
of the District to its students, parents and community members to effectuate the "Territory Transfer" of the Subject Area into the boundaries of the LCUSD in order to:

1. facilitate, enhance, and strengthen the engagement and alignment of the residents' educational activities of the Subject Area with City activities, events, organizations, and civic life;

2. strengthen ties between families and within the community - where all citizens can increase involvement and engagement with each other and in civic activities and have these activities aligned between the community and its schools, thereby creating and strengthening "social capital" which research demonstrates directly and positively supports improved student academic achievement;

3. improve and enhance the cohesiveness between residents and their children residing in the Subject Area with those residing in the greater City community given that the education, vocational and extracurricular opportunities will be identically available to the whole of the City's community;

4. improve self-governance given that the jurisdiction of LCUSD and the City will be better aligned and the school safety and educational needs of the Subject Area can be better identified and addressed;

5. improve school and public safety as LCUSD, City and local law enforcement, emergency, and operational planning will be simplified, unified and streamlined;

6. and allow the City to simplify the equitable expenditure of resources throughout the community, particularly with respect to matters supporting public education, as Subject Area residents and their children, along with the broader City community will share identically and equally as beneficiaries of City resources and expenditures.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, we, the Governing Board of the La Cañada Unified School District, do hereby adopt this resolution, this 24th day of October, 2016.

Governing Board Members

David Sagin, President

Dan Jeffries, Vice President

Kaitzer Diasia, Clerk

Ellen Multari, Member

Brent Kuszyk, Member
ATTACHMENT ‘D’
The following Summary of Mitigation Options is intended to serve solely as a review and preliminary analysis of the potential options available to the La Cañada Unified School District (LCUSD) and Glendale Unified School District (GUSD) for consideration in potential negotiations to arrive at a mutually agreeable mitigation agreement in connection with the proposed transfer of territory from GUSD to LCUSD. This summary is not intended to be construed as a feasibility study as related to the proposed territory transfer and does not attempt to serve as a full mitigation agreement in alignment with State criteria of the potential impacts/outcomes of the Territory Transfer. Achieving a full mitigation agreement that comprehensively addresses the State criteria governing school district territory transfers would require additional negotiations between all concerned parties. Sufficiency of any mitigation agreement would also require input from oversight entities such as the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization, Los Angeles County Office of Education and the State.

Development and build-out of the Crescenta Valley over the past decades has resulted in circumstances where the entire territory encompassed by the City of La Cañada Flintridge is within the LCUSD, except for a territory known as “Sagebrush” in the northwest corner of the City. The Sagebrush territory consists of approximately 900 residential parcels, generating approximately 400 K-12 students, currently within the boundaries of GUSD.

Since the 1960’s, several efforts have been undertaken by residents of the Sagebrush territory to facilitate its transfer to LCUSD. In 2013, community members initiated another effort to facilitate the transfer of the Sagebrush territory, and GUSD and LCUSD – in consultation with the City of La Cañada Flintridge – have attempted to arrive at an amicable pathway to achieve the community’s goal prior to the submission of a community initiated petition to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization.

With the prospect of a community initiated petition, both districts have attempted to reach a negotiated agreement which could be mutually supported and would minimize uncertain outcomes potentially resulting from the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization process. Through negotiations which included input from community members and the City of La Cañada Flintridge, an agreement was formulated which contemplated the gradual transition of students in conjunction with certain other mitigation measures. However, due to
limitations on enforcement of a gradual transition and lack of agreement on the financial impacts to both districts, the contemplated agreement was determined not to be viable.

Currently, GUSD has identified 364 total students within the Sagebrush territory of which approximately 278 remain enrolled in GUSD schools. Per GUSD information for students within the Sagebrush territory, 58, 19 and 9 were granted transfers in 2015-16, 2014-15 and 2013-14, respectively.

In July of 2015, the parties, continued negotiation efforts and retained Capitol Advisors Group and Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo to facilitate conversations related to exploring all viable options which could be employed to formulate a mutually agreeable transfer of the Sagebrush territory. On August 25, 2015, three separate one-on-one meetings were held with LCUSD, the City of La Cañada Flintridge and members of the Sagebrush community to obtain background information on prior efforts and resources which might be part of a mitigation agreement. A similar one-on-one meeting was held with GUSD on September 9, 2015.

Based upon feedback from prior meetings and subsequent phone conversations with each of the parties, a list of potential mitigation options was established based upon the understanding obtained from all parties. While many of the concepts detailed herein have been previously explored with some rejected and others deemed not viable at the time, our review of prior efforts indicated that there were four fundamental issues which the districts have sought to resolve to achieve a mutually supported agreement. Specifically:

1) Equity in debt repayment for existing General Obligation (GO) bonds
The proposed Sagebrush territory transfer will likely reduce the taxable value of GUSD and remove the territory from tax levies that support GUSD GO bonds. Correspondingly, LCUSD would experience an equivalent growth in taxable value for its GO Bonds. As a result, the transfer would likely increase tax rates for GUSD residents outside of the Sagebrush territory and decrease those for LCUSD residents. The desire is to mitigate tax increases for the remaining GUSD residents.

2) Provision of adequate student housing and mitigation of excess capacity
The proposed Sagebrush territory transfer may result in the existing GUSD Mountain Avenue Elementary (K-8) campus having excess capacity, and the current configuration of LCUSD campuses not having sufficient capacity to immediately accommodate all proposed Sagebrush territory students. The desire is to identify a way to mitigate this loss of efficiencies at the GUSD Mountain Avenue Elementary School campus and reconfigure attendance patterns to replace lost enrollment, while also providing LCUSD sufficient resources to meet the resulting enrollment growth.

3) Distribution of property and maintenance of traditional access pathways
The proposed Sagebrush territory transfer will likely surround a GUSD-owned parcel (the "Pickens Canyon" lot) that currently serves as a second access point and emergency egress for the Mountain Avenue Elementary campus. In previous proposals, sale of the parcel was contemplated as a mitigation measure to offset a portion of the fiscal impacts on GUSD. However, the desire is to also ensure that the existing alternate
access and emergency egress be maintained for the Mountain Avenue Elementary campus.

4) Mitigation of pupil funding impacts

The proposed Sagebrush territory transfer will likely result in a significant number of students leaving the GUSD Mountain Avenue Elementary campus and subsequently attending the LCUSD Palm Crest Elementary campus, less than one-half mile to the east. The result would be a loss of per pupil funding for GUSD with an equivalent gain in funding for LCUSD. While this transfer does place the burden of providing services to these students on LCUSD, it also reduces operational efficiencies for the GUSD. It is desired that fiscal impacts due to the loss of enrollment from GUSD be mitigated, while maintaining sufficient funding for LCUSD to provide services of comparable quality for the Sagebrush territory students.

Just as it is true that each of these four fundamental issues are interrelated, so too are many of the potential mitigation options. While some options may provide partial or full mitigation of certain impacts, there does not appear to be a stand-alone option which will provide full mitigation. Additionally, while in certain cases circumstances may not permit the use of all options, the combination of several to formulate a negotiated agreement was explored. However, after subsequent conversations with LCUSD and GUSD, it appears that a combination of options that would provide sufficient resources to permit full mitigation for all claims of a potential territory transfer could not be attained. As such, a mutually agreeable territory transfer cannot be reached without some accommodation or identifying additional resources, the significance of which cannot be agreed to by the parties.

The following potential mitigation options were explored in efforts to formulate a mitigation agreement that may have resulted in an acceptable outcome for all parties:

- Utilization of Ed. Code 35575 to cease taxation of the Sagebrush transfer territory for GUSD GO Bonds and commence taxation for LCUSD GO bonds
- Utilization of Ed. Code 35576 to cease taxation of the Sagebrush transfer territory for GUSD GO Bonds and commence taxation for LCUSD GO bonds, as well as affect the transfer of the GUSD-owned parcel within the Sagebrush transfer territory and taxation for a proportionate share of GUSD debt based upon the taxable value of the transfer territory
- Utilization of Ed. Code 35738 to derive an alternative allocation of bonded indebtedness
- Formation of a Financing Authority or other "JPA" through the joint powers of the districts to facilitate financing of debt impact mitigation options
- Formation of a School Facilities Improvement District (SFID) encompassing the Sagebrush territory to facilitate a separate and unique facilities funding source
- Pursuit of a Sagebrush territory specific parcel tax to provide a unique funding source
- Allocation of bonding capacity based upon taxable value as stipulated in existing Education Code provisions
- Allocation of bonding capacity on an alternative basis through special legislation
- Prepayment of projected waiver costs
- Acquisition/Construction of additional LCUSD facilities to accommodate additional enrollment
- Reconfiguration of LCUSD grade levels to accommodate additional enrollment
- Gradual transition of Sagebrush territory students from GUSD to LCUSD over a period of several years
- Temporary shared GUSD – LCUSD use of facilities through a lease arrangement
- Establishment of a revenue sharing agreement between GUSD and LCUSD to mitigate the impacts of enrollment shifts
- Establishment of Sagebrush student tracking mechanisms to provide a basis for revenue sharing agreements
- Examination of limitation of inter-district transfers to the extent permissible for a period of time to reduce the transfer’s impacts on enrollments
- Division of “Pickens Canyon” lot, with a portion retained by GUSD for access
- Sale of a portion of the “Pickens Canyon” lot to facilitate mitigation funding
- Establishment of an easement on the “Pickens Canyon” lot to provide access
- Lease of the “Pickens Canyon” lot to provide funding to mitigate the transfer’s impacts

Based upon our conversations with LCUSD, GUSD, the City of La Cañada Flintridge and community members interested in seeking a petition to transfer the Sagebrush territory, we believe the above list to be inclusive of options previously explored as well as additional options. On December 1, 2015, representatives of LCUSD and GUSD met to review all options and explore potential combinations of options which might achieve full—mitigation sufficient remuneration of potential monetary impacts and form the basis of a mutually agreeable mitigation agreement.

In summary, it appears that currently no individual or combination of mitigation options explored in our review results in a comprehensive mitigation of the potential impacts resulting from the proposed Sagebrush territory transfer for both LCUSD and GUSD.
APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF MITIGATION OPTIONS

The attached grid provides additional details on each of these mitigation options explored. If significant additional resources can be identified to aid in mitigating impacts, it may be viable to achieve a mutually satisfactory mitigation agreement which includes a combination of the options explored in the attached.
**APPENDIX A**

**SAGEBRUSH TERRITORY TRANSFER MITIGATION OPTION SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attition Option</th>
<th>Debt</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Previously Proposed</th>
<th>Viability</th>
<th>Potential Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jilification of Ed. Code 35175 to cease taxation of the sagebrush transfer territory for GUSD GO Bonds and commence taxation for LUSD GO bonds</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Likely viable if Pickens Canyon lot is excluded from territory to be transferred or sold</td>
<td>Would leave GUSD residents liable for additional taxes due to loss of Sagebrush territory value could result in need for additional measures to ensure access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jilification of Ed. Code 35276 to cease taxation of the sagebrush transfer territory for GUSD GO Bonds and commence taxation for LUSD GO bonds, as well as effect the transfer of the GUSD-owned parcel within the sagebrush transfer territory and taxation for a proportionate share of GUSD debt based upon the taxable value of the transfer territory</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Likely viable if Pickens Canyon lot is included in territory to be transferred AND NOT sold by GUSD</td>
<td>Would require Sagebrush territory to pay for bonds of both LUSD and GUSD, resulting in higher taxation within the transfer territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jilification of Ed. Code 31738 to derive an alternative allocation of bonded indebtedness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Likely viable if mutually agreed upon</td>
<td>Despite the flexibility provided by this option, it will be difficult to produce an outcome which does not require an increase in taxes on at least some parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formation of a financing Authority or other &quot;IPA&quot; through the joint powers of the districts to facilitate financing of debt impact mitigation options</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Possibility</td>
<td>Possibility</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Likely viable if mutually agreed upon</td>
<td>Would require analysis of outstanding debt and discussions with bond counsel to determine the extent of allowable allocation and financing options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formation of a School Facilities Improvement District encompassing the Sagebrush territory to facilitate a separate and unique facilities funding source</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Likely viable if approved by Sagebrush residents</td>
<td>Would only facilitate taxation within the Sagebrush territory which has a limited capacity of approximately $4.5 million at a $60 per $100,000 tax rate and requires proceeds to be used for facilities construction/acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursuit of a Sagebrush territory specific parcel tax to provide a unique funding source</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Likely viable if approved by Sagebrush residents</td>
<td>Given the limited number of parcels within the Sagebrush territory, would produce less than $100,000 annually per $100 of parcel tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of bonding capacity based upon taxable value as stipulated in existing Education Code provisions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Likely viable</td>
<td>Would likely result in a $14 million reduction in GUSD statutory bonding capacity with a like increase for LUSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of bonding capacity on an alternative basis through special legislation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Likely viable if mutually agreed upon</td>
<td>Would require state legislative action and may not allow for full statutory capacity for both LUSD and GUSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepayment of projected voter costs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Likely viable if mutually agreed upon</td>
<td>Would provide funding for a future waiver that may not actually be required based upon a review of existing bonding capacities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepared by: Capitol Advisors Group LLC
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## APPENDIX A
### SAGEBRUSH TERRITORY TRANSFER MITIGATION OPTION SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Option</th>
<th>Debt</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Previously Proposed</th>
<th>Viability</th>
<th>Potential Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition/Construction of additional LCUSD facilities to accommodate additional enrollment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Likely visible if a funding source for LCUSD can be identified.</td>
<td>Given the lack of existing GO Bond authorization and uncertainty about the future of the State School Facilities Program, would likely require additional bond authorization through a School Facilities Improvement District or district-wide measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconfiguration of LCUSD grade levels to accommodate additional enrollment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially visible</td>
<td>Would require reconfiguration of existing LCUSD attendance patterns for some or all grades and would likely not provide sufficient housing for all projected Sagbruch territory students without added classroom space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradual transition of Saglebrush territory students from GUSD to LCUSD over a period of several years</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not legally enforceable</td>
<td>Due to the inability to reclassify students within the Saglebrush territory from attending LCUSD after a transfer, a phased approach may not be viable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary shared GUSD – LCUSD use of facilities through a lease arrangement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially visible if mutually agreed upon</td>
<td>Would likely be difficult to reclassify without significant work to reconfigure an existing campus and may result in complexities for staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of &quot;Pickens Canyon&quot; lot, with a portion retained by GUSD for access</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Likely visible if mutually agreed upon</td>
<td>Would likely require a division of the parcel through the County of Los Angeles which may require rezoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of a portion of the &quot;Pickens Canyon&quot; lot to facilitate mitigation funding</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Likely visible if mutually agreed upon</td>
<td>Would likely be viable if a sufficient portion of the parcel is made available for sale and require City participation to provide funding but may not be a significant amount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of an easement on the &quot;Pickens Canyon&quot; lot to provide access</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Likely visible if mutually agreed upon</td>
<td>Would require examination of easement types to determine if a viable mechanism exists to enforce maintenance of access for GUSD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease of the &quot;Pickens Canyon&quot; lot to provide funding to mitigate transfer impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Likely visible if mutually agreed upon</td>
<td>Would likely require City involvement to facilitate funding for ongoing lease payments and require termination of a lease-purchase agreement with LCUSD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of a revenue sharing agreement between GUSD and LCUSD to mitigate the impacts of enrollment shifts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Likely visible if mutually agreed upon</td>
<td>May be cost prohibitive for LCUSD, given the need to provide services for the transfer students which generate a fixed amount of funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ATTACHMENT ‘E’
Homeowners’ Quest for the Best Schools

To get their children into top-performing schools, some parents buy homes in highly rated—and typically expensive—districts. After graduation, ‘there is a mass exodus.’

Katy McLaughlin
The Wall Street Journal

Jan. 26, 2017

Houston lawyer Anne Ferazzi Hammett spent about three months last spring looking for a great high school for her teenage daughters, Anna and Nora. Then she discovered Westlake, a high school that gets top marks in academic rankings and draws strong reviews from parents.

The only drawback: The school is located in Austin, Texas, about 165 miles northwest of the Hammetts’ home. Nonetheless, Ms. Ferazzi Hammett and her husband, Rick Hammett, bought a $2.25 million house in Westlake’s school district, and they and their daughters will move in June.

"We will start a new life in a new place," said Ms. Ferazzi Hammett, 56, who will telecommute. Mr. Hammett, 63, will commute back to Houston for his work as an attorney. It’s all worth it for "a great academic experience for the girls," she said.

For some home buyers, there is no factor more important than the public schools their children will attend. They analyze student-body performance on standardized tests, school rankings, what percentage of alumni go on to four-year colleges and which schools send students to Ivy League or top-tier state universities. They then uproot their lives to move within these districts’ boundaries, where homes can cost hundreds of thousands of dollars more than nearby homes zoned to different schools.

In La Cañada Flintridge, Calif., a city in Los Angeles county, the acclaimed La Cañada Unified School District determines the real-estate market, agents say. "I’m very busy in March, when the private-school rejection letters go out," said Anne Sanborn, a real-estate agent with Sotheby’s International Realty in Pasadena. When parents find out their kids haven’t been accepted at elite private schools, they start house hunting in La Cañada, Ms. Sanborn said.

Ms. Sanborn added that "there is a mass exodus from La Cañada when their kids graduate high school," as families sell their homes and seek neighborhoods closer to downtown Los Angeles or Pasadena.
Online tools that measure student performance have made it easier for home buyers and agents to assess schools across the country.

For example, GreatSchools, an Oakland, Calif., nonprofit, rates schools based primarily on how well students perform on statewide assessments and has provided rankings to real-estate websites Zillow, Trulia, Move and Realtor, said Weezie Hough, director of strategic partnerships.

In an analysis of 1.6 million home listings in the U.S. through the first six months of 2016, Realtor.com found that houses in public-school districts with GreatSchools ratings of 9 or 10, the highest scores possible, were priced, on average, 77% higher than homes in nearby districts with scores of 6 or lower. Additionally, homes located in top districts sell four days faster—at 58 days—than the national median of 62 days, the analysis found. (Melissa Corwin, owner of The Wall Street Journal, also operates realtor.com under license from the National Association of Realtors.)

The real-estate market in Bronxville, N.Y., a village located about 15 miles north of Manhattan, shows how a highly reputed school district affects sales. Homes within the district sell for twice the price per square foot ($654) as those with Bronxville addresses that aren't zoned to Bronxville schools ($330), said Kathleen Collins, an agent with Julia B. Fee Sotheby's International Realty in Bronxville.

Part of the reason buyers swallow the high prices—and high property taxes—is because nearby New York City private schools are even more expensive, Ms. Collins said.

Real-estate agent Denise Stephens and her husband, Tim, a 47-year-old banker, bought a $2 million home in Bronxville in 2015 so their three children could attend school in the village. Property taxes on their home—which are roughly 2% of the assessed home value—amount to $41,000 a year, Ms. Stephens said. But the couple sees the total package as "absolutely a better deal than the private schools," said Ms. Stephens, who is 50 years old. The couple previously lived in Manhattan, where they paid $32,000 a year in private elementary-school tuition and $15,000 for private preschool. Today, the same schools cost even more, Ms. Stephens said.

Finding a house they could afford in Bronxville was a multiyear saga. They moved midyear to Bronxville and found a "pretty dilapidated" townhouse for rent for $5,500 a month on a short-term lease, she said. Ms. Stephens, who also works in home décor, home staging and has an estate-sale company, fixed up the rental with new curtains, paint and carpeting. Four months after they moved in, a real-estate agent told her the owner wanted to sell it. The family moved to another townhouse for $6,000 a month, and a year later to another one for $6,500 a month.

For Ms. Stephens, the many moves and the costs have been worthwhile for the "high-achieving, rigorous" schools where "it's cool to be smart," she said.
After graduation, Ms. Collins, the agent, said homeowners are eager to unburden themselves of the high property tax bill and often move to Mount Vernon, Yonkers, and other nearby cities.

Opting for public schools isn't always a dollars-and-cents decision. Ms. Ferazzi Hammett, the Houston lawyer, said she looked at private schools and decided the family could afford them. But she was turned off by the small size of parochial schools and the "country club, uber rich" atmosphere of elite private schools, she said.

"I'm looking for a broader-based experience for my kids and for them to be exposed to different types of kids, including race and socioeconomic status," she said.

Persuading her daughters to pick up and move to Austin right before high school took some doing. On a lunch break during a day of house hunting, Ms. Ferazzi Hammett's agent, Tracy Picone of Realty Austin, brought along her own 17-year-old daughter,
Lana, to help prepare the girls for what to expect. A Westlake senior, Lana talked about participating in choir at the high school, as well as playing soccer and basketball in middle school, Ms. Picone said.

Last year, Jeff and Denise Springer sold their house in L.A.'s "hipster" neighborhood of Silver Lake for $1 million and bought a larger house in "small-towny, suburban" La Cañada for $1.6 million, Ms. Springer said. Competition for homes within the La Cañada district is so intense, "we saw that house at 10 a.m., offered full price, and were in escrow by 5 p.m.," Ms. Springer said.

Before choosing La Cañada, "I had a spreadsheet of private schools, charter schools and public schools" that could be options for their girls, Daisy, 13, and Josephine, 11. The couple debated the value of staying in the artsy Silver Lake neighborhood they loved and paying $20,000 to $40,000 a year for private school against the merits of uprooting themselves to high-cost La Cañada.

Ultimately, "it dawned on me," said Mr. Springer, a 46-year-old attorney who also plays guitar in a rock band. "When the girls go to college, we cannot sell a private-school education," Mr. Springer said. But someday when they sell the La Cañada house, access to a top-quality education will be part of the deal, he said.
4515 Leata Ln, La Canada Flintridge, CA 91011
2 beds 2 baths 1,477 sqft

SOLD: $707,000
Sold on 09/15/16
Zestimate®: $838,083
I disagree

EST. REFI PAYMENT
$2,764/mo
See current rates

Thinking About Selling?
Find a local agent who can give you a professional estimate of your home value.

Note: This property is not currently for sale or for rent. The description below may be from a previous listing.

This quiet cul-de-sac home has 2 beds and 2 baths. It also has an unpermitted study/office room that can be used as the third bedroom. Priced to sell at its "As Is" condition. Please note that the Glendale Unified School
District (GUSD) and the La Canada Unified School District (LCUSD) have been in close discussions to transfer the Sagebrush homes from GUSD to LCUSD. Buy this Sagebrush home at its current bargain price; you will have much to gain after the school district transfer takes place.

**FACTS**

- Lot: 5,575 sqft
- Single Family
- Built in 1964
- All time views: 13,622
- Cooling: Central
- Heating: Other
- Last sold: Sep 2016 for $707,000
- Last sale price/sqft: $479
- Great solar potential
  - Sun Number™: 82

**FEATURES**

- Fireplace
- Flooring: Hardwood
- Parking: Carport, Garage - Attached, 2 spaces
- Pond

More County websiteSee data sources

**Zestimate Details**

Zestimate

$838,083

- $1,798 Last 30 days
- $729K $922K

Rent Zestimate

$3,500/mo

+$74 Last 30 days
Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals

May 2017

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 17, 2017.

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 2017

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 17, 2017.

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

The Castaic Union SD submitted a preliminary petition on March 10, 2016, to establish trustee areas and trustee area voting. It was presented to the County Committee on May 4, 2016. The district completed its public hearings and map development process, and voted on a final map on February 16, 2017. The County Committee will hold a public hearing in the district on April 24, 2017, and a feasibility study will then be conducted which will be presented to the County Committee at a later date.

Status: Public hearing scheduled for April 24, 2017
*Status Date: April 17, 2017

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

The Lawndale SD submitted a petition on December 13, 2016, to establish trustee areas and trustee area voting. The petition was presented to the County Committee on January 4, 2017. The County Committee held a public hearing in the district on February 15, 2017, after which a feasibility study was conducted and is being presented to the County Committee, who may then vote on the proposal.

Status: Petition to be reviewed on May 3, 2017
*Status Date: April 17, 2017
PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORY FROM THE GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (USD) TO THE LA CANADA USD

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

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

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

Status: Petition to be reviewed on May 3, 2017
*Status Date: April 18, 2017

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 there were insufficient signatures to move the petition forward. Staff notified the chief petitioners, who elected to gather additional signatures. On December 4, 2014, the chief petitioners
submitted additional signatures, which were submitted to the Registrar-Recorder on December 5, 2014 for signature verification. On December 22, 2014, the Registrar Recorder notified staff that the additional signatures were validated, and the petition had sufficient signatures to move forward.

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

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

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

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

On July 23, 2015, LACOE received a request for a petition from chief petitioner Mr. Seth Jacobson, a community member who is a Malibu resident. Mr. Jacobson, along with two other chief petitioners, wants to form a separate Malibu USD from territory within the boundaries of the existing Santa Monica-Malibu USD.

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. A joint
committee appointed by both the district and the City of Malibu has released a study addressing the implications of this petition. Staff is reviewing this study.

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

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

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

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

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

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

On January 17, 2006, LACOE received a request for a petition from chief petitioners Ms. Maurice Morse, Ms. Shirlee Smith, and Mr. Bruce Wasson, three community members who are residents of the area known as Altadena. The chief petitioners want to form an Altadena USD from territory within the boundaries of the Pasadena USD. The petition request was returned to the chief petitioners on January 20, 2006, because it lacked an adequate description of the area pursuant to EC §35700.3. On February 10, 2006, LACOE received a revised request for a petition. Staff reviewed the request and forwarded a draft petition to County Counsel on February 22, 2006, for a legal compliance review regarding format and content. We received notification on
March 6, 2006, from County Counsel informing us that the draft petition was legally acceptable.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: February 21, 2008
FORMATION—LA MIRADA USD (CURRENTLY LIES WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE NORWALK – LA MIRADA USD)

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

Unification Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Azusa USD to Glendora USD/October 2016
- 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)/March 2017

Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

- El Monte Union HSD / March 2016
- Pomona USD / June 2015
- Walnut USD / May 2016
- Whittier Union HSD / January 2017

* = indicates activity since last meeting

This document was prepared by staff to the County Committee.