September 24, 2019

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

FROM: Keith D. Crafton, Secretary
County Committee

SUBJECT: Regular Meeting of the County Committee—Wednesday, October 2, 2019

The next regular meeting of the County Committee will be held at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, October 2, 2019, 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 October 2, 2019.

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
October 2, 2019
9:30 a.m.

I  Information
D  Discussion
A  Action

I. CALL TO ORDER – Chairperson Ms. Maria Calix

II. FLAG SALUTE – Ms. Calix

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – Ms. Calix  I, D, A

The minutes of the September 4, 2019 regular meeting of the County Committee will be submitted for approval. (Enclosure 1)

IV. PRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC –
Secretary Mr. Keith D. Crafton

Any persons present desiring to address the County Committee on any proper matter. (Form to be completed and submitted to the secretary) - Mr. Crafton

V. COMMUNICATIONS – Mr. Crafton  I, D, A

The Secretary will review any pertinent informational correspondence or newspaper articles.
VI. PETITION TO IMPLEMENT TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING IN THE COMPTON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (USD) – Mr. Crafton

The Secretary will present a petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting in the Compton USD. (Enclosure 2)

VII. PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORY FROM THE TORRANCE USD TO THE PALOS VERDES PENINSULA USD – Mr. Crafton

The Secretary will provide an update on the joint districts’ petition to transfer twenty-nine parcels of territory from the Torrance USD to the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD.

VIII. PETITION TO IMPLEMENT TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING IN THE LITTLE LAKE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT (SD) – Mr. Crafton

The Secretary will provide an update on the petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting in the Little Lake City SD.

IX. PETITION TO IMPLEMENT TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING IN THE SOUTH WHITTIER SD – Mr. Crafton

The Secretary will provide an update on the petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting in the South Whittier SD.

X. PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORIES BETWEEN THE SULPHUR SPRINGS UNION SD AND THE SAUGUS UNION SD – Mr. Crafton

The Secretary will provide an update on the petition to transfer territories between the Sulphur Springs Union SD and the Saugus Union SD.
XI. UPDATE ON PETITION TO FORM A MALIBU USD FROM TERRITORY WITHIN THE SANTA MONICA-MALIBU USD - Mr. Crafton

The City of Malibu has petitioned to form a Malibu USD out of territory within the Santa Monica-Malibu USD. Following the introduction of the petition in November, 2017, the city submitted additional material to the petition rationale, including a trustee area map, a description of the fiscal impact of the unification, and letters requesting that the scheduling of the County Committee’s preliminary public hearing be postponed until after further discussions occur related to the petition.

In September 2018, the County Committee received their requested update from the parties on their negotiations, and received another update at its September 2019 meeting. The parties will present further updates to the County Committee on the status of their negotiations at a future regular meeting.

XII. MOTION TO ACCEPT THE ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY FINDINGS RELATED TO THE PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORY FROM THE GLENDALE USD TO THE LA CANADA USD – Mr. Crafton

The County Committee held a public hearing on October 3, 2018, as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), related to the petition to transfer territory from the Glendale USD to the La Canada USD. The County Committee shall make a motion to vote on whether to accept the CEQA findings.

XIII. PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORY FROM THE GLENDALE USD TO THE LA CANADA USD – Mr. Crafton

The Secretary and staff will provide additional information related to the petition to transfer territory from the Glendale USD to the La Canada USD, after which the County Committee may choose to take a final vote on the petition. (Enclosure 3)

XIV. UPDATE ON REVIEW OF COUNTY COMMITTEE POLICIES – Ms. Calix

The Chairperson will request a report from the County Committee policy review subcommittee.
XV. UPDATE ON THE CALIFORNIA VOTING RIGHTS ACT (CVRA), TRUSTEE AREA AND ELECTION ISSUES – Mr. Crafton

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

XVI. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE – Mr. Crafton

The Secretary will provide an update on legislation that staff is following. (Enclosure 4)

XVII. UPDATE ON LOS ANGELES USD REORGANIZATION PROPOSALS – Mr. Crafton

The Secretary will provide an update on school district reorganization proposals affecting the Los Angeles USD. (“Summary of Los Angeles USD Reorganization Proposals”). (Enclosure 5)

XVIII. UPDATE ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY REORGANIZATION PROPOSALS, EXCLUDING THOSE AFFECTING THE LOS ANGELES USD – Mr. 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]”). (Enclosure 6)

XIX. COUNTY COMMITTEE FALL 2019 ANNUAL ELECTION – Mr. Crafton

The Secretary will apprise the County Committee about the annual election of certain members which is scheduled for Tuesday, October, 29, 2019.

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

XXI. ADJOURNMENT
UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF THE
LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION
Regular Meeting
September 4, 2019

The Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) met on Wednesday, September 4, 2019, at the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) in Downey. The meeting was called to order at 9:35 a.m., by Chairperson Maria Calix

Members Present

Susan Andriacchi
Frank Bostrom
Maria Calix
Ted Edmiston
Cherise Moore
John Nunez
Frank Ogaz
Suzan T. Solomon

Members Absent

Heidi Ashcraft
AJ Willmer

Staff Present

Keith D. Crafton, Secretary
Octavio Castelo, Staff
Dr. Allison Deegan, Staff
Eric Hass, Staff
Anna Heredia, Staff
Diane Tayag, Staff
Victoria Bernstein, Staff

Chairperson Ms. Maria Calix called the meeting to order.

Ms. Suzan T. Solomon led the flag salute.

It was MOVED by Mr. John Nunez and SECONDED by Mr. Frank Ogaz that the minutes of the regular meeting held on March 6, 2019 be approved. Motion carried. Votes are:

Ms. Susan Andriacchi  Yes  Ms. Cherise Moore  Abstain
Mr. Frank Bostrom  Late N/A  Mr. John Nunez  Yes
Ms. Maria Calix  Yes  Mr. Frank Ogaz  Yes
Mr. Ted Edmiston  Yes  Ms. Suzan Solomon  Yes

Secretary Keith D. Crafton stated that we have presentations from the public in regards to Item XII. They will present at the time the agenda item is presented.
Secretary Crafton directed the Committee to their folders for recent articles relating to matters currently before the committee and other related school district organization issues. Most articles are related to the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA).

Secretary Crafton informed the Committee that Attorney, David Soldani would like to address the Committee.

Attorney Soldani representing the petitioner stated that the petition has been withdrawn for the time being.

Secretary Crafton stated that this is an introduction of another petition in the same development as the prior one proposing to transfer 29 parcels from Torrance USD to Palos Verdes. It was submitted jointly by the Torrance USD and the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD. In the coming weeks, staff will work with all parties to schedule public hearings. Following the public hearings, a feasibility study will be conducted and will be presented at an upcoming County Committee meeting.

Secretary Crafton stated that this is petition to proposing to add trustee areas and trustee area voting in the Little Lake School District, it was submitted by the Little Lake School District. In the coming weeks, staff will work with all parties to schedule public hearings. Following the public hearings, a feasibility study will be conducted and will be presented at an upcoming County Committee meeting.

Secretary Crafton stated that this is a petition proposing to add trustee areas and trustee area voting within South Whittier, it was submitted by the South Whittier SD. In the coming weeks, staff will work with all parties to schedule public hearings. Following the public hearings, a feasibility study will be conducted and will be presented at an upcoming County Committee meeting.
Secretary Crafton state that we will review the petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting within the Whittier Union High School District.

Dr. Allison Deegan presented the feasibility study and recommended that it be approved.

Several parties in the matter addressed the Committee.

It was moved by Mr. Bostrom and seconded by Mr. John Nunez that the Petition to Implement Trustee Areas and Trustee Area Voting in the Whittier Union HSD be approved. Motion carried, votes are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. Susan Andriacchi</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Ms. Cherise Moore</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Frank Bostrom</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mr. John Nunez</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Maria Calix</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mr. Frank Ogaz</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ted Edmiston</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ms. Suzan Solomon</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. Levitt from National Demographics presented the map to the Committee.

It was moved by Mr. Nunez and seconded by Ms. Solomon to approve the map as presented. Motion carried, votes are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. Susan Andriacchi</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Ms. Cherise Moore</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Frank Bostrom</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mr. John Nunez</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Maria Calix</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mr. Frank Ogaz</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ted Edmiston</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ms. Suzan Solomon</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secretary Crafton stated that the district’s trustee area map be conveyed to the Registrar Recorder in order for their November 2020 election to be conducted according to the new trustee areas.
Secretary Crafton stated that a petition was submitted to transfer a number of parcels between the Saugus Union SD and the Sulphur Springs Union SD, both districts are within the William S. Hart Union High School District (UHSD).

Parties involved in the petition addressed the Committee.

Dr. Decgan presented the feasibility report and recommended that the Petition to Transfer Territories between Sulphur Springs Union SD and the Saugus Union SD be preliminarily approved, considering all nine statutory conditions are met.

It was moved by Mr. Bostrom and seconded by Mr. Ogaz that the Petition to Transfer Territories between the Sulphur Springs Union SD and the Saugus Union SD be preliminarily approved. Motion carried, votes are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Susan Andriacchi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Cherise Moore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Frank Bostrom</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mr. John Nunez</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Maria Calix</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mr. Frank Ogaz</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ted Edmiston</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ms. Suzan Solomon</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secretary Crafton stated that given the full agenda we had today and the expectation of a large crowd attending for the final review of the Glendale-La Canada petition, the decision was made to delay hearing that petition until the October 2, 2019, meeting. The expectation is that, at the October 2 meeting, the Committee will vote on acceptance of the findings from the CEQA study and then vote on approval or disapproval of the petition.

Secretary Crafton stated that Dr. Vivian Ekchian is the new Glendale USD Superintendent and that staff provided a review of the petition process for her last month.

Secretary Crafton also stated that any additional materials or communications sent to the Committee related to this petition will be reviewed by staff and sent to the Committee as part of the next agenda package.

Several parties in the matter addressed the Committee.

Christine Wood, Attorney for the City of Malibu addressed the Committee and stated that we can expect them to appear at the October 2 meeting and provide an update on their ongoing negotiations.
Secretary Crafton stated that members of the Policy Review Subcommittee reviewed the newly drafted Bylaws, completed under the guidance of General Counsel, Ms. Vibiana Andrade. They are now waiting for a review of the current policies, and will incorporate them with the bylaws for approval and adoption by the Committee at an upcoming meeting.

Secretary Crafton stated staff will provide an update.

Mr. Eric Hass stated that there is a significant amount of CVRA activity in Northern California.

Secretary Crafton stated that Senator Ben Allen is no longer on the education subcommittee.

Secretary Crafton stated staff will provide an update.

Mr. Eric Hass stated that SB 47 continues to move forward, SB 212 is coming to a third reading. AB 849 is heading to a third reading as well. SB 585 has had no movement.

Secretary Crafton stated there are no updates.

Secretary Crafton stated there are no updates.

Secretary Crafton stated that the County Committee is taking nominations for four upcoming elections. Nominations will close on September 11. It will be an online election and will conclude at the annual LACSTA banquet. The event will be held on October 29, 2019, at The Quiet Cannon in Montebello.

Mr. Bostrom made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Dr. Cherise Moore. Meeting adjourned at 11:20 a.m. Motion carried, votes are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Susan Andricchi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ms. Cherise Moore</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Frank Bostrom</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mr. John Nunez</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Maria Calix</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mr. Frank Ogaz</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ted Edmiston</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ms. Suzan Solomon</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
September 12, 2019

Re: Change In Compton Unified School District Election Date From November 2019 To March 2020

Dear Mr. Olvera:

This is to confirm that on September 10, 2019, the Superior Court approved a plan to move the presently scheduled November 2019 Compton Unified School Board elections to March 2020. Attached is a copy of the Court judgment.

Pursuant to the Court judgment, and applicable law, we will be holding public hearings and thereafter approving a proposed trustee-area map. The map will then be submitted to the CCSDO for approval. We anticipate the map being approved sometime in late October or so.

Should you have any questions or comments, or directions for us, I am available at your convenience.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Alejandro Alvarez, Ed.D.
Deputy Superintendent, Business and Administrative Services
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

LIZETTE AREVALO, FRANCISCO
OROZCO, and MONICA RINCON,
Plaintiffs,

v.
COMPTON UNIFIED SCHOOL
DISTRICT,
Defendant,

Case No. 19STCV14808

[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT

ASSIGNED FOR ALL PURPOSES TO
JUDGE RANDOLPH M. HAMMOCK, DEPT. 47

Trial Date: Not Set
Complaint Filed: April 29, 2019

I.

[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT
Plaintiffs Lizette Arevalo, Francisco Orozco and Monica Rincon ("Plaintiffs"), on the one hand, and Defendant Compton Unified School District (the "District" or "Defendant"), on the other hand, have stipulated to entry of judgment, as reflected in the Stipulation for Settlement filed February 26, 2019. Plaintiffs and Defendant may be referred to hereinafter as the "Parties."

Pursuant to the Stipulation, and in accordance with Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6, the Court hereby enters judgment as follows:

RECOLS

1. Defendant is a unified school district organized and existing under the laws of the State of California. The legislative body of the District is a seven-member elected Board of Trustees.

2. The District currently elects all seven of its Trustees on a staggered basis via an at-large election such that every two years the District’s voters elect either three or four Trustees. Such elections have historically been held in November of odd-numbered years, and as such are not concurrent with statewide elections (which as of 2019 are now held in March and November of even-numbered years, in light of Elections Code section 1001), but are scheduled to move to even numbered years commencing in 2022.

3. By letter dated October 5, 2018, and received by the District on or about October 9, 2018, counsel for Plaintiffs alleged that the District's current at-large system for electing Trustees violates the California Voting Rights Act of 2001 (hereinafter the "CVRA"), Elections Code §§ 14025 et seq.

4. On November 26, 2018, the District, by vote of its Board of Trustees, adopted Resolution No. 18/19-26, announcing an intention to change the District's election system from at-large election to trustee-area elections. That resolution further provided that the trustee-area boundaries would be determined and adopted after a public process including public notice, hearings and input that would be "completed by the end of calendar-year 2019 with implementation thereafter."

1 The term "trustee-area" is synonymous with the term "district-based" in this Judgment.

JUDGMENT
5. Previously, on December 20, 2017, pursuant to Elections Code §§ 14050 et seq., the District adopted Resolution No. 17/18-1220, in which it resolved to change the time of future elections to November of even-numbered years, to be held concurrent with statewide general elections. That Resolution specified that the new time for elections would be implemented after the scheduled November 2021 election, that the first elections under the new schedule would be held in November 2022, and that the terms of Trustees elected at-large in November 2017 and November 2019 would be extended by one year until the first scheduled election in even-numbered years after the expiration of the terms to which they had been elected — i.e., until their successors are elected in November of 2022 and 2024, respectively.

6. The combined result of these two Resolutions adopted by the District is that, as the elections schedule is presently constituted, some Trustees elected under the at-large election system would continue to serve until 2022 and the remainder until 2024.

7. By letter dated November 28, 2018, to the District, Plaintiffs demanded that the District implement its intended change to a trustee-area election system at the next Board of Trustees election, and not hold another at-large election for the Board in November 2019 as scheduled.

8. On or about April 29, 2019, Plaintiff filed the above-captioned action alleging that the District’s election system violates the CVRA, and requesting relief in the form of an injunction against further at-large elections and the imposition of a district-based election system.

9. The Court, having reviewed the Stipulation, the evidence and argument in support thereof, and any objections that have been made following posting of the proposed judgment, orders as follows:

   A. The Court finds a violation of Elections Code sections 14027 and 14028, and exercises its authority to implement appropriate remedies, including the imposition of district-based elections, that are tailored to remedy the violation.

   B. The election presently set for November 2019 is hereby cancelled, and shall instead be held at the next regularly scheduled statewide election (set for March 2020). During the pendency of the March 2020 election, and until such time as successors are elected and qualify, the

JUDGMENT
incumbent Trustees whose terms were set to expire in 2019 shall remain in office.

C. The next succeeding regularly scheduled election after that to be held in March 2020 shall be held at the first regularly scheduled statewide election in 2022 (set for March 2022). The term of the Board members who were elected in 2017 and whose terms were initially scheduled to end in 2021 shall be extended to the date successors are elected and qualify following certification of the March 2022 election. This includes the term of any Board member selected or elected pursuant to Education Code section 5091 due to any vacancy in seats of Board members elected in 2017.

D. Effective commencing with the March 2020 election, the District’s at-large election system for Board of Trustees shall be replaced with a trustee-area election process. All Board of Trustees elections at that time and thereafter shall be held concurrent with the statewide election in March of even-numbered years using a trustee-area (also known as “district-area”) based election system. With respect to trustee-area elections, the candidate with the greatest number of votes (i.e., a plurality) shall be deemed elected.

E. In the trustee-area election to be held in March 2020 for the District, three trustee-area Trustees shall be elected, each to a four-year term. In the trustee-area election to be held in March 2022 for the District, four trustee-area Trustees shall be elected, each to a four-year term. To be eligible for office, a Trustee candidate must reside within the applicable trustee-area for which he/she is seeking to be elected, and in the election for the trustee-area only voters residing within that trustee-area shall be eligible to vote.

F. The District shall establish a map (“Electoral District Map”), describing the seven discrete trustee-area boundaries pursuant to which the district-based elections shall be conducted. After the publication of results of the 2020 Census, the District may reapportion as required by law but shall retain a district-based election system in any such reapportionment.

G. The Electoral District Map shall be designed in accordance with applicable state and federal laws, including Elections Code § 10010.

H. Defendant shall take all reasonable steps to secure required approvals for, and implementation of, the trustee-area elections including, but not limited to, seeking, advocating for,
and securing actions of the Los Angeles County Board of Education, the Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, and any other governmental boards or agencies whose approvals or implementing actions are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Stipulation.

I. Plaintiffs are determined to be the prevailing party in the above-captioned action, and are entitled to recover their reasonable attorneys’ fees, costs and expenses, pursuant to the CVRA, Elections Code § 14030. The following fees and costs have been agreed to and awarded: $200,000 in fees and costs which has deemed to have been based on a blended rate of $600/hr. for legal fees, and $300/hr. for paralegal fees. This sum includes time for Plaintiffs’ counsel to advise Plaintiffs post-judgment, but does not include time that may be spent after a claim is filed by Plaintiffs to dispute the Electoral District Map (i.e., does not include time after the date such a claim (action) is filed).

J. This Court shall retain jurisdiction over Plaintiffs and the District to enforce the terms of this Stipulation pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 664.6. In the event a dispute arises between the Parties regarding the Electoral District Map, any claim based on the dispute shall be filed as a separate action and shall not be encompassed within the enforcement of this Stipulation, though the action will be considered a related case by this Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED:

Dated: 9/10/19

[Signature]

Judge of the Superior Court

RANDOLPH M. HAMMOCK
SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT TO THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION CONCERNING THE PROPOSED TRANSFER OF CERTAIN TERRITORY FROM THE GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT TO THE LA CANADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

SEPTEMBER 18, 2019

Prepared by:

Los Angeles County Office of Education Business Advisory Services
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I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

On May 3, 2017, a feasibility study concerning the proposed transfer of territory from the Glendale Unified School District (USD) to the La Canada USD was presented to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) at its regularly scheduled meeting.

The County Committee reviewed the matter and heard presentations from the impacted parties and members of the public, and provided a preliminary approval of the transfer of territory, pending review of additional information, along with the results of an environmental review, per California Education Code (EC) §35706(b), required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The additional information include a query made regarding the differentiation in the enrollment of Glendale Unified’s Crescenta Valley High School, compared to La Canada High School; confirmation of an assertion made by a speaker; and, clarification on the voting process for the petition.

This Supplemental Report will also include specific additional submissions made at the request of the Chief Petitioner(s), both school districts, and members of the public. It will also include a copy of the original feasibility study, the CEQA report (Appendix A), a summarization of the staff recommendation, and information about the potential election area, in the event that the County Committee chooses to approve the petition.

II. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUESTED

At the May 3, 2017 meeting, an enrollment differentiation question arose comparing Glendale Unified’s Crescenta Valley High School (CVHS), to La Canada High School (LCHS), as both high schools are deemed to be in the regional service area of the Sagebrush neighborhood, the territory which is the subject of this petition. Staff reviewed CVHS 2018-19 enrollment for Grades 9-12, and it is listed as 2,608 according to the California Department of Education. However, comparing LCHS enrollment isn’t equitable, as LCHS serves Grades 7-12, at a 2018-19 figure of 2,063. When factoring-out Grades 7-8, the Grades 9-12 enrollment then stands at 1,381 (cde.ca.gov).

In addressing the question of whether La Canada USD could house hundreds more students immediately without sufficient brick and mortar facilities to do so- in the absence of any phase-in plan- one of the speakers asserted that La Canada USD could erect portables at a cost of approximately $75,000 each, suggesting that the financial burden of the transfer would be minimal. Staff was not able to locate any such said portables which are legitimately designed, constructed, and maintained for classroom instructional use in California. The Coalition for Adequate School Housing (C.A.S.H.), the Division of the State Architect (D.S.A.), the General Services Administration (G.S.A.), the State Allocation Board (S.A.B.), and other entities involved in the certification of facilities and buildings for school children have very strict guidelines and standards. For a small 60’ x 32’ classroom portable which lacks a restroom, a cost of $444,502 is a typical cost estimate, and for a larger classroom- again, lacking a restroom- a cost of $780,934 would be what La Canada USD could be expected to pay, for each one (Appendix B).
Lastly, the County Committee requested further clarification on the final vote for the petition. On November 7, 2018, the County Committee conducted a Study Session as part of its regularly scheduled meeting, in which Dr. Allison Deegan took a close examination of the voting procedures, noting the differentiation between the California State Board of Education’s approach, as contrasted against their expectation that a local County Committee engages in. For clarity, while “The Nine Conditions” occupy primacy in the minds of stakeholders, members of the public, and even the County Committee, there is an intentional tenth condition which grants flexibility to all aspects of the deliberations and outcomes. The County Committee may find all of conditions substantially met, and nonetheless, choose to deny the petition. Conversely, the County Committee could find none of the conditions to be substantially met, and nonetheless, choose to approve the petition. This is the latitude given to the arbiters of School District Organization who are the primary safeguards in protecting districts- and the children they serve- from making decisions against their best interests. That is part of the rationale as to why a County Committee may formulate petitions on School District Organization with or without the consent of a school district’s governing board, irrespective of how many school districts it affects.

III. ADDITIONAL SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

Over the course of the petition’s processes and review, thousands of pages of documents and correspondence have been submitted by the parties, all of which has been presented to the County Committee. Final additional submissions- some of which the County Committee has already seen – are being presented to accommodate the requests of La Canada USD and the Chief Petitioner(s).

Appendix C contains a 22-page submission dated August 16, 2019, from Glendale USD, this is a new submission.

Appendix D contains a 4-page submission dated September 2019, referencing the previously submitted 45-page document dated January 9, 2019 (included), from the Chief Petitioner.

Appendix E contains additional submissions from Sagebrush residents.

Appendix F contains a 15-page submission from La Canada USD, with dates spanning from October 26, 2016, up until September 10, 2019. This material was previously presented at past meetings and public hearings.

IV. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

As required under EC §35706(b), an environmental review under CEQA was conducted for this petition. LACOE engaged an environmental consulting firm to review the CEQA implications of the transfer petition. Terry A. Hayes Associates developed a Mitigated Negative Declaration (Appendix A), which they presented at the CEQA public hearing on October 3, 2018, held in conjunction with the regularly scheduled County Committee meeting.

At the October 2, 2019, regularly scheduled County Committee meeting, the County Committee may make a motion to accept or deny the results of the CEQA report. If the motion accepts the results of the report, then the County Committee may proceed with the petition review. However, if the motion to approve the report fails to pass, then a new environmental report must be commissioned, as the petition cannot proceed without CEQA compliance.
V. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff did not find any additional information resulting from review of additional materials submitted by the impacted parties that contributed to a different understanding than what was presented at the County Committee meeting on May 3, 2017. At that time, Staff recommended that the County Committee deny the petition. It is appreciable that the Chief Petitioners and many of the Sagebrush neighborhood community members desire the transfer. However, Glendale USD’s assertions that it would be permanently damaged by the transfer, serve the understanding of why all previous petitions were ultimately denied as being against the district’s best interests. Since Glendale USD has consistently served the residents with interdistrict transfer permits, Sagebrush residents already have access to whichever schools they choose. From a countywide perspective, the situation of all residents in both school districts is enviable, as both are stellar examples of the best things about public education. Thus, staff still recommends that the County Committee deny the petition to transfer territory from the Glendale USD to the La Canada USD.

VI. ELECTION AREA

Under EC 35710.51, the County Committee has full authority to determine the area of election for any petition it approves. Regarding the petition to transfer territory, if the County Committee approves the transfer, it has the option to scope the election area as the petition area, or to include any or all of the territory of the impacted districts. Thus, if the County Committee chooses to approve the petition, staff recommends that the County Committee make the entirety of both school districts the election area, to assure that the majority of all of the residents do indeed consent to the permanent boundary changes.
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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 Advisors 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 supports’ 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glendale USD Racial/Ethnic Distribution*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>1566</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).
### TABLE 3
La Canada 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 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La Canada Unified</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2072</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>84093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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 discernible 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.
Table 4
Comparative Real Estate Analysis
Glendale USD

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>

Table 5
Comparative Real Estate Analysis
La Canada USD

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 Hilliard 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 Hilldale 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 have 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 certainty 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.
X.

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.
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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.”
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>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></td>
<td>STATE ZIP</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></td>
<td>STATE ZIP</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></td>
<td>STATE ZIP</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></td>
<td>STATE ZIP</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></td>
<td>STATE ZIP</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></td>
<td>STATE ZIP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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>7. PRINT NAME BELOW</td>
<td>STREET ADDRESS</td>
<td>PRECINCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN NAME BELOW</td>
<td>DATE BELOW</td>
<td>CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATE ZIP</td>
<td></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</td>
<td>CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATE ZIP</td>
<td></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</td>
<td>CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATE ZIP</td>
<td></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</td>
<td>CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATE ZIP</td>
<td></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</td>
<td>CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATE ZIP</td>
<td></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</td>
<td>CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATE ZIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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>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</td>
<td>CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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</td>
<td>CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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</td>
<td>CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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</td>
<td>CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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</td>
<td>CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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</td>
<td>CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STATEZIP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOR COUNTY USE
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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>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>
</tbody>
</table>

| 20. PRINT NAME BELOW | STREET ADDRESS              |
| SIGN NAME BELOW     | DATE BELOW CITY, STATE ZIP  |

| 21. PRINT NAME BELOW | STREET ADDRESS              |
| SIGN NAME BELOW     | DATE BELOW CITY, STATE ZIP  |

| 22. PRINT NAME BELOW | STREET ADDRESS              |
| SIGN NAME BELOW     | DATE BELOW CITY, STATE ZIP  |

| 23. PRINT NAME BELOW | STREET ADDRESS              |
| SIGN NAME BELOW     | DATE BELOW CITY, STATE ZIP  |

| 24. PRINT NAME BELOW | STREET ADDRESS              |
| SIGN NAME BELOW     | DATE BELOW CITY, STATE ZIP  |
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PROONENT INFORMATION: Designation of Chief Petitioners - Education Code §35701

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  
   
   (818) 397-2981  
   Phone Number

2. **Natalie Lasiewicz**  
   Printed Name  
   4634 Latir Dr.  
   Residence Address  
   **La Canada Flintridge, California 91011**  
   City or Town and Zip Code  
   
   Signature and Date  
   
   (818) 249-9591  
   Phone Number

3. **Nick P. Karapetian**  
   Printed Name  
   2229 Canada Dr.  
   Residence Address  
   **La Canada Flintridge, California 91011**  
   City or Town and Zip Code  
   
   Signature and Date  
   
   (310) 246-7088  
   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.
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ATTACHMENT 'B'
GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

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. Armin Gharebian, President

Nayiri Nahabedian, Vice President

Gregory S. Krikorian, Clerk

Jennifer Freemon, Member

Christine Walters, Member
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 unified 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 Rosecrans 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 WHEREOF, 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 Sagle, President

Dan Jeffries, Vice President

Kaitzer Leigh, 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 35739 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 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.
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### SAGEBRUSH TERRITORY TRANSFER MITIGATION OPTION SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obligation Option</th>
<th>Debt</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Previously Transferred</th>
<th>Viability</th>
<th>Potential Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilize Local Education Code Section 357 to cease division of the SAGEBRUSH transfer territory for GUSD GO bonds and commensurate taxation for LCUSD GO bonds.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Utilize Local Education Code Section 357 to cease division of the SAGEBRUSH transfer territory for GUSD GO bonds and commensurate 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 parcel.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would require SAGEBRUSH territory to pay for bonds of both LCUSD and GUSD, resulting in higher taxation within the transfer territory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize Local Education Code Section 357 as to derive an alternative allocation of bonded indebtedness.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Despite the flexibility provided by this option, it will be difficult to produce an outcome which does not require an increase in fees on at least some parcels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formation of a district facilities improvement district, pursuant to SAGEBRUSH territory to facilitate financing of facilities improvement options.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would require analysis of outstanding debt and discussions with bond counsel to determine the effect of allowable allocation and financing options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursuit of a SAGEBRUSH territory specific parcel to provide a unique funding source.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Given the limited number of parcels within the SAGEBRUSH territory, would produce less than $100,000 annually per $100,000 estimated 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></td>
<td></td>
<td>Likely viable if approved by SAGEBRUSH residents.</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>Likely viable if approved by SAGEBRUSH residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repayment of projected waiver costs.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Likely viable if mutually agreed upon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would likely result in a $14 million reduction in GUSD statutory bonding capacity with a slight increase for LCUSD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would require State legislative action and may not allow for full statutory capacity for both LCUSD and GUSD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Likely viable if mutually agreed upon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
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## 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></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 grades leads to accommodate additional enrollment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would require reconfiguration of existing LCUSD attendance patterns for scores or all grades and would likely not provide sufficient housing for all projected Sagebrush territory students without added classroom space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradual transition of Sagebrush student transfer from GUSD to LCUSD over a period of several years</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Due to the inability to predict student numbers and the potential for reconfiguration of attendance patterns, some approaches may not be feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary shared GUSD-LCUSD use of facilities through a lease arrangement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would require a transfer agreement without significant risk to reconfigure an existing campus and may result in complications for staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of “Pickens Canyon” lot, with a portion retained by LCUSD for access</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would require a division of the parcel through the County of Los Angeles which may require approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of a portion of the “Pickens Canyon” lot to facilitate mitigation funding</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would likely be viable if a sufficient portion of the parcel is made available for sale and require LCUSD participation to provide funding but may not be a significant amount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of an easement on the “Pickens Canyon” lot to provide access</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would require examination of easement types to determine if a viable mechanism exists to enforce maintenance of access for LCUSD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease of the “Pickens Canyon” lot to provide funding to mitigate transfer impacts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would likely require LCUSD involvement to facilitate funding for ongoing lease payments and require some agreement 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 change</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May be cost prohibitive for LCUSD, given the need to provide services for the transfer students which generates 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. (Bryan Dawson, 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 48-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.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) has been prepared to inform the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) decision-makers, affected agencies and the public of any potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed transfer of territory from the Glendale Unified School District (USD) to the La Cañada USD (proposed project).

1.1 ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE REQUIREMENTS

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

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

1.2 PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Transfer of Territory from Glendale Unified School District to La Cañada Unified School District

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

Contact Person and Phone Number: Allison Deegan, Ed.D.
(562) 922-6336

Chief Petitioners: Tom Smith and Nalini Lasiewicz
1.3 ORGANIZATION OF THIS IS/MND

This IS/MND is organized into the following four chapters:

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

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

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

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

2.1 BACKGROUND

Since the 1960s, four petitions have been submitted to request for the transfer of territory within the project area (see discussion of “Project Location,” below) from Glendale USD to La Cañada USD. Two legislations have also been proposed for the transfer of territory. Neither the petitions nor the legislations were successful. The most recent request for petition to transfer territory from Glendale USD to La Cañada USD (fifth petition) was received by the LACOE on June 29, 2016. LACOE forwarded the petition to the Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk (Registrar-Recorder) for signature verification on June 20, 2016. On July 18, 2016, the Registrar-Recorder notified LACOE staff and certified that the petitioners had sufficient signatures to move forward. On September 7, 2016, the petition was presented to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee).

Pursuant to California Education Code (EDC) §35705, two public hearings were conducted. One public hearing was conducted at the La Cañada USD District Office on October 26, 2016, and the second one was conducted at the Glendale USD Crescenta Valley High School in La Crescenta on November 2, 2016. In addition to the public hearings, the County Committee received numerous mail and email messages from community members and stakeholders, all of which were forwarded to members for review.

Pursuant to the conditions set forth in EDC §35753, the petition was examined in accordance to the nine conditions that guide review of school district organization petitions to transfer territory. In accordance with EDC §35706(b), the 120-day period for approving or disapproving a petition shall commence after certification of an environmental impact report or adoption of a negative declaration/mitigated negative declaration. This IS/MND has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of CEQA, and LACOE will consider the information contained in this environmental document in making a decision to approve or deny the proposed project.

2.2 PROJECT LOCATION

The proposed transfer territory, or project area, is located entirely within the City of La Cañada Flintridge boundaries. It is bounded by the La Cañada Flintridge city boundary to the west, north and south; and by the La Cañada Flintridge city boundary and Rosebank Drive to the east. The westerly boundary generally follows Pickens Canyon and the Pickens Canyon flood control channel. Figure 2-1 shows the location of the project area. The project area is sometimes referred to as the Sagebrush section of the City of La Cañada Flintridge.

Although the project area was incorporated as part of the city in 1976, the project area is within the boundaries of Glendale USD. The project area is approximately 380 acres in size and contains 829 parcels. The project area consists of approximately 85 percent residential uses, 6 percent commercial uses, and nine percent other uses (such as institutional and utilities). A majority of the residential properties within the project area are single-family homes. The project area has approximately 720 single-family residential properties, 68 townhomes, and 180 multi-family residential units. Multi-family residential housing, townhomes, and commercial uses are generally found towards the southern portion of the project area. Multi-family residential structures and townhomes are generally within 700 feet of Foothill Boulevard, while commercial uses are situated along Foothill Boulevard. Although the project area is nearly fully developed, some undeveloped hillsides areas are located at the north and south sides of the project area.
Figure 2-1: Regional Location

Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates Inc.
Similar to the project area, the area surrounding the project area is suburban in character with primarily single-family housing. Clusters of commercial and multi-family residential structures are situated along or near Foothill Boulevard.

## AFFECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

The school districts that would be affected by the proposed project are Glendale USD and La Cañada USD.

**Glendale Unified School District (USD).** The project area is currently assigned to Glendale USD for TK-12 grade education. It is a charter city school district that serves the City of Glendale, the unincorporated La Crescenta – Monrovia community of Los Angeles County, and the project area. According to the California Department of Education (CDE), the 2016-17 student enrollment for Glendale USD was 26,075. Glendale USD operates 20 elementary schools, 4 middle schools, 4 high schools, and 5 high schools (one of which is a continuation high school). In addition, the school district operates one independent study school. The Glendale USD schools that would be primarily affected by the proposed project are Mountain Avenue Elementary School, Rosemont Middle School, and Crescenta Valley High School (Table 2-1). Figure 2-2 depicts the location of the affected schools in relation to the project area.

| TABLE 2-1: SCHOOLS AFFECTED BY PROPOSED PROJECT | 
|--------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| **Schools** | **Location** | **Grades Served** | **Student Enrollment (2016-2017)** | **Distance from Transfer Territory (Miles)** |
| GLENDALE USD | 2307 Mountain Ave., La Crescenta | TK-6 | 568 | 0.02 |
| Mountain Avenue Elementary School | 4725 Rosemont Ave., La Crescenta | 7-8 | 1,312 | 0.45 |
| Rosemont Middle School | 2900 Community Ave., La Crescenta | 9-12 | 2,660 | 0.63 |
| Crescenta Valley High School | 5025 Palm Dr., La Cañada Flintridge | TK-6 | 669 | 0.12 |
| LA CAÑADA USD | | | | |
| Palm Crest Elementary School | 4463 Oak Grove Dr., La Cañada Flintridge | 7-12 | 2,085 | 2.75 |
| La Cañada High School | 1 |
| 1 Distance to schools are from the closest point in the project area. |

**La Cañada Unified School District (USD).** La Cañada USD serves all areas of the City of La Cañada Flintridge, except for the project area, which is within the boundaries of Glendale USD. According to CDE, the 2016-17 student enrollment for La Cañada USD was 4,132. La Cañada USD operates three elementary schools and one high school. The schools that would be primarily affected by the proposed project are Palm Crest Elementary School and La Cañada High School (Table 2-1).
Figure 2-2: Proposed Transfer Territory and Affected Schools

Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates Inc.
2.3 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project involves transferring territory from Glendale USD to La Cañada USD. The proposed transfer territory (project area) is currently assigned to Mountain Avenue Elementary School, Rosemont Middle School, and Crescenta Valley High School in the Glendale USD. With the transfer of territory, the project area would be assigned to Palm Crest Elementary School and La Cañada High School in the La Cañada USD.

According to the Glendale USD Office of Public Information, 356 students within the project area were enrolled in Glendale USD schools during the 2016-2017 school year.1 Of the 356 students, 186 attended Glendale USD elementary schools, 42 attended Glendale USD middle schools, 121 attended Glendale USD high schools, and 7 attended other programs within the school district. Within the project area, 165 students currently attend La Cañada USD schools on permits, of which 102 students are enrolled in TK-6 and 63 students are enrolled in grades 7-12. With implementation of the proposed project, all TK-12 students within the Project Area would be assigned to La Cañada USD schools, primarily Palm Crest Elementary School and La Cañada High School.

With implementation of the proposed project, the route and distance students travel to school would change. Currently, a pedestrian bridge over Pickens Canyon provides the shortest and most direct route to Mountain Avenue Elementary School from the project area. Using this bridge, the school is approximately 190 feet from the westerly boundaries of the project area. This concrete pedestrian bridge has chain link fences that span the entire length of the bridge on the north and south sides. The top of the chain link fences are curved inward, and the chain link fence posts are securely anchored to the concrete portion of the bridge. The students within the project area can also currently access Mountain Avenue Elementary School using other routes, such as by traveling westbound on Foothill Boulevard, northbound on Briggs Avenue, then eastbound on Mountain Avenue. Using this route, the school is approximately 0.5 miles from the westerly boundaries of the project area.

To access Rossmont Middle School, students within the project area can currently travel westbound along Foothill Boulevard and northbound along Rosemont Avenue. Using this route, the school is approximately 0.5 miles from the westerly edge of the project area. Similarly, students within the project area can currently access Crescenta Valley High School by traveling westbound along Foothill Boulevard and southbound on Glenwood Avenue. Using this route, the school is approximately 0.9 miles from the westerly edge of the project area. These routes are the shortest and most direct paths to the schools, although students can also access these schools using other routes.

With implementation of the proposed project, many students within the project area would access Palm Crest Elementary School by using residential streets, while other students (particularly those students who live towards the southerly portion of the project area) would likely travel eastbound on Foothill Boulevard and northbound on Palm Drive to access the school. This school is approximately 0.15 miles east of the project area. Some residential streets have sidewalks and crosswalks, while other streets do not. Intersections closest to the school (such as Jessen Drive/Solliden Lane and Jessen Drive/Palm Drive) have crosswalks. Palm Drive between Jessen Drive and Foothill Boulevard has crosswalks and sidewalks along the west side of the street. Sidewalks are located along both sides of Foothill Boulevard, and crosswalks are provided at some intersections on this street. Foothill Boulevard has Class II bike lanes on both sides of the street.2

---

2 Class II bike lanes are bike lanes that are striped and stenciled onto a vehicular street.
To access La Cañada High School, students within the project area would likely travel eastbound on Foothill Boulevard or Interstate 210 (I-210). Using these two routes, the school is approximately three miles between the easterly edge of the project area and the school. Given the distance between the project area and the school, it is likely that students would either drive or bike to La Cañada High School. Bike lanes are provided along Foothill Boulevard from the project area to Alta Canyada Road. The bike lanes end approximately two miles west of the school. Sidewalks are provided on both sides of Foothill Boulevard along most of the route. However, between Daleridge Road and Oak Grove Drive, sidewalks are only available along the south side of the street. The sidewalk on the north side of Foothill Boulevard ends approximately 0.15 miles west of the school. Additionally, crosswalks are provided at some intersections on Foothill Boulevard. Intersections closest to the school (such as Foothill Boulevard/Viro Road, Foothill Boulevard/Oak Grove Drive, and Berkshire Place/Oak Grove Drive) have crosswalks.

In addition to driving and biking, it is possible that students within the project area would use the existing La Cañada Flintridge Shuttle (LCF) on Foothill Boulevard to access the high school. LCF Shuttle is a free shuttle service within the City of La Cañada Flintridge. Based on the 2017 LCF Shuttle schedule, the shuttle ride between the project area and the high school is approximately 20 minutes.
3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST AND EVALUATION

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

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use / Planning
- Population / Housing
- Transportation / Traffic
- Agriculture / Forestry Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources
- Public Services
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Geology / Soils
- Hydrology / Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation
- Utilities / Service Systems

Mandatory Findings of Significance

DEFINITION OF IMPACT CATEGORIES

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

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

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

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

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

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

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

[Signature]
Keith D. Crafton
Printed Name

Date
08/22/2018

For
### 3.0 Initial Study Checklist & Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a-d) No Impact.** The project area, Palm Crest Elementary School, and La Cañada High School are located within an urbanized area of the City of La Cañada Flintridge. The project area contains 829 parcels, a majority of which are developed with single-family homes. Clusters of commercial and multi-family residential structures are located along or within 700 feet of Foothill Boulevard. The project area and the affected La Cañada USD schools are not part of a scenic vista and are not located adjacent to or within the view of a state scenic highway. The proposed project does not include components that would directly affect scenic vistas, damage scenic resources, or degrade the existing visual character or quality. The proposed project does not involve components that would create new sources of light or glare. Students would use existing roadways, bike lanes, sidewalks, or LCF Shuttle services to access La Cañada USD schools. The use of these routes would not result in any indirect impacts to the scenic vistas, state scenic highways, visual character, light, and glare in the surrounding area. Therefore, no impact related to aesthetics would occur.
3.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES - Would the project:

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

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

a-e) **No Impact.** The project area, Palm Crest Elementary School, and La Cañada High School are located within an urbanized area. The project area is mostly developed with single-family homes, with several clusters of commercial and multi-family residential structures along the southern portion of the project area. Similarly, the surrounding area is also mostly developed with single-family homes, with some multi-family housing and commercial uses. Although a few portions of the project area and its surrounding areas have undeveloped hillsides, no farmland, agriculturally zoned land, Williamson Act Contract land, forest land, or timberland are located within the project area and the affected La Cañada USD schools. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a direct impact on agriculture or forestry resources. Students within the project area would use the existing roadways, bike lanes, sidewalks, crosswalks, and LCF Shuttle services to access La Cañada USD schools. The routes that would be used are located in areas that are primarily developed with residential and commercial use, and are not expected to have any indirect impacts on agriculture or forestry land. Therefore, no impact related to agriculture or forestry resources would occur.
**3.3 AIR QUALITY - Would the project:**

- **a)** Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
  - [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
  - [ ] Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
  - [x] Less-Than-Significant Impact
  - [x] No Impact

- **b)** Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
  - [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
  - [ ] Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
  - [x] Less-Than-Significant Impact
  - [x] No Impact

- **c)** Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
  - [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
  - [ ] Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
  - [x] Less-Than-Significant Impact
  - [x] No Impact

- **d)** Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
  - [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
  - [ ] Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
  - [x] Less-Than-Significant Impact
  - [x] No Impact

- **e)** Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?
  - [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
  - [ ] Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
  - [x] Less-Than-Significant Impact
  - [x] No Impact

---

**a-e) No Impact.** The only source of air pollutant emissions associated with the proposed project would be increased vehicle miles traveled (VMT) related to changes in student pick-up and drop-off routes. Section 3.16, Transportation and Traffic, below, includes a detailed discussion of anticipated changes in transportation modes (i.e., walking, biking, and driving) and mobility patterns in the project area. As discussed in Section 3.14, Public Services, below, approximately 218 additional students would attend Palm Crest Elementary School and approximately 193 additional students would attend La Cañada High School with implementation of the proposed project. As discussed in Section 3.16, Transportation and Traffic, below, the 218 additional elementary school students would generate approximately 412 daily trips to Palm Crest Elementary School, and the 193 additional high school students would generate approximately 411 daily trips to La Cañada High School. The change in trip lengths would result in additional VMT within the project area for those students transferred to different schools than they were previously attending.

The change in daily VMT was estimated using the maximum route distance between the current school of attendance and the proposed school of attendance for elementary school students and high school students. Using Google Earth, the route from Mountain Avenue Elementary School to Palm Crest Elementary School was measured to be approximately two miles and the route from Crescenta Valley High School to La Cañada High School was measured to be approximately five miles. The estimated total daily VMT was calculated by summing the products of 412 daily trips of two miles each and 411 daily trips of five miles each, which resulted in 2,879 daily VMT. Emissions were estimated using passenger vehicle emission rates obtained from the California Air Resources Board (CARB) EMFAC2017 mobile source emissions model. The EMFAC2017 emission rates are provided by the model in units of grams of pollutant emitted per VMT. The daily pollutant emission rates were estimated by calculating the product of the daily VMT and the emission rate, and then converting from grams to pounds. The average vehicle speed in the project area was estimated to be 35 miles per hour based on speed limits of primary commuting corridors.
The EMFAC2017 emission rates were utilized to estimate daily emissions of the six air pollutants for which the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has established mass daily thresholds of significance: ozone ($O_3$) precursors known as volatile organic compounds (VOC), oxides of nitrogen ($NO_x$), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur oxides ($SO_x$), respirable particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter ($PM_{10}$), and fine particulate matter less than two and a half microns in diameter ($PM_{2.5}$). As shown in Table 3-1, daily pollutant emissions associated with increased vehicle travel would be well below the SCAQMD significance thresholds. Based on the level of emissions, there would be no potential for the proposed project to interfere with air quality management plans, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or contribute to a cumulative impact. In addition, it is not anticipated that the proposed project would generate diesel emissions from passenger vehicles resulting in exposure to substantial pollutant concentrations, or new sources of odors. Therefore, no impact related to air quality would occur.

**TABLE 3-1: OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>$NO_x$</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>$SO_x$</th>
<th>$PM_{2.5}$</th>
<th>$PM_{10}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Source Emissions</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Significance Threshold</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceed Threshold?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a-f) No Impact.** The project area, Palm Crest Elementary School, and La Cañada High School are not identified by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) as a critical habitat for threatened and endangered species. The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), a computerized database that identifies past occurrences of plants, animals, and communities listed by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and USFWS as species of special concern (e.g., species that are rare, threatened, or endangered), has listed one endangered species that has been found within the southerly portion of the project area and/or its vicinity in the past. According to CNDDB, this species, the slender-horned spinyflower (*Dodecahema leptoceras*), is possibly extirpated as the area is heavily developed. CNDDB also listed the crotch bumble bee (*Bombus crotchii*), American peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus anatum*), mesa horkelia (*Horkelia cuneata var. puberula*), silver-haired bat (*Lasionycteris noctivagans*), and white rabbit-tobacco

---

(Pseudognaphalium leucocephalum) as having been found within the project area and/or its vicinity in the past. None of these species are listed as endangered by CDFW or USFWS, and the mesa horkelia is listed as extirpated from the project area and its vicinity. CNDDB also identified the Southern Sycamore Alder Riparian Woodland within and in the vicinity of the northerly portion of the project area.4

According to the USFWS National Wetlands Inventory, a portion of the Hall Beckley Canyon debris basin and Pickens Canyon (north of Teasley Street) are identified as wetlands within the project area. Within the vicinity of the project area, a portion of the Pickens Canyon debris basin and Webber Canyon debris basin are identified as wetlands.5

No adopted Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans have been prepared for the project area or the affected La Cañada USD schools. Regulations to preserve and protect designated trees on private property are found in the Chapter 11.40 of the City of La Cañada Flintridge Municipal Code. Regulations to protect designated trees on public rights-of-ways are found in Chapter 4.24 of the Municipal Code.

As previously discussed, a small portion of the project area consists of undeveloped hillside while the majority of the project area is developed with single-family homes, multi-family residential housing, and commercial structures. The proposed project does not involve components that would directly modify any natural habitat for special status species, alter wetlands, interfere with wildlife movement, and conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. In addition, residents within the proposed transfer territory would use the existing roadways, bike lanes, sidewalks, crosswalks, and LCF Shuttle services within the developed portions of the City of La Cañada Flintridge to get to La Cañada USD schools. Residents would not be able to use wetland areas to access schools. Thus, the proposed project would not have an indirect impact on biological resources. No impact would occur.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Section 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a-d) No Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially alter or remove identified cultural resources. The proposed project does not include components that would have a direct impact on historic, archaeological, paleontological resources, or human remains. In addition, residents within the project area would use the existing roadways, bike lanes, sidewalks, crosswalks, and LCF Shuttle services within the developed portions of the City of La Cañada Flintridge to get to La Cañada USD schools. The use of these routes would not result in any indirectly impact cultural resources. Therefore, no impact would occur.
3.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv)</td>
<td>Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potential result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Be located on expansive soil as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a-e) No Impact. A significant impact could occur if the proposed project would exacerbate existing environmental conditions so as to increase the potential to expose people or structures to the potential substantial adverse effects involving seismic hazards. The Sierra Madre fault is located in the northerly portion of the project area. However, the project area, including the portion of the project area that surrounds the Sierra Madre fault, and the affected La Cañada USD schools are not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. According to the California Geological Survey, the northern portion of the project area (primarily in the undeveloped hillside), Pickens Canyon north of Teasley Street, and a small portion of the undeveloped hillside in the southern portion of the project area are located in earthquake-induced landslide zones. Additionally, a small portion of Pickens Canyon immediately outside of the project area (north of Earnslow Drive) is located within a liquefaction zone. The pedestrian bridge that currently
provides pedestrian access to Mountain Avenue Elementary School at the western boundary of the project area is not located within a liquefaction or earthquake-induced landside zone.⁶

According to the City of La Cañada Flintridge General Plan Safety Element, the project area, the affected La Cañada USD schools, and the pedestrian bridge, are located on soil assigned to the Hanford soil association. The Hanford association consists of loam and sandy loam soils that are well drained, with slow runoff, slight erosion hazard (except where dry soils are subject to wind erosion), and moderately rapid subsoil permeability. Expansion potential (shrink-swell hazard) is typically low.⁷

As with all properties in the seismically active Southern California region, the project area and the affected La Cañada USD schools are susceptible to ground shaking during a seismic event. The proposed project does not include components that would directly increase the potential to expose people or structures to the adverse effects involving seismic hazards, disturb or destabilize soils, expose soils to erosion processes, or place structures on unstable soils. In addition, residents within the project area would use existing roadways, bike lanes, sidewalks, crosswalks, and LCF Shuttle services within the developed portions of the City of La Cañada Flintridge to get to La Cañada USD schools. The use of these routes would not result in any indirectly impacts. Therefore, no impact related to geology and soils would occur.

---

⁷ City of La Cañada Flintridge, General Plan 2030, Safety Element, adopted January 22, 2013.
3.7 GREENHOUSE GAS (GHG) EMISSIONS - Would the project:

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

a-b) **No Impact.** Assembly Bill (AB) 32 requires CARB to develop and enforce regulations for the reporting and verification of statewide GHG emissions and directs CARB to set a GHG emission limit, based on 1990 levels, to be achieved by 2020. CARB adopted the AB 32 Scoping Plan, which sets forth the framework for facilitating the State’s goal of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. The First Update of the AB 32 Scoping Plan was adopted on May 22, 2014, and the 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update was adopted on December 14, 2017. The 2017 Update establishes a proposed framework of action for California to meet the aggressive climate target of 40 percent reduction below 1990 levels by 2030 that was codified in Senate Bill 32 (SB 32). Neither AB 32 nor the updated AB 32 Scoping Plan establishes regulations implementing, for specific projects, the Legislature’s statewide goals for reducing GHGs (Center for Biological Diversity v. California Department of Fish and Game (2015) 62 CAL.4th 204, 239). The AB 32 Scoping Plans outline a series of technologically feasible and cost-effective measures to reduce Statewide GHG emissions, including expanding energy efficiency programs, increasing electricity production from renewable resources (at least 33 percent of the statewide electricity mix), and increasing automobile efficiency, implementing the Low-Carbon Fuel Standard, and developing a cap-and-trade program. These measures are designed to be implemented by State agencies.

The only source of GHG emissions associated with the proposed project would be increased vehicle miles traveled related to changes in student pick-up and drop-off routes. Section 3.16, Transportation and Traffic, below, includes a detailed discussion of anticipated changes in transportation modes (i.e., walking, biking, and driving) and mobility patterns in the project area. As discussed in Section 3.14, Public Services, below, approximately 218 additional students would attend Palm Crest Elementary School and approximately 193 additional students would attend La Cañada High School with implementation of the proposed project. As discussed in Section 3.16, Transportation and Traffic, below, the 218 additional elementary school students would generate approximately 412 daily trips to Palm Crest Elementary School, and the 193 additional high school students would generate approximately 411 daily trips to La Cañada High School. The change in trip lengths would result in additional VMT for those students transferred to different schools than they were previously attending.

As previously discussed in Section 3.3, Air Quality, implementation of the proposed project is estimated to result in 2,879 daily VMT. GHG emissions were estimated using passenger vehicle emission rates obtained from CARB EMFAC2017 mobile source emissions model. EMFAC2017 emission rates are provided by the model in units of grams of pollutant emitted per VMT. The daily pollutant emission rates for methane (CH₄) and carbon dioxide (CO₂) were estimated by calculating the product of the daily VMT and the emission rate and then converting from grams to pounds. Annual GHG emissions expressed in terms of metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents (MTCO₂e) were estimated by summing the daily CO₂ emissions with the product of daily CH₄ emissions and its global warming potential.
(GWP) value of 25, and then multiplying by 180 annual school days and dividing by 2,204.62 pounds per metric ton. The average vehicle speed in the project area was estimated to be 35 miles per hour based on speed limits of primary commuting corridors.

Additional VMT associated with implementation of the proposed project was estimated to result in GHG emissions totaling approximately 153 MTCO$_2$e annually. The proposed project would not introduce any new stationary source of GHG emissions and would not independently generate new vehicle trips. The additional VMT attributed to shifts in mobility patterns would result from changes in the length of existing trips. There are no new sources of GHG emissions that could be controlled through mitigation measures. The proposed project would not interfere with implementation of the AB 32 measures, and there is no potential for the student transfer to interfere with local GHG reduction plans. Therefore, no impact related to GHG emissions would occur.
### 3.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

| a) | Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ |
| b) | Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ |
| c) | Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ |
| d) | Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ |
| e) | For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ |
| f) | For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for the people residing or working in the area? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ |
| g) | Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ |
| h) | Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ |

**a-h) No Impact.** The properties within the project area are primarily developed with single-family homes. The project area also has several multi-family housing and commercial uses, which are clustered near the southern portion of the project area. Residential uses and schools typically do not involve activities that would create a public hazard through the transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. Hazardous material use and storage for residential uses and schools are generally limited to common...
hazardous substances, including lubricants, paints, cleaning supplies, pesticides and other landscaping supplies, and vehicle fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. A few of the commercial uses within the project area use hazardous materials, such as gas station and dry cleaners. However, these businesses, as well as other businesses that use substantial amounts of hazardous materials, are required to adhere to strict requirements regarding the handling, transporting, and storing of hazardous materials. The proposed project does not include any activities that would involve the transport, use, disposal, or release of hazardous materials. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly create a public hazard through the transport, use, disposal, or release of hazardous materials.

The project area and the affected La Cañada USD schools are not located within an airport land use plan and are not in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Thus, the proposed project would not directly expose people to airport safety hazards.

The City of La Cañada Flintridge has prepared a Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP), which includes goals and action items to identify potential hazards and develop strategies to lessen their impacts on the community. The HMP addresses multi-hazard issues, as well as specific activities for earthquakes, floods, windstorms, landslides, wildfires, and man-made hazards. In addition to the HMP, the project area is part of Disaster Management Area C (Area C), which was created through a Joint Powers Agreement of 10 cities with the Los Angeles County. Area C was created in 2004 to promote the coordination of disaster management, planning and preparedness efforts. The entire City of La Cañada Flintridge, the adjacent La Crescenta – Montrose community, and the City of Glendale are part of Area C.\(^8\) The proposed project does not involve any activities that would physically interfere with the HMP, the disaster management of Area C, and other adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan that are applicable to the project area.

As with the entire City of La Cañada Flintridge and the adjacent area to the west, the project area and the affected La Cañada USD schools are located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone.\(^9\) Steep undeveloped hillside is located in some portions of the project area. In addition, the project area is located near the steep terrain of the San Gabriel Mountains. These hillside areas contain chaparral, which is extremely combustible and genetically predisposed to burn. Given the location of the project area and the affected La Cañada USD schools in relation to the undeveloped hillside areas and that these areas are located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, the project area and the affected La Cañada USD schools are susceptible to the risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. Although the project area and the affected La Cañada USD schools are susceptible to the hazards associated with wildfires, the proposed project does not involve any components that would directly increase the hazards associated with wildland fires.

Residents within the project area would use the existing roadways, bike lanes, sidewalks, crosswalks, and LCF Shuttle services within the developed portions of the City of La Cañada Flintridge to get to La Cañada USD schools. The use of these routes would not result in any indirect impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials. Therefore, no direct and indirect impacts would occur.

---


3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:
   a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?  
      | Potentially Significant Impact | Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-Than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
      |   □   |   □   |   □   |   □   |   ✓   |
   b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned land uses for which permits have been granted)?  
      |   □   |   □   |   □   |   □   |   ✓   |
   c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?  
      |   □   |   □   |   □   |   □   |   ✓   |
   d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off site?  
      |   □   |   □   |   □   |   □   |   ✓   |
   e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?  
      |   □   |   □   |   □   |   □   |   ✓   |
   f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?  
      |   □   |   □   |   □   |   □   |   ✓   |
   g) Place housing within a 100-year flood plain as mapped on federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?  
      |   □   |   □   |   □   |   □   |   ✓   |
   h) Place within a 100-year flood plain structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?  
      |   □   |   □   |   □   |   □   |   ✓   |
   i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?  
      |   □   |   □   |   □   |   □   |   ✓   |
   j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?  
      |   □   |   □   |   □   |   □   |   ✓   |
a-j) **No Impact.** The project area, Palm Crest Elementary School, and La Cañada High School are located in the Los Angeles River Watershed, which is situated in the central portion of Los Angeles County and encompasses approximately 834 square miles. Drainage within the developed portions of the project area is through Pickens Canyon and through an extensive network of underground storm drains. The Pickens Canyon debris basin is situated adjacent to the western boundary of the project area. It is an engineered structure designed to collect sediment and any loose debris eroded from the steep hillside watershed of the San Gabriel Mountains and prevent damage to downstream properties and channels. In regards to storm drains, exiting streets, curbs and gutters direct runoff into collection points where flows enter existing storm drains. No dams or levees are located within or in the vicinity of the project area and the affected La Cañada USD schools. The project area, Palm Crest Elementary School and La Cañada High School are not located within a 100-year flood plain. Additionally, the pedestrian bridge that currently provides pedestrian access to Mountain Avenue Elementary School at the western boundary of the project area is located in an area with minimal flood hazard, which is an area that is located outside of the Special Flood Hazard Area and has less-than-0.2 percent of annual chance flood.\(^{11}\)

The proposed project does not include any activities that would directly violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge, alter existing drainage patterns, create or contribute to runoff water, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. Additionally, as the project area, Palm Crest Elementary School and La Cañada High School are not located within a 100-year flood plain and are not located in the vicinity of a dam or levees, the proposed project would not directly impede or redirect flood flows and would not expose people or structures to significant flood risks.

The project area and the affected La Cañada USD schools are not located in the vicinity of any bodies of water and, thus, the project area is not susceptible to inundation by a seiche or tsunami. The project area has the potential to experience inundation by mudflow since it is located near the steep undeveloped hillside areas of the San Gabriel Mountains. However, the proposed project does not involve any components that would exacerbate existing environmental conditions and, thus, would not increase the potential to expose people or structures to a significant risk of injury or damage from mudflow.

Residents within the project area would use existing roadways, bike lanes, sidewalks, crosswalks, and LCF Shuttle services within the developed portions of the City of La Cañada Flintridge to get to La Cañada USD schools. The use of these routes would not result in any indirect impacts related to hydrology and water quality. Therefore, no direct and indirect impacts related to hydrology and water quality would occur.

---

3.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community? ☐

b) Conflict with applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? ☐

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? ☐

a-c) No Impact. The project area, Palm Crest Elementary School, and La Cañada High School are located entirely within the City of La Cañada Flintridge. The project area is physically separated from the adjacent unincorporated La Crescenta – Montrose community by Pickens Canyon. Access to the La Crescenta – Montrose community is available on Foothill Boulevard and a pedestrian bridge at the western boundary of the project area, immediately south of Mountain Avenue Elementary School. With implementation of the proposed project, access to the adjacent community would remain at Foothill Boulevard and the pedestrian bridge. The proposed project does not involve any components that would physically separate the affected La Cañada USD schools from its community. The proposed project is not expected to separate uses and would not disrupt access between land use types. Thus, the proposed project is not expected to physically divide an established community.

The project area consists of approximately 85 percent residential uses, six percent commercial uses, and nine percent of other uses (such as institutional and utilities). The project area is primarily developed with single-family residential uses, with clusters of commercial uses and multi-family housing along and within 700 feet of Foothill Boulevard, respectively. According to the City of La Cañada Flintridge General Plan Land Use Element, the project area mostly has a land use designation of Low Density Residential. Properties within the project area also have a General Plan land use designation of Very Low Density Residential, Hillside Residential, Medium Density Residential, High Density Residential, Public, Open Space, Mixed Use, Commercial/Office, and Institutional. The properties within the project area are primarily zoned as Single-Family Residential (R-1). In addition, the project area also has parcels that are zoned as Multi-Family (R-3), Mixed Use, Public/Semi-Public (PS), Foothill Community Development (FCD), and Open Space (OS). Palm Crest Elementary School and La Cañada High School have a General Plan land use designation of Public and are zoned PS. The proposed project does not involve any components that would directly conflict with the city’s General Plan or zoning.

No habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan have been prepared for the project area or the affected La Cañada USD schools. Thus, the proposed project is not expected to directly conflict with any of these plans. With implementation of the proposed project, school-age children within the project area would primarily attend Palm Crest Elementary School and La Cañada High School within the La Cañada USD. Residents within the project area would use existing roadways, bike lanes, sidewalks, crosswalks, and LCF Shuttle services within the developed portions of the City of La Cañada Flintridge to get to these schools. The use of these routes would not result in any indirect impacts to land use and planning. Therefore, no direct and indirect impacts on land use and planning are expected.
3.11 MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:
   a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? ☐
   b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? ☐

   a-b) No Impact. The project area, the affected La Cañada USD schools, and its vicinity are not located within a mapped mineral producing area as classified by the California Geological Survey, and no mining activities occur in the project area and the affected La Cañada USD schools. The proposed project does not involve components that would have a direct impact on mineral resources. Furthermore, residents within the project area would use existing roadways, bike lanes, sidewalks, and crosswalks within the developed portions of the City of La Cañada Flintridge to get to La Cañada USD schools. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to have indirect impacts on mineral resources. No direct and indirect impacts related to mineral resources would occur.
3.12 NOISE - Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise in levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

b) Exposure of people to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

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

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

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

a-f) **No Impact.** The city’s community noise ordinance, codified in Title 5, Chapter 5.02 of the Municipal Code, regulates persistent and temporary noise. Any project-related activities would be required to comply with this noise ordinance and, thus, the proposed project would not expose persons to noise in excess of standards and temporary increases in noise. Additionally, the proposed project does not involve components that would generate excessive groundborne vibration. The nearest airport to the proposed project area is located approximately seven miles to the west. Thus, the proposed project would not result in the exposure of persons to airport-related noise.

The proposed project would change pick-up and drop-off routes and associated roadway noise. According to the California Department of Transportation Technical Noise Supplement, a doubling of traffic volumes is typically needed to sustain an audible increase in mobile noise. The Mobility Issues Review (see Appendix A) identified that the proposed project would incrementally increase vehicle trips to and from Palm Crest Elementary School and La Cañada High School, which would incrementally increase localized roadway traffic congestion and intersection/driveway queuing during peak morning and afternoon traffic generating periods for the two schools. Palm Crest Elementary is expected to receive an additional 146 a.m. peak hour trips and 74 p.m. peak hour trips; La Cañada High School is anticipated to receive an additional 112 a.m. peak hour trips and 64 p.m. peak hour trips. These additional
trips would be distributed throughout the roadway network in the project area, are not anticipated to double traffic volumes, and are not likely to result in a significant increase in noise levels on local roadways. Queuing on Palm Drive, Foothill Boulevard, and the Oak Grove Drive/Berkshire Place intersection would not significantly increase noise levels on those streets. This is because the majority of mobile noise can be attributed to vehicles pushing air out of their path as they pass at high speeds, which would not be the case for the identified roadways. Vehicles queuing along these roadways would be stopped or travelling at low speeds, which generates limited amounts of noise levels, mostly related to engine idling. Therefore, the proposed project would not increase community noise levels due to redistribution of student trips and mobile noise.

It is also likely some students within the project area would walk or bike to school. Students and parents walking or biking to school may generate noise associated with communication. In social situations, people often speak at distances of approximately 3 to 13 feet. A typical voice level at 13 feet is approximately 50 dBA.¹² This noise level is consistent with daytime ambient noise levels typical to residential communities and would be below the noise level limits established by the City of La Cañada Flintridge. Section 5.02.100 of the City of La Cañada Flintridge Municipal Code limits daytime noise levels to 60 dBA (L_{eq}) in single-family residential areas, 65 dBA (L_{eq}) in multi-family residential areas, and 70 dBA (L_{eq}) in commercial areas. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly increase community noise, and no impact related to noise would occur.

3.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:

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

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

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

a-c) No Impact. The project area consists of an established residential neighborhood with mostly single-family homes, with clusters of multi-family residential housing and townhomes located within 700 feet of Foothill Boulevard. The project area has a total of approximately 720 single-family residential properties, 68 townhomes, and 180 multi-family residential units. The proposed project does not include any components that would directly displace housing in the area and would not induce population growth. Furthermore, residents within the project area would use existing roadways, bike lanes, sidewalks, crosswalks, and LCF Shuttle services within the developed portions of the City of La Cañada Flintridge to get to La Cañada USD schools. Using existing roadways, bike lanes, sidewalks, and crosswalks would not result in any indirect impacts to population and housing. Therefore, no direct and indirect impacts related to population and housing would occur.

13 The 720 single-family residential properties include 41 vacant parcels that are zoned for single-family residential uses and, thus, could potentially be developed with single-family residential homes in the future. Any population change associated with development of these properties would be within the City’s growth projections since these properties are zoned as and has a General Plan land use designation of residential.
3.14 PUBLIC SERVICES - Would the project:
a) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:
   i) Fire protection?  
   ii) Police protection?  
   iii) Schools?  
   iv) Parks?  
   v) Other public facilities (including roads)?

---

a.i-v) Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The Los Angeles County Fire Department provides fire services, and the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department provides law enforcement services to the project area. As discussed in Section 3.13, Population and Housing, the proposed project would not increase the population and, therefore, would not increase demands on existing fire and police protection services, which are already in place and serve the properties within the project area, Palm Crest Elementary School, and La Cañada High School.

As previously discussed in Section 2.3, 356 students within the project area were enrolled in Glendale USD schools during the 2016-2017 school year. With implementation of the proposed project, these students would be given the option to attend Palm Crest Elementary School and La Cañada High School (and a potential loss of the same amount to the affected Glendale USD schools). It is possible that some of the students who are currently enrolled in Glendale USD schools would choose to remain in those schools or that some students within the project area that are currently attending private schools may decide to enroll in La Cañada USD schools if the proposed transfer of territory is approved. It is also possible that more families with school-age children may move into the project area and enroll in La Cañada USD schools, resulting in a larger number of school-age children than existing conditions.

To estimate the amount of school-age children that would likely enroll in La Cañada USD schools with implementation of the proposed project, the following analysis estimates the total number of school age children that could be generated based on the total number of existing residential properties, townhomes, and multi-family residential units. The project area currently has 968 residential units.

14 Assuming a student generation factor of 0.7 per residential unit, it is assumed that the project area has the potential

---

14 A few single-family residential properties in the project area are vacant. These vacant parcels are included in this number since there is a potential that these parcels would be developed with single-family residential uses in the future.
to generate approximately 678 students.\textsuperscript{15} According to kidsdata.org, approximately 85 percent of the child population within the City of La Cañada Flintridge attends public schools.\textsuperscript{16} Based on this information, it is estimated that approximately 576 of the 678 students within the Project Area would attend La Cañada USD schools, of which 165 students within the project area are currently attending La Cañada USD schools on permit. Thus, a total of approximately 411 students would attend La Cañada USD schools with implementation of the proposed project. Currently, approximately 53 percent of the student population within the project area attends elementary school and 47 percent of the student population attends middle and high schools in Glendale USD. Assuming a similar distribution of students with implementation of the proposed project, approximately 218 students would attend Palm Crest Elementary School and 193 students would attend La Cañada High School.

Table 3-2 summarizes the number of additional students that would be generated by the proposed project. La Cañada USD prepared a Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP), which is a three-year plan that outlines the school district’s priorities and vision for students. The LCAP provides strategies and objectives that support each of the identified priorities. The LCAP has set a goal of reducing and/or maintaining TK-3 class size at 22:1 or smaller, grades 4-6 class size to 30:1, and 5\textsuperscript{th} grade English language arts and math class sizes to 26:1. These class size limits were used to determine the school capacity of Palm Crest Elementary School and La Cañada High School. As shown in Table 3-2, with implementation of the proposed project, Palm Crest Elementary School and La Cañada High School would not be able to meet the LCAP class size goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing 2016-2017 Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Additional Students with Proposed Project</th>
<th>Total Number of Students with Proposed Project</th>
<th>School Capacity LCAP (1/4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palm Crest Elementary School (TK-6)</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Cañada High School (7-12)</td>
<td>2,085</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>2,278</td>
<td>2,106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{1/4} Grades TK-3 capacity is based on a student-teacher ratio of 22:1 for grades K-3 and 30:1 for grades 4-8, per La Cañada USD Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP). The LCAP aims to reduce 5\textsuperscript{th} grade English language arts and math class sizes to 26:1. For the purposes of calculating school capacity, this ratio is applied to all classes in La Cañada High School.


To meet the class size goal identified in the LCAP, Mitigation Measure PS-1 would require that portable classrooms be installed at Palm Crest Elementary School and La Cañada High School. With implementation of this mitigation measure, a less-than-significant impact is anticipated. It should be noted, however, that the installation of portable classrooms would reduce the amount of open space areas, particularly playing fields, available within the affected schools.

With implementation of the proposed project, it is possible that a new school may need to be constructed, or major renovation at Palm Crest Elementary School and La Cañada High School may be required in the future to accommodate the additional students. However, there is no certainty that the proposed project would be approved and, during the preparation of this IS/MND, La Cañada USD has not proposed any renovation plans, has not identified any new school location(s), and has not approved any renovation plans or a new school for future construction. Thus, it would be speculative to assume that major renovations at the affected La Cañada USD schools or construction of a new school would occur. Any major renovation or new school construction that are proposed in the future would require separate

\textsuperscript{15} Student generation factor was obtained from the Glendale USD, Level I Developer Fee Study for Glendale Unified School District, April 4, 2016.

\textsuperscript{16} Lucille Packard Foundation for Children’s Health, kidsdata.org, accessed February 27, 2018.
environmental review at the time those actions are proposed to determine whether potentially significant impacts would occur.

The parks and recreational facilities within the City of La Cañada Flintridge serve the project area. Residents within the project area are also located near parks in the adjacent unincorporated La Crescenta – Montrose community. The nearest park in the adjacent La Crescenta – Montrose community is approximately 0.5 miles from the project area westerly boundary. The proposed project is not expected to increase population and housing and, thus, is not expected to increase demand on existing parks and recreational facilities, as well as other public facilities.

Residents within the project area would use existing roadways, bike lanes, sidewalks, crosswalks, and LCF Shuttle services to get to La Cañada USD schools. Use of these existing routes is not expected to directly or indirectly impact public services. Therefore, no impact related to fire protection, police protection, and parks would occur. A less-than-significant impact with implementation of Mitigation Measure PS-1 is anticipated for schools.

**Mitigation Measure**

**PS-1** To accommodate the additional students from the project area, portable classrooms shall be placed on the campuses of Palm Crest Elementary School and La Cañada High School.
3.15 RECREATION - Would the project:

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

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

a-b) No Impact. There are no recreational facilities within the project area. As discussed in Section 3.14, Public Services, the proposed project would not increase population in the project area and, thus, is not expected to increase demand on existing recreational facilities. Implementation of the proposed project does not involve components that would have a direct impact on the recreational facilities. Additionally, residents within the project area would use existing roadways, bike lanes, sidewalks, crosswalks, and LCF Shuttle services to get to La Cañada USD schools. Use of these facilities is not expected to indirectly impact public services. Therefore, no impact related to recreation would occur.
3.16 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC - Would the project:

| a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-Than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |

| b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-Than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |

| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-Than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |

| d) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-Than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |

| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-Than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |

| f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-Than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |

a-f) Less-Than-Significant Impact. A Mobility Issues Review has been prepared by KOA on April 3, 2018 for the proposed project. The following is a summary of this report, which can be found in Appendix A of this IS/MND. KOA conducted traffic circulation monitoring in the vicinity of Palm Crest Elementary School and La Cañada High School during the peak morning and afternoon periods based on published bell schedules. Traffic conditions during pick-up and drop-off periods for Palm Crest Elementary School were observed on February 7 and 8, 2018. Traffic conditions during pick-up and drop-off periods for La Cañada High School were observed on February 8 and February 14, 2018.

The following summarizes site pick-up and drop-off operations and nearby roadway operations monitoring at Palm Crest Elementary School:
Site Operations
- The pick-up/drop-off zone is located within the school site, within the parking lot on west side of Palm Drive.
- Parents can drop off between 7:55 a.m. and 8:10 a.m., and this creates some staggering of arrival times, reducing congestion versus the afternoon pick-up period.
- Within the existing valet parking zone, parents and designated aids open curb-side doors for students, in order to help the flow of traffic during AM hours.
- Some parents drop-off and pick-up students on side streets, such as Palm Drive and Lyans Drive.

Roadway Characteristics and Operations
- A crossing guard is stationed at the adjacent corner at 7:30 a.m. for approximately one hour.
- A crossing guard is present at the southwest corner of the Jessen Drive/Palm Drive/Fairmont Avenue intersection.
- Based on conversations with the crossing guard, it was found that, once a month, traffic congestion can increase greatly on collaboration days, where all students come in at 8:15 a.m. and students are all released at 11:30 a.m.
- Hillard Avenue does not have existing sidewalks.
- Palm Drive has existing sidewalks on the west side of the roadway only.

Queues
- Approximately 15 vehicles were queued from the drop-off point at 8:05 a.m.
- The typical queuing lengths on northbound Palm Drive found during the afternoon were as follows. This represents the peak queue seen in the field:
  - 2:33 p.m. 3 cars
  - 2:45 p.m. 30 cars
  - 2:59 p.m. approximately 40-45 cars
- The northbound queue caused by inbound traffic can extend to Ravista Lane, at the intersection to the south of the school.

The following summarizes pick-up and drop-off operations and nearby roadway operations monitoring at La Cañada High School:

Site Operations
- Three lanes are provided for drivers to pick-up students adjacent to the school, on the west side of Oak Grove Drive.
- There is localized congestion in the school parking lot, as parents wait for students who depart the campus at various times throughout the peak period.
- At the north side of the school is a Child Educational Center (140 Foothill Boulevard), which generates additional traffic in the local area.
- A high proportion of students enter the campus through the parking lot at the northeast corner of the campus, walking in and driving in, whether dropped off by parents or other students.
- A curbside drop-off area is present on Oak Grove Drive for southbound traffic, but it appears to be used primarily for parking.
- Many parents drop-off and pick-up students across Oak Grove Drive from La Cañada High School, at the Hahamongna Watershed Park. These drivers then exit via left-turn movements onto Oak Grove Drive to return to the direction they came. This activity can often cause localized traffic delays and conflicts.
- LCF Shuttle, which provides service within the Foothill Boulevard corridor, picks up students along Oak Grove Drive.
- Cones are set up adjacent to the school curb parking area to prevent vehicles from parking within the LCF Shuttle stop.
**Roadway Characteristics and Operations**
- A crossing guard is present at the northwest corner of the Viro Road/Foothill Boulevard intersection.
- The east side of the Oak Grove Drive roadway has no existing sidewalk, but no active land uses are located on that side of the roadway, outside of the park.
- The intersection of Viro Road/ Foothill Boulevard has a crossing guard present, controlling the west leg (from 7:20 a.m. to 8:35 a.m.) and in the afternoon (from 1:45 p.m. to 3:45 p.m.).

**Queues**
- During the peak of the pick-up period, vehicle queuing is present from the school frontage on Foothill Blvd back onto Oak Grove Drive.
- At the Oak Grove Drive/Foothill Blvd. intersection, a peak vehicle queue of at least 40 vehicles extends past Dalridge Road on Foothill Boulevard.
- A queue of at least 10 vehicles occurs at the entrance to the southern campus parking lot, which appeared to be students driving in and parking,
- A queue of at least 10 vehicles was present in the northbound direction, attempting to make left-turn movements into the site pick-up/drop-off area queue.
- At the Oak Grove Drive/Berkshire Boulevard intersection, there is a queue of northbound vehicles during the peak, and a queue of vehicles making left turn onto northbound Oak Grove Drive.
- There is heavy traffic on Oak Grove Drive and Foothill Boulevard, resulting from a combination of traffic from parents dropping off kids at St. Francis High School, the Child Education Center, and those commuting to JPL at the north end of Oak Grove Drive.
- Eastbound left-turn queuing at the Viro Road/ Foothill Boulevard intersection is pronounced due to high conflicting westbound through movements, and vehicles that do not make the left-turn movement often stop within the crosswalk (at the west leg).
- Oak Grove Drive/Foothill Boulevard intersection queuing:
  - At 2:59 p.m., 15 vehicles were observed in a queue on Foothill Boulevard, waiting to make a right turn on red movement onto Oak Grove Drive.
  - At 3:20 p.m., 20 vehicles were observed queuing at this same location, backing up close to the Viro Road/Foothill Boulevard intersection onto Oak Grove Drive.
- Berkshire Place/Oak Grove Drive intersection queuing:
  - Vehicle queuing averages eight to ten vehicles on Oak Grove Drive (southbound direction toward pick-up area).

With implementation of the proposed project, the number of students at Palm Crest Elementary School is anticipated to increase by 218, and the number of students at La Cañada High School is anticipated to increase by 193. **Table 3-3** summarizes the additional vehicle trips that would be generated with implementation of the proposed project.

The number of AM and PM peak hour vehicle trips would increase by 146 and 74, respectively, at Palm Crest Elementary School and by 112 and 64, respectively, at La Cañada High School. The increases in vehicle trips to and from the two campuses would incrementally increase localized peak-period roadway traffic congestion and intersection/driveway queuing. Traffic peaks for school facilities are short in nature, however, and are not normally sustained for a full hour or more, such as for other major land uses and transportation facilities. Peak conditions for schools generally last for 15 to 30 minutes, and a less intense peak period may bracket that higher peak time period.
The incremental effects on traffic conditions could cause the following to occur:

- At Palm Crest Elementary School, Palm Drive – The northbound left-turn vehicle queue into campus could increase during peak times, which would extend beyond Revista Lane (as it does under existing conditions) but would not likely reach the next intersection at Orchard Lane and cause blockages there.
- At La Cañada High School, Foothill Boulevard – The eastbound vehicle queue on Foothill Boulevard for vehicles entering the campus would not likely extend to the next intersection at Crown Avenue.
- At La Cañada High School, Oak Grove Drive/Berkshire Place intersection – Traffic queuing at the southbound through and the northbound left-turn movements of this intersection would not likely increase in a significant manner, where the resulting queues would affect other intersections.

Pedestrian and bicycle trips to and from the school sites are not particularly high under existing conditions. Based on both existing activity and the distance of the transferred students from their places of residences, the proposed project is not expected to significantly increase these types of trips. Both schools have crossing guard control at intersections that provide connections to and from adjacent neighborhoods. As discussed above, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact with regards to traffic circulation.

Although the traffic conditions review for the proposed project does not identify any potential for significant impacts from the proposed project, traffic monitoring should occur after the transfer takes place to verify these estimates.

La Cañada USD should coordinate with the City Engineer to conduct monitoring of conditions, with initial monitoring occurring beyond two weeks from the start of school with the transferred students. Monitoring should occur in the fall and spring seasons, and the following should be observed:

- Vehicle queuing patterns on roadways leading to the school sites and at nearby intersections to see if average queues increase beyond those identified in the Mobility Issues Review.
- Significant pedestrian and bicycle activity occurring within peak-period vehicle-congested local roadway corridors.

If changes in traffic and circulation patterns are identified beyond those documented within the Mobility Issues Review, the following measures should be undertaken to reduce vehicle travel to and from the school sites:
- Promote carpooling through incentives and monitoring;
- Promote transit use where transit access is viable, such as the high school site, through incentives and monitoring; and
- Promote walking for those students with residences within 1.0 to 1.5 miles of the school site.

**TABLE 3-3: ADDITIONAL VEHICLE TRIPS WITH PROPOSED PROJECT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITE Code</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Trip Ends Basis/Intensity</th>
<th>Daily Total</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour Total</th>
<th>In</th>
<th>Out</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour Total</th>
<th>In</th>
<th>Out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITE Code</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Trips</th>
<th>AM Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>Palm Crest</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>La Cañada</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The peak hour is analyzed as "peak of generator," which is the peak time for the school, not the peak evening commute time.

A CMP analysis is typically conducted at specific CMP monitoring locations when a project would add 150 or more vehicle trips during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours. As presented in Table 3-3, above, the proposed project would generate less than 150 vehicle trips during the AM and PM peak hours. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated on CMP monitoring locations.

The proposed project is not located in the vicinity of an airport and does not involve any activities that would have an effect on air traffic patterns. The proposed project does not involve any physical changes and, thus, would not increase hazards and would not result in inadequate emergency access. Residents within the project area would use existing roadways, bike lanes, sidewalks, crosswalks, and LCF Shuttle services within the developed portions of the City of La Cañada Flintridge to get to La Cañada USD schools. Thus, the proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. The proposed project would have no impact on air traffic patterns; traffic hazards; emergency access; and public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.
3.17 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?

b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

a-b) No Impact. The proposed project involves transferring territory from Glendale USD to La Cañada USD. No construction or excavation activities would occur, and the proposed project does not include components that would have a direct impact on tribal cultural resources. Therefore, no impacts related to tribal cultural resources would occur.
### 3.18 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resource, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the projects projected demand in addition to the providers existing commitments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the projects solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a-g) No Impact.** The properties within the proposed transfer territory are generally developed with single-family homes, multi-family residential housing, and commercial uses. The project area also includes some undeveloped hillside areas. Utility service systems are already in place and serve the developed portions of the project area, Palm Crest Elementary School and La Cañada High School. Water, wastewater, stormwater drainage, and solid waste services would not be directly affected as a result of the proposed project as implementation of the proposed project would not increase population and, thus, would not increase demands on existing utilities and service systems. Additionally, residents within the project area would use existing roadways, bike lanes, sidewalks, crosswalks, and LCF Shuttle services to get to La Cañada USD schools. Use of these facilities is not expected to indirectly impact utilities and service systems. Therefore, no impact related to utilities and service systems would occur.
3.19 **Mandatory Findings of Significance** - Would the project:

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

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

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

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

a-c) **No Impact.** As discussed above, the proposed project is not expected to result in an increase population. The project area is nearly fully developed. The properties within the project area are generally developed with single-family homes, multi-family residential housing, and commercial uses. Although some undeveloped hillside areas are located within the project area, access to La Cañada USD schools is not available through these undeveloped areas. Residents within the project area would use existing roadways, bike lanes, sidewalks, crosswalks, and LCF Shuttle services within the developed portions of the City of La Cañada Flintridge to get to La Cañada USD schools. Therefore, the proposed project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, would not modify any natural habitat for wildlife species, would not adversely affect fish and wildlife population, would not adversely affect plant species, and would not eliminate any cultural resources.

Although development projects may be constructed in the vicinity of the project area, the proposed project would not contribute to cumulative impacts. As previously discussed in Section 3.14, Public Services, it is possible that a new school may need to be constructed, or major renovation at Palm Crest Elementary School and La Cañada High School may be required in the future to accommodate the additional students. However, it would be speculative to assume that these actions would occur since it is uncertain whether the proposed project would be approved and no renovation plans or new schools have been identified, proposed, or approved. Further, as discussed throughout this IS/MND, the proposed project would not have any substantial adverse impacts on human beings either directly or indirectly. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would occur.
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APPENDIX A
Mobility Issues Review
### Fee Estimate - Cost Summary

**3/22/2018**

#### Cost Items

Based on similar projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Direct Cost</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portable Building - 60x32</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$253,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cost from Silver Creek Budgetary Proposal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Site Work - Building & Misc

- Concrete Foundation & related site work $30,000
- Parking Striping and Signage - $0.25/ft $1,525
- Restroom Accessory Upgrades - $1000 LS $1,000
- Locker Relocation & Installation $5,000

**Total:** $37,525

#### Site Work - Civil

- Site Clearing / Demolition $5,000
- Earthwork & Excavation $35,000
- Concrete area = 2390 sf @ 59/lf $21,510
- Site Stairs @ $50/LF x 48 LF $2,400
- Stair Handrails @ $113/LF x 26 LF $2,990
- Storm drain 13.6 lf (6") @ $40/LF $5,440
- 9" Square area drain 4 ea @ $250/EA $1,000
- Cleanouts 3 ea @ $669/ea $2,007

**Total:** $75,347

#### Site Electrical / Comm / IT

(Preliminary estimate) $38,000

#### Fire Protection Design

(Preliminary estimate) $10,000

**Total: $160,872**

#### Construction Mark-ups

- Bonds and Insurance 2.50%
- General Conditions 8.50%
- Contractor Overhead and Profit 7.00%

**2 - Site Construction Costs**

$191,433

**Total Cost (with Markups)**

$444,502
## Fee Estimate - Cost Summary

**3/22/2018**

### Cost Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Based on similar projects</th>
<th>Direct Cost</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Portable Building - 120x32

Cost from Silver Creek Budgetary Proposal

$489,997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Work - Building &amp; Misc</th>
<th>$47,970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation &amp; related site work</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Stripping and Signage - $0.25/sf</td>
<td>$1,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom Accessory Upgrades - $1000 LS</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Site Work - Civil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Clearing &amp; Demolition</th>
<th>$10,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earthwork &amp; Excavation</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete area = 2,330 sf @ $9/sf</td>
<td>$20,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12&quot;x12&quot; Catch Basins 2 ea @ $275/sf</td>
<td>$550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Electrical / Comm / IT</th>
<th>$100,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary estimate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire Protection Design</th>
<th>$20,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary estimate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Mark-ups</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonds and Insurance</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Overhead and Profit</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Site Construction Costs

$290,937

| Total Cost (with Markups) | $780,934 |
APPENDIX C
August 16, 2019

VIA EMAIL & CERTIFIED MAIL

Members of Los Angeles County Committee on
School District Organization
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242-2890

Re: Glendale Unified School District’s Supplemental Letter in Opposition to the Proposed Territory Transfer

Dear County Committee Members:

The Glendale Unified School District ("GUSD") hereby submits this supplemental letter ("Letter") in opposition to Petitioners’ letter dated January 9, 2019 ("Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter"), and more generally, to the “Petition” seeking to “Transfer” a portion of the GUSD’s “Territory” located in the City of La Cañada Flintridge ("LCF") to La Cañada Unified School District ("LCUSD"). GUSD and LCUSD are collectively referred to herein as the “Districts.” All facts, points, and concerns that GUSD has previously expressed on each Condition remain valid and of utmost importance to GUSD. This letter only provides rebuttal and new information in support of denying the Petition.

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.

Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter raises arguments in the context of each of the nine (9) Conditions enumerated in Education Code § 35753.1 Petitioners are wrong—nearly all Conditions are not substantially met:

- **Condition 2 (Community identity):** The exclusion of Territory students from the LCF Community conclusively demonstrates that the Territory does not have a substantial community identity with LCF. The Committee is not tasked with fixing fractured cities.

- **Condition 3 (Equitable division of property):** As a proper factor for consideration, significant bonding capacity to the tune of **$12 million** would be torn from GUSD.

---

1 Condition 1 in Education Code § 35753(a)(1) is not disputed.
• **Condition 4 (Discrimination/segregation):** LCUSD does not promote diversity to the extent GUSD does, as exemplified by the breadth and success of GUSD’s English Learners’ program.

• **Condition 5 (Increased state costs):** Having exhausted its local sources of revenue, LCUSD hinted in bond propaganda that it will seek state funding, which is all that is left to accommodate the Transfer.

• **Condition 6 (Disruption of GUSD programs):** The loss of a substantial number of students at each of the three serving schools, Territory parent support, and enrollment revenue, all conspire to disrupt GUSD programs at these schools. At a minimum, the loss of Territory talent would erode the richness of these programs, which in itself is disruption, even if not quantifiable.

• **Condition 7 (Significant school facility costs):** LCUSD’s classroom crisis can only be remedied by adding new facilities to accommodate the Transfer that would be at significant expense.

• **Condition 8 (Increased property values):** Given that an overwhelming majority of those who signed the Petition have no children in GUSD schools, coupled with the lucrative prospect of increasing their depressed property values, it is rather easily inferred that the Petition is truly engineered to increase their property values.

• **Condition 9 (Significant GUSD financial impact):** The Transfer will cause the loss of per-pupil funding, charitable contributions, and involvement of Territory parents in an annual amount not less than $2.7 million, which cannot be curtailed by cost reductions. Expenses are not linear with respect to revenue losses. The resulting financial impact of several millions of dollars annually to GUSD is nothing but significant.

As described in detail below, Petitioners’ mere desire for the Transfer would be harmful to GUSD, would increase public costs to LCUSD, and would disrupt district integrity for the simple goal of raising Petitioners’ and signatories’ property values. Petitioners’ desire for the Transfer does not translate into a need for the Transfer.

II. **INTRODUCTION.**

A. **Failed Prior Transfer Attempts.**

Petitioners reference prior transfer attempts to support their Petition, but fail to acknowledge that these were ultimately denied by such respected entities as the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (“Committee”), Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, Los Angeles County Board of Education, State Board of Education (“SBE”), County of Los Angeles Superior Court, and the Court of Appeal for the Second Appellate District.

Following an unsuccessful 1961 petition, a 1979 petition was denied by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, per the Los Angeles County Board of Education’s recommendation.
A 1992 petition was denied on appeal by the SBE. (1993 SBE Agenda and Minutes, pp. 11-12; Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, p. 3.) Petitioners claim, “The [SBE’s] Administrative Committee’s recommendation [to deny the Petition] . . . caused significant confusion to the appeals process at that time.” (Ibid.) Petitioners’ argument is unsubstantiated and directly contradicts the Los Angeles Superior Court’s determination, which states:

“Here, the court concludes that by any applicable standard, the petition should be denied. The action of the State Board was neither arbitrary nor capricious and was supported by ample evidence. In short, there was no abuse of discretion. The GUSD’s position and support are clearly documented in the administrative record. (See, e.g., A.R. 372-483: 484-520.) Moreover, the Board had requested the administrative record, including the transcripts of public hearings (A.R. 580) and itself conducted public hearings. (A.R. 815-850.) Finally, the Board had before it the report of the Committee which included detailed information regarding the two school systems. (A.R. 31-322.) This court has reviewed the record and, consistent with the limits upon the breadth of its review, concludes the evidence was more than sufficient to warrant the State Board’s action…¶ The court concludes the State Board acted within the scope of its delegated authority, it employed fair procedures, and its action was reasonable.” (Burch v. Cal. State Bd. of Ed. (1997) Case No. BS034463; p. 5, ¶¶ 10-19; p. 7, ¶¶ 9-10, emph. added.)

The Court of Appeal for the Second Appellate District affirmed the superior court’s denial of the 1992 petition. (Ex. 225, Burch Court of Appeal Judgment, pp. 15-16.)

B. There Is No Compelling Academic Need for the Transfer.

Territory students are excelling at GUSD and their parents are very involved in GUSD schools. Petitioners admit this by stating, “A 2012 research study funded by the U.S. Department of Education, ‘Raising All Boats: Identifying and Profiling High-Performing California School Districts’ identified both LCUSD and GUSD as among the 30 highest performing K-12 districts in California.” (Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, p. 15.) This conclusively demonstrates no need for a Transfer. Even so, Petitioners, who have no students in GUSD schools, seek to pull other parents’ children out of GUSD schools and force them in LCUSD so that Petitioners can increase their property values and satisfy their noneducational desires.

Committee staff (“Staff”) also found no compelling educational reason for the Transfer. (Ex. 241, Staff Report February 10, 2017, p. 12.) Petitioners try to deflect by contending that the Conditions do “not address nor require a determination for a ‘compelling academic need’ for a transfer[.]” (Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, p. 20.) The Los Angeles Superior Court unequivocally rejected this argument before, stating:

“Petitioners have placed great emphasis on the comments by one of the State Board member’s statements that she felt approval of the reorganization had to be based upon what she variously described as a ‘compelling interest’ (A.R. 855, 856, 861) or an ‘educationally compelling’ reason. (A.R. 861.) Petitioners argue that these
criteria are not included in section 35753 and, therefore, their application vitiates the State Board’s action. The court disagrees for three reasons.

First, as indicated above, the criteria enumerated in the section are merely the minimum threshold to permit approval of a district reorganization. Obviously, since the legislature said that if the requirements of the section are met, the State Board may, but need not, approve a reorganization, it contemplated that other factors might be evaluated by the State Board to approve or disapprove proposed district reorganizations on a case by case basis. Certainly, the issue of whether there are compelling reasons from an educational standpoint for a transfer seems to be very relevant to such an assessment. Indeed, arguably at least five of the nine criteria in section 35753 could be viewed as relating to the issue of whether a proposed reorganization of a district is supported by educationally compelling reasons. (Ed. Code § 35753 subdiv. (1), (3), (4), (6), (7), emph. added.)” (Burch v. Cal. State Bd. of Ed. (1997) Superior Case No. BS034463, p. 6, ¶ 10-25, emph. added.)

As discussed in GUSD’s September 6, 2018 letter to the Committee, Territory students enrolled in GUSD schools are thriving academically and in extracurricular programs. In addition to the documentation demonstrating the Territory’s academic excellence, more information continues to confirm this. In 2019, Rosemont Middle School (“RMS”) and Crescenta Valley High School (“CVHS”) were each honored as 2019 California Distinguished Schools, which are recognized by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction for “outstanding education programs and practices.” (CDE News Release 02-25-2019, pp. 1, 6 https://www.cde.ca.gov/nc/ce/aa/ds19.asp.) No LCUSD schools were named as California Distinguished Schools in 2019.


Unlike LCUSD, GUSD’s CVHS enrolls more than 300 students in the unique Academy of Science and Medicine (“ASM”) program, which “offers students the opportunity to explore different careers in the science, engineering and medical fields[,] . . . including medical biology, biotechnology, sports medicine, science research, emergency medical technology, robotics, and kinesiology” and grants GUSD students the opportunity to network with medical and science professionals in their workplaces. (Honing Skills in the Academy of Science and Medicine, CV Weekly, Oct. 18, 2018, pp. 1-2 https://www.crescentvalleyweekly.com/?s=honing+skills+in+the+academy+of+science+and+.)
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edicate.) This unique GUSD program assists students in achieving high honors in academics, participating in mentorships and internships that serve their GUSD community, and developing skills necessary for success in their future careers. (Id. at pp. 2, 4, 6-8.) All of this points to the conclusion that there is no academic need for the Transfer.

Thus, GUSD hereby respectfully requests that each Committee member disapprove the Transfer Petition based on these and the following Condition-specific reasons.

III. CONDITION 2.

“The school districts are each organized on the basis of a substantial community identity.” (Ed. Code, § 35753(a)(2).)

A. The Territory Does Not Have a Substantial Community Identity with LCF.

Petitioners argue that GUSD and Staff focus on the community identity of the current Districts, rather than whether the Transfer will negatively impact community identity of the resulting Districts after a Transfer. (Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, p. 6.) Petitioners criticize Staff’s analysis and determination that “an examination of the petition area does not indicate a substantially stronger community identity with the La Cañada USD than with the Glendale USD.” (Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, p. 8; citing Ex. 241, Staff Report February 10, 2017, pp. 3, 10.) Petitioners state, “[W]hat ‘examination’ did Staff perform to make this claim?” (Petitioners’ Letter, p. 8.)

In accordance with statutory requirements, Staff evaluated ample evidence provided by the Districts on the criteria necessary for this Condition, including “isolation; geography; distance between social centers; distance between school centers; topography; weather; community, school, and social ties; and other circumstances peculiar to the area.” (Ex. 241, Staff Report February 10, 2017, p. 10.) For the purposes of Staff and Committee’s evaluation of Condition 2, GUSD provided nearly 100 pieces of compelling evidence, which assisted Staff’s determination that this Condition 2 was not substantially met. (See GUSD Transfer Opposition Letter 11-02-2016, pp. 4-19; GUSD Opposition Letter to Petitioners’ Brief 04-26-2017, pp. 8-13; GUSD Supplemental Letter in Opposition to the Proposed Territory Transfer 09-06-2018, pp. 2, 15-19; Exs. 1, 8-86, 217-28, 240-42, 262-64.)

Even Petitioners’ own actions prove this. Both Petitioners enrolled their children in GUSD schools and Petitioner Nalini Lasiewicz’s son graduated from CVHS. (Amirkhahian, School: ‘It’s Liberating and Exciting’, Glendale News-Press, Jun. 21, 2007 (Ms. Lasiewicz’ son [Evan] graduated in 2007 from CVHS more than eight years before this Petition was brought to the Committee, which raises the question of why Petitioner Lasiewicz did not seek to bring a Petition while her son was in school, especially when LCUSD denied her son’s transfer request)


Petitioners each benefit from their residence within GUSD and its welcoming community, as many generations of Territory families have before them. Petitioner Lasiewicz participated in the greater GUSD community by volunteering at a Glendale polling location for the Glendale General...

Petitioners point to a 2014 survey to contend that residents hold an affinity for LCUSD. (Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, p. 8.) The Staff already considered this evidence, and still urged the Committee to deem this condition not substantially met. (Id. at p. 12.) Petitioners ignore the fact that a 1997 survey indicated similar resident support for a Territory transfer, yet, the Court of Appeal still affirmed denial of a transfer. (Ex. 225, Burch Court of Appeal Judgment, pp. 10, 15, Memorandum, p. 1; Petitioners’ Ex. C148, City Survey of Sagebrush 1997, p. 8.)

Petitioners argue that the number of Territory students attending LCUSD schools on interdistrict permits supports its conclusion that the Territory’s community identity is aligned with LCUSD. (Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, p. 9.) To game the system, Petitioners engaged in an aggressive campaign to cajole Territory parents to transfer their children to LCUSD. In 2015, 2016, and 2018, Petitioners “crafted an outreach campaign with mailings, flyers, and visits to local preschools so that all new and current Sagebrush families would be ‘advised’ of the opportunity to apply for interdistrict permits to attend LCUSD in the 2016-17 school year.” (UniteLCF Campaign Updates https://unitelef.wordpress.com/uploads/; UniteLCF Update re LCUSD Permit Application Time.) Petitioners found their methods highly effective, stating, “Tabling, distributing flyers and informing the neighborhood residents through our mailing list helps over 60 Sagebrush students enroll in LCUSD, compared to only ten the year before.” (UniteLCF Campaign Updates https://unitelef.wordpress.com/uploads/)

In March 2018, former Chief Petitioner Tom Smith emailed Territory residents to pressure even more transfers. (UniteLCF Update re LCUSD Permit Application Time.) In his email, Mr. Smith stated, “Please help spread the word to new residents and neighbors who may not know that this window is the only time of the year Sagebrush families can apply to LCUSD. UniteLCF! is planning to host an informational session pertaining to the process for Sagebrush residents to apply for permits to have their children attend LCUSD schools. We will provide additional information as our plans solidify.” (Ibid.) In the same month, Petitioners distributed a flyer providing instructions on obtaining interdistrict permits. (Petitioners’ LCUSD Permit Flyer (Petitioners’ flyer also provided contact information for Petitioner Nick Karapetian’s partner, Stuart McKinney, to whom Territory parents could call with questions regarding interdistrict permits.) We urge the Committee to recognize this devious and unfair gamesmanship and discount the number of existing interdistrict transfers.
B. The Territory Does Not Have a Substantial Community Identity with the LCF Community.

Petitioners also argue that the Transfer will not negatively impact the Districts’ community identities after the Transfer. Condition 2 clearly focuses on the existing community identities of the school districts by phrasing the condition in present tense. Further, Petitioners’ own arguments for why it wants the Transfer demonstrates that if the Transfer were to occur, the Territory would not share community identity with the LCF community. In Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, they contend that the Petition should be approved to unite the “fractured community” of LCF, while simultaneously asserting that the LCF community is not fractured and is instead “uniting by common goals and purpose, . . . [unlike] GUSD[.]” (Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, pp. 5, 7, 8, 35.) Petitioners cannot have it both ways, and their previous arguments support the fact that the Territory does not have substantial community identity with the LCF/LCUSUSD community. From the beginning, Petitioners have consistently complained that the LCF community served by LCUSD excludes Territory students from “educational programs, partnerships, internships and scholarships.” (Petitioners’ December 12, 2016 Brief, p. 17; Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, p. 5 (“Territory families are simultaneously members of LCF yet excluded from the fabric of the community.”)) The refusal of the LCF/LCUSUSD community to acknowledge and provide all LCF residents with such benefits demonstrates an exclusionist community that does not commute with the Territory and essentially cries, “If you are not with us, you are against us.” This definitively shows the lack of substantial community identity with the LCF/LCUSUSD community. Petitioners’ desire to forcibly relocate Territory students to LCUSD is not in the students’ best interests, but in Petitioners’ who long to increase their property values and be members of the exclusive community.

Moreover, as Staff concluded, the Committee has no authority to remedy the LCF community’s bad acts. (Ex. 241, Staff Report February 10, 2017, pp. 10-11, emph. added.) To do so would only serve to reward bad behavior. Nor does the Committee have jurisdiction to fix or create substantial community identity where it does not exist.

C. LCUSD is Not Safer Than GUSD.

Although not a factor for determining whether Condition 2 is met, Petitioners continue to argue that the Transfer will provide “an appreciably safe environment for Territory students and their families during an emergency or crisis[.]” (Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, p. 36.) Petitioners obstinately reference Local Agency Formation Commission for Los Angeles County (“LAFCO”) sphere of influence maps for Glendale and LCF as the basis for its contention that “LCF was better equipped to rapidly and efficiently assist the impacted Territory residents” during natural disasters in 2009 and 2010. (Id. at pp. 7, 37.) The LAFCO sphere of influence maps cited by Petitioners are merely plans “for the probable physical and service area, for each city and special district in the County.” (LAFCO FAQs, p. 2, emph. added.) The maps do not prove community identity. More importantly, Staff conclusively denied Petitioners’ claim, stating, “Staff found no evidence that Glendale USD is more dangerous, or less well served by emergency services, than La Canada USD.” (Ex. 241, Staff Report February 10, 2017, p. 12, emph. added.)

Per the foregoing, Condition 2 has not been substantially met.
IV. CONDITION 3.

“The proposal will result in an equitable division of property and facilities of the original district or districts.” (Ed. Code, § 35753(a)(3).)

A. Bond Debt Is an Appropriate, Important Factor.

Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter contends that because the Transfer would not include the transfer of property or school facilities, this Condition “is generally a non-issue.” (Id. at p. 10.) Petitioners could not be more wrong. Per the Committee’s own policies on this Condition, the Committee considers, in pertinent part, “Bonded Indebtedness[,] provided for under EC §35570-§35579.” (Ex. 8, Policies of the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization, Appendix 4, pp. 2-3.) This is important because the bond liability is released on the transferred area: “When 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 and shall automatically assume its proportionate share of the outstanding bonded indebtedness of the district of which it becomes a part.” (Ed. Code, § 35575.) As a result, increasing bond debt on the remaining GUSD taxpayers is a relevant factor considered under Condition 3.

B. GUSD Will Suffer Significant Bond Impacts.

Petitioners argue that the Territory’s assessed valuation (“AV”) cannot be significant to GUSD, in comparison to GUSD’s overall AV, because it is only 1.85%. (Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, pp. 10-12.) The percentage may not be significant, but the dollar amount is. GUSD’s bonding consultant, Keygent, estimated that GUSD will currently lose $12 million in bonding capacity as a result of the Transfer. (Ex. 265, Keygent Email to S. Dickinson, Glendale USD – Sagebrush Portion of Bonding Capacity, Apr. 23, 2019.) This significantly impacts GUSD’s ability to renovate schools and replace outdated school facilities.

V. CONDITION 4.

“The reorganization of the school districts will preserve each affected district’s ability to educate pupils in an integrated environment and will not promote racial or ethnic discrimination or segregation.” (Ed. Code, § 35753(a)(4).)

Petitioners acknowledge that a 2012 U.S. Department of Education (“USDOE”) study “identified both LCUSD and GUSD as among the 30 highest performing K-12 districts in California.” (Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, p. 15; citing Raising All Boats: Identifying and Profiling High-Performing California School Districts, Appendix A, p. 26.) Of the 30 schools, GUSD was one of only six (6) schools featured in the study; LCUSD was not. (Id. at p. ii.) Important to the promotion of racial and ethnic equality, the study acknowledged that “a focus on English learners has been a priority for” GUSD. (Id. at p. 11.) The study revealed that 30% of GUSD’s students are English learners, compared to only 5% of LCUSD’s student body. (Id. at Appendix A, p. 26.)

Petitioners further contend that “English Learners are well provided for” in LCUSD. (Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, p. 15.) What Petitioners cannot dispute is that GUSD does it better. Of the LCUSD students that are English learners, only 19.9% were determined to be proficient in English
in 2017-18. (EdData, LCUSD District Profile http://www.ed-data.org/district/Los-Angeles/La-Canada-Unified.) In comparison, 31.3% of GUSD’s English learners were English proficient in 2017-18. (EdData, GUSD District Profile http://www.ed-data.org/district/Los-Angeles/Alhambra-Unified.) The success of English learners within GUSD is a testament to the commitment of GUSD’s Board, teachers, and staff to providing equal racial and ethnic opportunities to all GUSD students. (Exs. 97, GUSD Board Policy BP 6174, p. 1; 98, GUSD Pathways to Graduation, p. 7; 99, GUSD Parent Handbook 2016-2017, pp. 8, 14-15; 100, GUSD FLAG Programs, pp. 1-2, 4-6.) This evidence demonstrates that GUSD surpasses LCUSD when it comes to promoting racial and ethnic equality. Thus, the Transfer would not promote either racial or ethnic equality. Accordingly, Condition 4 has not been substantially met.

VI. 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.” (Ed. Code, § 35753(a)(5).)

A. Petitioners’ Misrepresentation.

Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter falsely alleges, “Both GUSD and Staff refer to GUSD’s loss of enrollment-based revenue as a cause of significant additional cost to the state.” (Id. at p. 16, emph. added.) GUSD’s opposition and supplemental letters set forth no such claim. Instead, GUSD’s September 2018 Supplemental Letter states that an analysis of GUSD’s finances “has no place in the analysis of this Condition 5, which focuses on significant costs to the State.” (GUSD Supplemental Letter in Opposition to the Proposed Territory Transfer 09-06-2018, pp. 9-10.)

B. The Transfer Would Result in Increased State Costs Due to LCUSD’s Inability to Accommodate Territory Students and Having Exhausted Local Funding.

Petitioners argue, “GUSD makes unfounded claims that LCUSD ‘undoubtedly needs to seek significant State funds’ to cover necessary facilities costs, which LCUSD has forcefully refuted.” (Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, p. 16.) GUSD has provided substantial evidence to show that LCUSD will require significant State funding. (GUSD Transfer Opposition Letter 11-02-2016, pp. 27-31; GUSD Supplemental Letter in Opposition to the Proposed Territory Transfer 09-06-2018, pp. 9-11; Exs. 1, 3-4, 8, 14, 35-39, 102-108, 240-42, 250, 252, 255.)

In an attempt to explain the deficiency between LCUSD’s estimated $251.9M facilities’ construction costs and LCUSD’s $149M school facilities bond, Petitioners claim “the $251.9 million amount was the visionary ‘wishlist’ amount identified by LCUSD’s Facilities Master Plan Committee as the initial step in its process to establish a fully vetted proposal for community buy-in and approval.” (Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, p. 18, emph. added.) Yet, the Master Plan makes no mention of a “wishlist,” nor does the LCUSD Resolution and Board Meeting Agenda for the adoption of the Master Plan. (Exs. 251, LCUSD Resolution No. 21-16-17; 252, LCUSD Facilities Master Plan June 2017: LCUSD Regular Board Meeting Agenda, Jun. 20, 2017 https://agendaonline.net/public/Meeting.aspx?AgencyID=80&MeetingID=40102&Agenc%E2%80%A6.) This is because it is not a “wishlist.”

Per the USDOE, a school master plan is not a wishlist, but is instead “the ‘blueprint’ for daily decision-making throughout a school district. It provides concrete documentation about the
organization's needs and intentions. Moreover, it is a formal way of communicating the
district’s priorities, and establishes necessary documentation for funding authorities
and other approving organizations.” (USDOE, National Center for Education Statistics, National Forum on

LCUSD’s Master Plan was developed, in pertinent part, according to formalized standards and
regulations, including California Code of Regulations, Title 5, section 14034, which references
The Guide for Planning Educational Facilities, published by the Council of Educational Facility
Planners. (Ex. 252, LCUSD Facilities Master Plan, June 2017, p. 24; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, §
14034.) The Guide for Planning Educational Facilities states:

“Master planning is a way of identifying the best route to the future through a
workable plan for handling priority-rated, predictable situations and anticipated
changes. A master plan defines ultimate goals and the facilities required to help
achieve the goals... If the facilities master plan reveals a need for facility
improvements or new construction, cost estimates are made. For most school
districts, the amount of money that can be spent on construction or modification is
determined by legal considerations, by the real or supposed willingness of citizens
to provide funds, by the availability of state or provincial monies, or by a
combination of methods.” (The Guide for Planning Educational Facilities, p. 45,
emph. added https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED344336.pdf.)

LCUSD’s Master Plan is a final, complete document, which was approved by LCUSD’s Board on
June 20, 2017. (LCUSD Regular Board Meeting Agenda, Jun. 20, 2017
80%A6.) The Master Plan expressly includes necessary costs for new classrooms and upgraded
facilities. (Ex. 252, LCUSD Facilities Master Plan June 2017, pp. 83-84.) The $251.9M amount
is the total construction project cost, which “includes the total costs to construct the project with
the following markups and soft costs applied to the construction unit costs.” (Id. at pp. 81-82.)
Thus, the Master Plan is not a wishlist, but is instead a blueprint that LCUSD will be taking all
steps to realize.

In addition, LCUSD anticipated that even with its $149M school facilities bond, it would still need
additional state funding. Prior to the school facilities bond election, LCUSD released a flyer,
which stated, “Funds from a local measure would help LCUSD qualify for State matching funds[.]”
(LCUSD Information About Proposed School Facilities Improvement Measure, emph. added
https://www.lcusd.net/apps/pages/index.jsp?uREC_ID=743931&type=d&pREC_ID=1154168.)
Moreover, it is undisputed that LCUSD will experience even further student growth from
accessory dwelling units (“ADUs”), which will exacerbate LCUSD’s classroom crisis.

As stated by Staff, LCUSD must be able “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.”
(Ex. 241, Staff Report February 10, 2017, p. 14.) However, “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).” (Id. at p. 23.) LCUSD’s Resolution only supports the Transfer so long as LCF, Territory residents, and LCUSD could agree upon “a financial mitigation strategy to 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.” (Ex. 4, LCUSD Resolution 5-16-17, emph added.)

Pursuant to the foregoing evidence, LCUSD will need State funding to accommodate the Territory students, which makes Condition 5 not substantially met.

VII. CONDITION 6.

“The proposed reorganization will continue to promote sound education performance and will not significantly disrupt the educational programs in the affected districts.” (Ed. Code, § 35753(a)(6).)

Petitioners falsely claim that GUSD “successfully maintained a four-year ‘improving trend’ of its enrollment through 2017-18[,]” to support its assertion that GUSD has experienced no harm from the current transfers to LCUSD and will not experience significant disruption to its educational programs in the future. (Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, p. 17.) In reality, GUSD’s enrollment has decreased for 18 of the past 19 years, resulting in a nearly 15% loss of enrollment since 1999. (GUSD K-12 Public School Enrollment, Cal. DOE, 1996-2018 [GUSD’s overall enrollment decreased from 30,374 in 1999-2000 to 26,071 in 2017-18].) In the 2018-19 academic year alone, GUSD lost 55 Territory students, including 38 from MAES, 9 from RMS, and 8 from CVHS. (First Interim Financial Report 12-11-18, p. 39 [https://www.gusd.net/cms/lib/CA01000648/Centricity/Domain/38/Board%20Report%20-%201st%20Interim%20Financial%20Report%2011-12-18.pdf].)

GUSD’s enrollment losses caused by Petitioners’ gamesmanship have already harmed GUSD, which will only be exacerbated by the Transfer. Such losses of enrollment, including “students who live in the Sagebrush area[,] will affect GUSD financially” in the future due to loss of average daily attendance (“ADA”). (O’Keefe, Superintendent Weighs In on Territory Transfer, Crescenta

Given the revenue loss inflicted by Petitioners’ wrongful transfer campaign and enrollment challenges, educational programs will suffer. Unfortunately, the exact significant impacts cannot be quantified at this time. As a result, Condition 6 has not been substantially met.

VIII. CONDITION 7.

“Any increase in school facilities costs as a result of the proposed reorganization will be insignificant and otherwise incidental to the reorganization.” (Ed. Code, § 35753(a)(7).)

A. LCUSD Has a Classroom Crisis and Cannot Immediately House Territory Students.

Petitioners argue that LCUSD has the capacity to accommodate the Territory students without increased facilities costs. As support, Petitioners’ claim that LCUSD enrolled 181 new non-resident permit students, including 50 Territory students, in 2018-2019, without incurring a significant increase in school facilities costs. (Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, p. 23.) However, Petitioners fail to provide any evidence backing this bold statement. Moreover, existing transfers are but the tip of the iceberg. LCUSD enrollment is swelling and will accelerate even more by the influx of ADUs. The Transfer will only exacerbate LCUSD’s classroom crisis.
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=2017-18.) As Petitioners acknowledge, LCUSD has employed a non-resident permitting process intended to maintain enrollment up to 4,150 students. (Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, p. 23.) However, as of the 2017-218 school year, LCUSD was already enrolling 4,167 students, exceeding its goal enrollment. (Ibid.)

At just one of LCUSD’s elementary schools, Palm Crest Elementary School, there are already at least eleven (11) portable classrooms on campus. (LCUSD Board Meeting Minutes 12-13-2018, p. 82  https://4.files.edl.io/5af9/02/14/19/182808-4c858b81-0a13-416f-b4e9-98697f60c1c2.pdf; Palm Crest Elementary Site Planning and Massing Analysis Update R81-18-19, p. 6.) The presence of nearly a dozen portables shows that Palm Crest Elementary School cannot currently house its students in permanent buildings. The Territory Transfer would only worsen the strain on Palm Crest’s facilities. To this point, LCUSD is openly evaluating plans to construct a two-story building and build at least four (4) additional classrooms to house existing Palm Crest students. (Id. p. 8.)

Per LCUSD’s own Administrative Regulation (“AR”) 5111, the districtwide grade level capacity limit for grades 7-12 is 336 students per grade level. (LCUSD AR 5111 http://www.gamutonline.net/district/Lacanada/DisplayPolicy/370034/5.) In 2017-18, LCUSD exceeded their grade level capacity limits for grades 8 through 12. (LCUSD 2017-18 Enrollment by Ethnicity and Grade  
=2017-18.)

LCUSD’s non-resident permitting process further burdens LCUSD’s capacity. Per Petitioners’ admission, LCUSD enrolled 181 new, non-resident permit students last year, which does not include students that are enrolled on existing permits. (Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, p. 23.) It is important to note that LCUSD’s non-resident permit prioritizes the following applicants, in order: (1) Children of full-time LCUSD employees; (2) Siblings of continuing permit students already enrolled in LCUSD; (3) Students of part-time LCUSD employees; (4) Territory residents; and (5) Allen Bill – Students whose parents physically work full-time within LCUSD boundaries. (LCUSD Permit Facts  
https://www.lcusd.net/apps/pages/index.jsp?uREC_ID=620671&type=d&pREC_ID=1103934.) Many of these students have non-revocable permits, and their seats cannot be relinquished to Territory students. As acknowledged by former Committee Member Peterson, “Students who are permitted because they have family employed by the [LCUSD] are not subject to the reverse permitting process; once they are accepted into the district they stay in the district.” (Sagebrush Territory Approved – Preliminarily, CV Weekly, May 4, 2017, emph. added https://www.crescentvalleyweekly.com/?s=Sagebrush+territory+transfer+approved.) Committee Staff also confirmed that those students cannot be removed. (Ex. 242, Transcription of May 3, 2017 Committee Meeting, p. 58.)
The Committee’s Mitigated Negative Declaration (“MND”) on the Transfer anticipates substantial increases in enrollment that far exceed LCUSD’s capacity limits:

“To estimate the amount of school age children that would likely enroll in La Cañada USD schools with implementation of the proposed project, the following analysis estimates the total number of school age children that could be generated based on the total number of existing residential properties, townhomes, and multi-family residential units. The project area currently has 968 residential units. **Assuming a student generation factor of 0.7 per residential unit, it is assumed that the project area has the potential to generate approximately 678 students.**

According to kidsdata.org, approximately 85 percent of the child population within the City of La Cañada Flintridge attends public schools. Based on this information, it is estimated that approximately 576 of the 678 students within the Project Area would attend La Cañada USD schools, of which 165 students within the project area are currently attending La Cañada USD schools on permit. Thus, a total of approximately 411 students would attend La Cañada USD schools with implementation of the proposed project. Currently, approximately 53 percent of the student population within the project area attends elementary school and 47 percent of the student population attends middle and high schools in Glendale USD. Assuming a similar distribution of students with implementation of the proposed project, approximately 218 students would attend Palm Crest Elementary School and 193 students would attend La Cañada High School.” (IS-MND Transfer of Territory, pp. 31-32, emph. added.)

At Palm Crest Elementary School, the student enrollment already requires the use of at least eleven (11) portables. (LCUSD Board Meeting Minutes 12-13-2018, p. 82 [https://4.files.edl.io/5af9/02/14/19/182808-4e858b81-0a13-416f-b4e9-98e697f60e1c2.pdf]) At La Cañada High School, LCUSD is already exceeding capacity limits for every grade level. (LCUSD 2017-18 Enrollment by Ethnicity and Grade [https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/dqcensus/EnrEthGrd.aspx?cds=1964659&agelevel=district&year=2017-18].) The MND estimates do not include any students that will reside in ADUs, which will only further strain LCUSD’s enrollment capacity. (Ex. 246, LCF Ordinance No. 460, p. 2.) Thus, the Transfer would invariably result in significant school facilities costs to LCUSD.

**B. Additional Classrooms Are Required to House LCUSD’s Students.**

Petitioners argue that there is no need for a delayed implementation plan. (Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, pp. 19, 23.) They claim that “some Territory students (especially high school students) would choose not to transfer since LCUSD has agreed to offer releases to any Territory students currently attending GUSD, as well as their siblings, should they request one.” (Id. at p. 23.) But LCUSD has not given that guarantee. LCUSD’s website states, “A permit is not a guarantee of enrollment.” (LCUSD Permit Facts, emph. added [https://www.lcusd.net/apps/pages/index.jsp?uREC_ID=620671&type=d&pREC_ID=1103934].)
Petitioners further argue that GUSD “could, at any time, change its current practice and cease granting releases to Territory students[.]” (Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, p. 39.) However, GUSD will maintain its current interdistrict practice.

Because Petitioners are no longer pursuing a delayed implementation plan, LCUSD must have capacity for all students immediately. (Ex. 241, Staff Report February 10, 2017, p. 14 [“However, (LCUSD) 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”].) In fact, as stated in the MND, LCUSD must install portable classrooms to accommodate the Territory students, and such classrooms would impact the little open space available to students:

“To meet the class size goal identified in the LCAP, Mitigation Measure PS-1 would require that portable classrooms be installed at Palm Crest Elementary School and La Cañada High School. With implementation of this mitigation measure, a less-than-significant impact is anticipated. It should be noted, however, that the installation of portable classrooms would reduce the amount of open space areas, particularly playing fields, available within the affected schools.

With implementation of the proposed project, it is possible that a new school may need to be constructed, or major renovation at Palm Crest Elementary School and La Cañada High School may be required in the future to accommodate the additional students.” (MND Transfer of Territory, p. 32, emph. added.)

Petitioners have acknowledged that portable classrooms will be essential to housing the Territory students, stating, “The CEQA Initial Study determination was a Mitigated Negative Declaration with a single mitigation measure requiring portable classrooms to be placed on two LCUSD school sites to accommodate the remaining Territory students, if needed.” (Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, p. 21, emph. added.) As a result, Petitioners must recognize that LCUSD does not have the capacity to accommodate the Territory students without significant additional facilities costs.

Moreover, where portable classrooms are needed, permanent classrooms will be invariably required to replace them. This evidences that additional classrooms are more than “visionary” or “nice-to-have” facilities, and are instead, essential additional facilities that would be required to house the Territory students. (Id. at p. 24.)

C. LCUSD Requires Financial Mitigation Strategies to Enroll Territory Students.

Most importantly, LCUSD’s Board continues to admit that the Transfer will cause a financial facilities impact to LCUSD, which will require a financial mitigation strategy. LCUSD’s November 27, 2018 Resolution No. 5-18-19 expressly states, “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[.]” (Ex. 266, LCUSD Resolution No. 5-18-19, p. 1, emph. added.) Thus, without a financial mitigation strategy, material disruption to LCUSD is likely.
Given that LCUSD continues to require a financial mitigation strategy for the Transfer that includes student housing, LCUSD will experience significant school facilities costs as a result of the Transfer. Accordingly, Condition 7 of Education Code § 35753 has not been substantially met.

IX. CONDITION 8.

“The proposed reorganization is primarily designed for purposes other than to significantly increase property values.” (Ed. Code, § 35753(a)(8).)

Petitioners claim that GUSD has provided no substantive documentation to support that the proposed Transfer is primarily designed to increase Petitioners’ property values. (Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, pp. 9, 24-25.) To the contrary, GUSD has provided documentation in its prior opposition and supplemental letters in support of its position. (GUSD Transfer Opposition Letter 11-02-2016, pp. 63-67; GUSD Opposition Letter to Petitioners’ Brief 04-26-2017, pp. 17-18; GUSD Supplemental Letter in Opposition to the Proposed Territory Transfer 09-06-2018, pp. 21-23.) Petitioners simply ignore the compelling evidence. Even prior to the Petition, some Territory residents have been focused on property values in the context of a territory transfer. A candidate running for LCF City Council acknowledged that Territory properties are depressed as a result of belonging to GUSD:

“Sagebrush students are clearly living within LCF boundaries. It not only affects students, but home sales, etc. for those families looking to live in the LCF school district and those wishing to sell their homes as well.” (Fox, Reassess Sagebrush Issue Immediately, Candidate Says, Patch, Mar. 6, 2011, emph. added https://patch.com/california/lacanadaflintridge/reassess-sagebrush-issue-immediately-candidate-says.)

Petitioners question the legitimacy of the Curtis-Rosenthal Appraisal Report (“Appraisal”), which concluded, “The transfer of the Sagebrush Territory from GUSD to LCUSD is the primary factor that will contribute to a substantial increase in the Sagebrush Territory property values. This was demonstrated by paired sale analysis of properties located in the Sagebrush Territory and comparable properties in the LCUSD. LCUSD is comprised of the remainder of La Cañada Flintridge, excluding the Sagebrush Territory. Quantification was performed to analyze any observed differences in market value based on jurisdictional location and other factors.” (Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, pp. 25-26; Ex. 31, Curtis-Rosenthal, Inc. Appraisal Report, p. 3, emph. added.)

Petitioners simply make the argument, rather than offering any other appraiser’s opinion. Petitioners have no expertise with appraisal standards and their mere opinion without supporting evidence should be disregarded.

In accordance with the CDE Guidelines and Education Code § 35753(a)(8), where “the petitioners’ rationale for the Transfer appears questionable or not compelling, the county committee should at least consider whether increased property values might be the primary reason for the petition.” (Ex. 1, CDE Handbook, Ch. 6, p. 93, emph. added.) Statutory law and CDE Guidelines do not require a “smoking gun,” but instead permit inferring Petitioners’ rationale from the circumstances. As discussed above, the fact that 78 percent of signatories to the Petition
do not have children in GUSD is as close to a smoking gun as one can get under these circumstances.

The Committee must be focused on determining whether there is a problem with the students’ education, and if there is no problem, to deny the disruptive, costly Transfer. Increasing public costs to satisfy the whim of Petitioners to increase their property values is not authorized nor prudent. Accordingly, Condition 8 has not been substantially met because there is substantial evidence demonstrating that Petitioners’ primary goal is to significantly increase their property values by the Transfer.

X. 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 affected district.” (Ed. Code, § 35753(a)(9).)

Petitioners claim that GUSD will suffer no substantial negative financial impact. (Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, p. 26.) Petitioners base this argument, in pertinent part, on their conclusion that the loss of Territory student enrollment revenue would be insignificant to GUSD. (Ibid. at p. 27.) Petitioners argue that GUSD cannot claim significant financial impacts because 215 Territory students have already transferred to LCUSD on interdistrict permits, and “Petitioners believe an estimated 150 Territory students currently attend GUSD schools (See table at Condition 7) and not all of them would seek to transfer to LCUSD schools.” (Ibid., emph. added.)

As is clearly set forth in Condition 2, Petitioners have unfairly impacted GUSD’s existing enrollment and revenue through their brazen efforts to increase permissive permits during these Territory Transfer proceedings. Petitioners have gamed this process by actively decreasing the number of students subject to the Transfer, in furtherance of their claim of having only a minor impact on GUSD. This gamesmanship should not be given any credence especially when Petitioners’ actions already caused the loss of nearly $500,000 in enrollment revenue.

Petitioners further assert that GUSD has “voluntarily relinquished all claims for ADA reimbursement for these Territory students who transferred to LCUSD schools[,] thereby rendering its assertions of monetary losses for future transfers in conflict with its stated preference and its current practice.” (Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, pp. 27-28.) GUSD did not voluntarily agree to allow Petitioners to meddle in the Territory Transfer process. Moreover, it is one thing to allow someone to transfer, and quite another to force all students to attend LCUSD. The cost impact is apparent.

The losses of enrollment and associated revenue have already directly impacted GUSD financially. In December 2018, GUSD’s First Interim Budget revealed that GUSD “may not be able to meet its financial obligations for the current and subsequent two fiscal years.” (Campa, Shrinking Reserves Draw Glendale Unified’s Attention, Glendale News-Press, Dec. 24, 2018 https://www.latimes.com/social/glendale-news-press/news/tn-gnp-me-qualified-budget-report-
20181221-story.html.) In addition, GUSD has been forced to plan for possible budget reductions in 2019-2020, including potential reductions in teachers, administration, management, and classified staff. (First Interim Financial Report 12-11-18, p. 21; Governor’s 2019-20 January
Budget Proposal and Update 02-05-2019, p. 14.) The Transfer will result in the loss of hundreds of Territory students and their associated ADA, which significantly erode GUSD’s fiscal status. Petitioners have provided no evidence to refute this fact.

Next, Petitioners claim that GUSD’s estimated $2.7M in annual lost enrollment revenue does not include an offset for the expenses of no longer educating the Territory students. (Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, p. 28.) However, revenue loss does not equate to one-to-one reductions in costs, which GUSD explained in its Letter of September 13, 2009, pages 2 and 17; in the Sagebrush Timeline Presentation of August 26, 2014, page 17; in the Mitigation of Impacts of Sagebrush Transfer on GUSD; and in GUSD’s Transfer Opposition Letter dated November 2, 2016, page 49. The recent Governor’s 2019-20 January Budget Proposal and Information Report highlights GUSD’s financial concerns, including that “[d]eclining enrollment will continue to make it difficult to balance the budget . . . [and] Property Transfer could result in a loss of $2.7 million annually[].” (Governor’s 2019-20 January Budget Proposal and Update 02-05-2019, p. 8.) In light of such concerns, GUSD has been forced to develop options to reduce a two-year deficit spending target of $10M. (Id. at pp. 11-15.)

The Capitol Advisors’ report also recognizes the significant financial impacts to GUSD, which Petitioners misrepresent as failing to “consider . . . the magnitude of GUSD’s claimed monetary impacts[].” (Petitioners’ Jan. 2019 Letter, p. 33.) Per the request of GUSD, LCUSD, and LCF City Council members, Capitol Advisors, provided a summary of mitigation options relevant to the Transfer. (Ex. 2, La Cañada City Officials Ask to Join Sagebrush Transfer Talks, p. 1.) Although Petitioners seek to distance themselves from the mutually supported Capitol Advisors’ report, it was created, in pertinent part, at the request of former Petitioner Tom Smith. (Id. at p. 2.) This report, which relied on information provided by both Districts, recognized the need for “[m]itigation of pupil funding impacts[].” (Ex. 3, Capitol Advisors Transfer Mitigation Options 04-20-2016, p. 3, emph. added.)

In fact, the MND noted that GUSD could lose as many as 678 students residing in the Territory. (Id. at pp. 31-32.) As a result, the annual loss of $2.7M by GUSD is a conservative estimate of the actual losses that GUSD would suffer.

Petitioners cannot prove that GUSD will not suffer significant loss of enrollment or GUSD’s inability to fully offset those losses as a result of the Transfer. Petitioners have no experience working for, or on behalf of, any school districts, have no expertise in school district financing, have, at best, anecdotal knowledge of the financial status of GUSD, and cannot speak on behalf of GUSD as to the significant financial impact it will suffer as a result of the Transfer. Petitioners’ mere speculations are unsupported, inflammatory, and ignore real-life consequences that GUSD and its students will experience as a result of a Transfer.

Pursuant to the foregoing, Petitioners have failed to rebut the substantial evidence demonstrating that GUSD will suffer a significant financial impact as a result of the Transfer. Thus, Condition 9 has not been substantially met.
XI. CONCLUSION.

As is detailed above, eight of the Conditions are not substantially met. Thus, GUSD respectfully requests that the Committee reverse its preliminary determination and deny this Territory Transfer Petition.

Sincerely,

[Vivian Ekchian, Ed.D]
Vivian Ekchian, Ed.D
Superintendent of Schools

Enclosures
Hi Steve,

California’s statutory bonding capacity is equal to a district’s total assessed value (AV) multiplied by the unified school district debt limit of 2.5% less the principal amount of any outstanding general obligation bonds.

Glendale USD’s total 2018-19 AV is $35,660,279,414. The current principal balance of outstanding bonds is $246,439,986.

So the Glendale USD’s current statutory bonding capacity is $35,660,279,414 AV x 2.50% debt limit - $246,439,986 in outstanding bonds = $645,066,999.

The Sagebrush portion of Glendale USD has a 2018-19 AV of $660,165,464, or 1.8512627% of total Glendale USD AV. So the Sagebrush portion of Glendale USD’s current statutory bonding capacity is $645,066,999 x 1.8512627% = $11,941,885.

Please note our new street name.

Chet Y. Wang
Keygent LLC
999 N. Pacific Coast Hwy., Suite 570
El Segundo, CA 90245
Office: (310) 322-4222
Cell: (310) 801-6331
Fax: (866) 518-7656
chet.wang@keygentcorp.com
https://www.keygentcorp.com

Keygent LLC ("Keygent") is a Municipal Advisor. Firm information included in this message and any attachments are provided for discussion purposes only. Such information reflects Keygent’s views as of the date of this message (unless otherwise noted) and is subject to change without notice. Any terms and conditions discussed herein are preliminary until confirmed in a definitive written agreement. Keygent does not provide accounting, tax or legal advice. This message and any attachments are for the intended recipient(s) only and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and/or proprietary. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete this message and immediately notify the sender. This confidentiality, privilege or property rights are waived or lost by any reader in transmission. Keygent’s outgoing and incoming emails are electronically monitored and subject to review by entities authorized to perform such reviews on behalf of Keygent.
LA CAÑADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

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
RESOLUTION 5-18-19

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 Rosebank 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;
WHEREAS, the Governing Board commits to honoring any request by a resident of the “Sagebrush” Territory to release their student in order that he or she may continue to attend their school within the Glendale Unified School District if the Territory Transfer is effected. This commitment to release via the interdistrict permit process will also be extended to siblings of Sagebrush residents attending Glendale Unified School District schools once they reach school-age, if requested by the parent or guardian.

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, and the community’s request to explore 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

3. between the community and its schools, thereby creating and strengthening “social capital” which

4. research demonstrates directly and positively supports improved student academic achievement;

5. 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;

6. 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;

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

8. 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 27th day of November, 2018.

Governing Board Members

Kaitzer Puglia, President

Brent Kuszyk, Vice President

Joe Radabaugh, Clerk

Ellen Multari, Member

Dan Jeffries, Member
APPENDIX D
Petitioners’ Summary of Information Previously Provided to the County Committee - GUSD to LCUSD Transfer Petition  
September 2019

This Summary is being provided to assist the County Committee members in their final review of the referenced Petition. Petitioners request that, in addition to this Summary, the Petitioners response document dated January 9, 2019 be included in the meeting packet provided to the Committee members ahead of their October 2019 meeting. A comprehensive list of the documents previously provided to LACOE from Petitioners and supporters can be found on the last page of this Summary.

**Overview**

Petitioners request that the County Committee approve our transfer Petition in order to provide the Territory residents the opportunity to vote on their support for a school district transfer. A decision to approve is the gateway for the most-impacted, the Territory residents, to be given the opportunity to vote on their future.

**Why Petitioners seek a Territory Transfer:**

At the heart of this Petition is the need of the Sagebrush community (the “Territory”, as referred to in the Petition) to secure the permanent right for their children to have the same educational opportunities and benefits as the rest of the La Cañada Flintridge community – namely, the irrevocable right to attend their hometown La Cañada Unified schools.

The Territory transfer would also address these additional needs and concerns:

- An appreciably safer environment during emergencies due to multiple access paths to the LCUSD schools and no longer being dependent on a single footbridge separating parents from children in a crisis;
- Enhanced civic engagement and participation in local school governance; and
- Certainty and stability that parents look for when making critical educational decisions for their children, which is not possible with a permissive attendance or “Permit” process.

**Status Today:**

*More Territory students attend LCUSD than GUSD!* Parents of over 50% of Territory students have pursued permits to leave Glendale schools and enroll their children in La Cañada schools. They currently make up more than 5% of LCUSD enrollment. Yet they enjoy no permanent rights to stay during transition years or have a voice in district governance. The community duress stems from GUSD being able to change its policy and stop all permit releases as it has in the past when the pressure of prior petitions subsided.

**Our Question:**

If Local Educational Needs and Concerns were already being addressed ... **why would so many Territory families go through the significant effort, disruption and duress to move their children to LCUSD?**
**Key Facts / Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Approximate)</th>
<th>Territory Sagebrush</th>
<th>GUSD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>LCUSD</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>226,000</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Voters</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>112,000</td>
<td>1.43%</td>
<td>13,400</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB Students @ GUSD / LCUSD</td>
<td>189¹ / 215</td>
<td>25,790</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Valuation</td>
<td>$660 M</td>
<td>$35.7 B</td>
<td>1.85%</td>
<td>$7.6B</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Territory Students 2018-19</th>
<th>LCUSD Palm Crest Elementary</th>
<th>GUSD Mountain Avenue Elementary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>84¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size Average – K to 3 2017-18</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>25.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size Average – 4 to 6 2017-18</td>
<td>29.33</td>
<td>34.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 less kids per classroom at Palm Crest
5 less kids per classroom at Palm Crest

**PROPOSED TRANSFER AREA** | The proposed transfer is straightforward, involving a very small portion of Glendale Unified, which is the only section of the City of La Cañada Flintridge not served by its hometown LCUSD schools. The Petition purposefully avoids any transfer of school property, unifies and aligns a fractured community with its local school priorities and would have minimal financial impact on either district ... all while creating NO precedent for future transfer petitions. Following an approved transfer, GUSD would continue to be responsible for educating 100% of the student population residing within City of Glendale boundaries, plus 100% of the student population residing in the neighboring unincorporated areas of Montrose and La Crescenta. Meanwhile, LCUSD would be responsible for educating 100% of the student population residing within LCF boundaries and the sparsely populated National Forest area.

**ENHANCED ACCESS & SAFETY DURING EMERGENCIES** | Another key benefit of a transfer would be enhanced Safety during an emergency or catastrophe. Pickens Canyon is a formidable natural barrier that creates physical separation between the Territory and the GUSD schools. The very location and geography of the territory makes it subject to a whole host of natural disasters and challenges to first responders. Communications and coordination affecting student safety would also be streamlined with a unified City/School District response plan. In terms of access - Glendale’s local elementary school has limited direct access to-and-from the Territory... via a single footbridge – while there are multiple access paths from within the Territory to the local La Cañada elementary school.

**GOOD PUBLIC POLICY IS SERVED WITH A TRANSFER** | Territory students currently represent more than 5% of LCUSD’s enrollment but residents have no meaningful voice in the district’s governance including on tax-related matters. Lastly, alternatives do not work. The current permit application window is but a few weeks long, places undo stress on families and is subject to change at any time. GUSD stopped issuing releases to Territory students in the past when the threat from prior transfer petitions died down. “Permits” or “permissive boundaries” do NOT fully address or correct any of these issues.

¹ Source – GUSD stated to County Committee in 2018 & 2019 regarding Territory student attendance in their 3 local TK-12 schools in 2018-19.
EDUCATIONAL NEEDS & CONCERNS | Approving this transfer would address our community’s legitimate local educational needs and concerns. These have repeatedly been detailed by Petitioners in our submitted documents and public comments. The same concerns are also echoed in the testimony of multiple generations of parents through their public comments and letters.

Every school district is unique in the educational goals and the priorities it sets for its educational programs and services. Codifying this reality, the CA Legislature purposefully established a community-driven process known as the Local Control and Accountability Plan - or LCAP - to ensure that the educational priorities and programs established by school districts truly reflect the local priorities and aspirations of the community it serves. While two districts may both be successful, the educational experience of students is not identical. Similarly, the social capital and enrichment students would derive from either environment is different.

*Territory students do not have full access to the LCAP-driven educational environment and experience* that was forged by the very community they are whole-heartedly members of ... including significantly smaller class sizes, more high school counselors, and a host of programs addressing student social and emotional health, welfare and engagement. Instead, we are assigned to a district whose LCAP priorities do not reflect the interests, aspirations and priorities of our community.

This conflict and disconnect highlights the compelling educational reasons why Petitioners seek this transfer and demonstrates that the status quo runs contrary to what the CA Legislature sought to establish when it implemented the LCAP process in the first place.

OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION:

EARLIEST TRANSFER DATE – August 2021 | If the County Committee approves the Petition in October 2019 – and there is no appeal - the transfer could not be implemented until July 2021 at the earliest, following an election and adjustment of property tax rolls for the two districts by the State Board of Equalization.

MOVING SCHOOLS - The transfer will not force Sagebrush kids to move from GUSD to LCUSD | LCUSD has formally adopted multiple Board resolutions that include the release of any Sagebrush student who chooses to remain in GUSD, should the Petition be approved... there would absolutely be NO "forced transfer" of students.

NO REPORTED GUSD DISRUPTION | With more than 50% of the Sagebrush students having transferred from GUSD to LCUSD, GUSD and Mountain Avenue enrollment has remained stable with little or no impact on its educational programs.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVING NO SIGNIFICANT FINANCIAL IMPACT TO GUSD:

- No real estate or school property would transfer to LCUSD – ALL PROPERTY REMAINS WITH GUSD
- GUSD taxpayer bond obligations – $4 to $5 INCREASE/YEAR; STILL BELOW THE 'PROMISED' $60 MAX
- GUSD future bonding capacity – MASSIVE GUSD AV INCREASES DWARF THE LOSS OF SAGEBRUSH AV
- GUSD revenue loss – TERRITORY TRANSFERS AND PERMISSIVE TRANSFERS HAVE IDENTICAL IMPACT
- GUSD net fiscal impact if all Sagebrush students transfer – INSIGNIFICANT TO GUSD; LESS THAN 0.1%
# Support Documents Chart

The Chart below lists the documents previously provided to LACOE since 2016 from Petitioners and Supporters. The column on the right identifies if these are found on the LACOE website and which packet and page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th># Pgs</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
<th>Found in County Committee Packet Month / Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Letters of Support</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4-24-19 to 5-16-19</td>
<td>May 2019 - Addendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Letters of Support</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3-21-19 to 4-23-19</td>
<td>May 2019 - pg 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitioners’ Letter re Election Area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4-22-19</td>
<td>May 2019 - pg 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitioners’ Letter re GUSD 3-6-19 Letter</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4-15-19</td>
<td>May 2019 - pg 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitioners’ Handout at 3-6-19 Meeting – Public Comment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3-6-19</td>
<td>April 2019 – pg 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitioner’s Counsel Letters to LACOE re Request for Clarification on Process</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2-8-19 &amp; 3-8-19</td>
<td>April 2019 – pg 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitioner’s Response to GUSD Binder to LACOE titled “GUSD’s Supplemental Letter in Opposition to the Proposed Territory Transfer” 9-6-18</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1-9-19</td>
<td>1-28-19 posted on website &amp; not part of a packet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCUSD Letter re Support Resolution</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12-6-18</td>
<td>Jan 2019 - pg 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Canada Flintridge Letter re Support Resolution</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11-20-18</td>
<td>Jan 2019 - pg 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitioners’ Handout at 11-7-18 Meeting – Public Comment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11-7-18</td>
<td>Jan 2019 - pg 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitioners’ Handout GUSD Bond Document at 11-7-18 Meeting</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>11-7-18</td>
<td>Jan 2019 - Addendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCUSD Letter re GUSD Binder to LACOE titled “GUSD’s Supplemental Letter in Opposition to the Proposed Territory Transfer” 9-6-18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9-28-18</td>
<td>NOT - Sent to CC directly by Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitioners’ Supplemental Comments - CEQA Initial Study</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9-27-18</td>
<td>NOT - Sent to CC directly by Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitioners’ Comments - CEQA Initial Study</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9-18-18</td>
<td>NOT - Sent to CC directly by Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Justus Comments - CEQA Initial Study</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9-18-18</td>
<td>NOT - Sent to CC directly by Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCUSD Comments – CEQA Initial Study</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9-18-18</td>
<td>NOT - Sent to CC directly by Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitioners’ Presentation Slides – 5-7-17 Meeting</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5-3-17</td>
<td>NOT - Sent to CC directly by Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCUSD Presentation Slides – 5-7-17 Meeting</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5-3-17</td>
<td>NOT - Sent to CC directly by Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Letters of Support</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>11-1-16 to 3-2-17</td>
<td>NOT - Sent to CC directly by Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitioners’ Response to GUSD document to LACOE titled “GUSD’s Opposition to the Proposed Territory Transfer” 11-2-16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2-13-17</td>
<td>NOT - Sent to CC directly by Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitioners’ Brief in Support of Petition for Territory Transfer Including Conditions Affecting Reorganization Proposals</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>12-21-16</td>
<td>NOT - Sent to CC directly by Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitioners’ Presentation Slides Part 1 &amp; 2 - 2nd Public Hearing</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11-2-16</td>
<td>NOT - Sent to CC directly by Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCUSD Presentation Slides 2nd Public Hearing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11-2-16</td>
<td>NOT - Sent to CC directly by Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitioners’ Presentation Slides Part 1 &amp; 2 - 1st Public Hearing</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10-26-16</td>
<td>NOT - Sent to CC directly by Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCUSD Presentation Slides 1st Public Hearing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10-26-16</td>
<td>NOT - Sent to CC directly by Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January 9, 2019

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

Re: Petitioner’s response to the Glendale Unified School District (“GUSD”) Supplemental Letter in Opposition to the Proposed Territory Transfer dated September 6, 2018 (“GUSD Opposition Letter”) submitted to the Los Angeles County Office of Education (“LACOE”)

This document (“Petitioners’ Supplemental Response”) is being provided to LACOE staff (“Staff”) for your review and consideration. We request that this document be provided to County Committee members (“the Committee”) as soon as possible, pursuant to their specific request to have new information received by LACOE forwarded to them.

The following comments represent the response of Petitioners to statements in the above-referenced GUSD document and other claims made by GUSD. This response is organized to address each of the Nine Conditions listed in Education Code §35753, plus comments made in the GUSD Oppositional Letter. Referenced sections and page numbers refer to the noted GUSD Opposition Letter submitted to LACOE.

Thank you again for your time and we look forward to working with you to provide additional information needed from us to assist the Committee in this process.

Submitted by:

Nick Karapetian, Co-Chief Petitioner
Nalini Lasiewicz, Co-Chief Petitioner
LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION
(“COUNTY COMMITTEE”)

TRANSFER OF TERRITORY
FROM
GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (“GUSD”)
TO
LA CAÑADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (“LCUSD”)

Petitioners’ Response
to the
GUSD Supplemental Letter dated September 6, 2018
in Opposition to the Proposed Territory Transfer

- With Additional Considerations

January 9, 2019
General Comments

Petitioners have provided extensive comments on the Nine Conditions and on comments made by both GUSD and Staff from the beginning of this Petition process. The following two documents were previously submitted to LACOE by the Petitioners and contain greater detail on Petitioners’ positions should the Committee members choose to refer to them:

- Petitioners’ Brief in Support of Petition for Territory Transfer Including Conditions Affecting Reorganization Proposals – dated December 21, 2016 (“Petitioners’ Brief”)
- Petitioners’ Response to the Glendale Unified School District (GUSD) document submitted to LACOE titled “GUSD’s Opposition to the Proposed Territory Transfer” dated November 2, 2016” – dated February 13, 2017 (“Petitioners’ Response”)

For the sake of brevity, Petitioners have focused their comments in this document on the most-pertinent points made previously, GUSD’s most-recent statements and new information since the aforementioned documents were submitted.
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Introduction

The Introduction section of the GUSD Opposition Letter states:

1. “Changing District boundaries must not be taken lightly, ... are necessarily permanent and intended ... to honor the civic decisions made by authorities who mapped out our County long before it was nearly fully built out, as it is today.”

2. “There is no compelling reason for the Territory Transfer.”

Summary Points:

- Contrary to the opinion of GUSD and Staff, school district boundaries are not sacrosanct and the California Department of Education (“CDE”) and the California legislature have continued to take measures that simplify and more-fairly adjudicate boundary changes consistent with current California Education Code and with a heightened emphasis on local issues and decision-making guiding the process.

- Petitioners have, at great length, cited compelling local educational reasons and concerns for a transfer, largely based on the relatively new Local Control and Accountability Plan (“LCAP”) process and intent as articulated by CDE.

1. The CDE and the California legislature have aided and simplified, not hindered, school district boundary changes: Petitioners believe that the Committee is best positioned to assess what is appropriate today with regard to school district boundaries, what constitutes local educational needs and concerns and what best serves a community and its student population without causing significant harm to neighboring districts.

Contrary to GUSD’s and Staff’s assertions that school district boundaries are somehow sacrosanct, recent CDE policy changes and actions demonstrate a preference for local concerns and priorities having a greater role in decisions related to school district boundary changes.

Additionally, California has a longstanding history of advocating for school district reorganization as the state transitioned “with increases in population and movement from an agricultural-based economy” to accelerated school district reorganization beginning in 1945.¹

In fact, the number of school districts in California has purposefully contracted from 1,535 in 1963 (when unification laws were passed) to 947 in 2014 (when the Local Control Funding Formula was enacted). According to CDE, there was a 69% decrease in

¹ California Department of Education, Organization Handbook, Chapter 2 History of School District Organization in California, Table 2.2: Number of California School Districts, by Type and by Selected Years, p 7. 
https://www.cde.ca.gov/rl/dr/dt/
the number of California school districts from 1935 (3,030 school districts) to 2014 (947 school districts).2

Two examples of change since the 1991 Territory petition: 1) the California State Board of Education’s (“SBE”) Administrative Committee has since been deactivated, further streamlining the SBE appeals process today. [It was this Committee that made the pivotal recommendation to the full SBE in 1993 to reject CDE’s recommendation to deny GUSD’s appeal seeking reversal of the local Committee decision, which approved the transfer of the Territory to LCUSD. The Administrative Committee’s recommendation, which was contrary to the CDE’s decision caused significant confusion to the appeals process at that time.] and 2) CDE has moved away from the so-called Fullerton method of establishing the election area in favor of the so-called LAFCO (Local Agency Formation Committee) method, which limits the election area to the Territory to be transferred. Otherwise, a large school district voting area could unfairly overwhelm an election with its size, thereby denying the most-impacted residents the right to have their voices freely and fairly heard.

2. Clear, compelling local educational reasons and concerns justify the proposed transfer: The Petitioners’ rationale for the transfer and supporting local educational needs and concerns were a central part of the circulated Petition, the Petitioners’ Brief, the Petitioners’ Response and presentations given at the public hearings and directly before the Committee. Fifty years of community activism to achieve this goal can hardly be characterized as a “whim” as GUSD asserts.

The Petitioners have presented academic research that links community cohesiveness and strengthened family and community social capital to positive results for student achievement and helps children to excel in school. Similarly, strengthening ties between families and within a community allowing people greater involvement and engagement with each other in civic activities that are aligned with school activities has a direct and positive effect on student academic achievement.3

Territory residents are far more aligned with the educational and community concerns and priorities of LCUSD than GUSD as demonstrated by their continuing efforts to enroll in LCUSD schools and fully participate in its governance and joint City/School programs that are so crucial to the social fabric of the community in which they reside.

2 Ibid., p 13.
3 “The Influence of Family and Community Social Capital on Educational Achievement”; Glenn D. Israel, Lionel J. Beaulieu, Glen Hartless; Rural Sociology; 66(1), 2001; Conclusions: pp 61-63. (Funded as part of a national Research Initiative grant by the CSREES/USDA, titled Social Capital Attributes of Families, Schools, and Communities, and is part of Florida Agricultural Experiment Station Project FRA-4-H-03436); http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.66.7676&rep=rep1&type=pdf.
As stated before, each district’s concerns and priorities are determined through the LCAP process which, in turn, is informed and developed through significant community input and reflects the local educational needs, concerns and interests of that community. The two District’s very divergent LCAPs show how two high achieving school districts can still represent and serve communities with two very different sets of aspirations and expectations.

A clear distinction of LCAP priorities between the two districts is LCUSD’s purpose-driven commitment to class size reduction for grades 4th-6th and 9th grade English and math, plus providing significantly more high school academic counselors per student, which are not goals of GUSD.

LCUSD’s costly commitment of resources toward class-size reduction has produced tangible results consistent with its local needs and concerns. While GUSD Mountain Avenue Elementary averages 36.5 students in its 4th-6th grade classrooms this year, LCUSD Palm Crest Elementary averages less than 30 students per classroom – a difference of students per classroom that exceeds 20%. Plus, LCUSD La Cañada High has twice the number of academic counselors per student than GUSD Crescenta Valley High.

Notably, LCUSD looks beyond grades and test scores in order to identify and recognize alternative definitions, pathways and expectations for student engagement, success and achievement as an early partner in Challenge Success – a Stanford University-based program that aims to balance academic excellence with student confidence and well-being. LCUSD has recently expanded Challenge Success to all district campuses. This significant and highly visible program is one cornerstone of a resolute initiative driven by local community input and concerns pertaining to student safety, well-being and emotional health.

Another timely and impactful outcome – consistent with LCUSD’s LCAP goals that was launched from organic community input following the mass school shooting in Parkland, Florida – is LCUSD’s recent commitment to provide comprehensive, integrated, school-based counseling services beginning with the 2019-20 academic year for students in grades 7-12. Using evidence-based school counseling models, this service is expected to benefit individual students, student groups and families (i.e. stress-management, family conflict, coping strategies for grief and loss, anger management, conflict resolution, social skills training, organization and self-management, substance abuse therapy, and parenting skills), as well as the school community as a whole.

Meanwhile, school age children and their families in the Territory (past, present and future) are stuck in a vortex of inequality and lack of full engagement with their hometown. Unlike their LCUSD and GUSD counterparts, Territory students are deprived of the substantial educational enrichment benefits of the social and community capital inherent in the City/School District symbiosis. Those counterparts enjoy the full benefits
of their community's social fabric, the sense of belonging and being a part of the greater community with full engagement in their LCAP priorities.

Territory families are simultaneously members of LCF yet excluded from the fabric of the community. It may seem intangible, but the sense of wholeness is immeasurable to children and their parents who strongly believe that social and community capital itself is authentic and addresses critical local educational needs and concerns, which Petitioners seek to secure for every child and family residing in the Territory.

Your predecessors on this Committee recognized the on-going fragmentation of the Territory community and found in favor of the Petitioners in the 1970s and again in the 1990s. (CDE also found in favor of the Petitioners in the 1990s on appeal although the SBE followed the recommendation of its Administrative Committee and approved GUSD's appeal on unspecified grounds.) Unless resolved definitively, this issue will return again and again.

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

All parties to this Petition - LCUSD, GUSD, Staff and Petitioners - have stated a belief that this Condition would be met should the proposed Petition be approved. Clearly both districts would meet this requirement both now and after a Territory transfer should one be approved.

CONDITION 2:  The districts are each organized on the basis of a substantial community identity.

Summary Points:

- GUSD and Staff fail to focus on the crux of Condition 2, as articulated by CDE, that a determination on this Condition is to be based on whether a transfer will negatively impact the community identity of the resulting districts after a transfer, not the community identity of the current districts. Petitioners argue it would not.

- The Petition has nothing to do with "coterminous or matching City/School boundaries" but with uniting and healing a fractured community to further enhance its social and community capital, which nurtures and promotes student educational and civic achievement; plus provide an appreciably safer environment for Territory students and their families in the event of a major emergency or crisis. Territory families would have multiple routes to more-readily access their children at LCUSD schools rather than rely on a single pedestrian bridge spanning Pickens Canyon to provide access between GUSD Mountain Avenue Elementary and the Territory.
The Territory’s identity is inextricably linked to the City of La Cañada Flintridge (“LCF”) and has only incidental association with the City of Glendale and the unincorporated communities of La Crescenta/Montrose, all of which are wholly served by GUSD.

1. The crux of a Condition 2 determination: As with all nine Conditions, the Committee is tasked with considering the impacts after a transfer to determine if the Condition would be met. CDE articulated this clarification in two separate territory transfer appeals in 2016: the determination to be made is whether each resulting district would be “organized on the basis of substantial community identity” following a territory transfer.

In a matter of an appeal of a Santa Clara County Committee decision to deny a transfer petition, CDE’s recommendation in May 2016 was to reverse the local County Committee decision and found this condition had been substantially met with a properly focused determination on whether community identity was negatively affected after a transfer. The SBE voted in agreement with the CDE recommendation.

CDE reaffirmed its position (Sep. 2016, Item #12, p 8): EC Section 35753(a)(2) requires the local County Committee to determine if, after a proposed reorganization, affected districts would be “organized on the basis of a substantial community identity.”

Further, CDE stated in its Sep. 2016 recommendation that the local County Committee vote on this matter inappropriately “reflect[ed] a determination of the degree of isolation of the territory proposed for transfer rather than a finding that the territory transfer will negatively affect the community identity of the districts (which is the basis of the “Community Identity” condition).”

In contrast, GUSD and Staff have focused their comments on this Condition by questioning whether the Territory residents have a “substantially stronger community identity with La Cañada USD than with Glendale USD”, which is not the basis for a determination on this Condition, per CDE’s interpretation of Ed Code.

Petitioners, on the other hand, have focused their comments on asserting that after a Territory transfer the community identities of both GUSD and LCUSD would not be negatively affected. The areas comprising the GUSD communities of Glendale, Montrose and La Crescenta would remain fully intact, remain wholly within GUSD boundaries, and maintain the strong community identities they enjoy today. Likewise, the Territory—described by GUSD in public documents as “a very small portion of the City of La Canada-Flintridge” — would maintain its unique community identity and be fully aligned with its hometown schools.

---

4 CA SBE Agenda for September 2016, Item 12, Appeal from an action of the Santa Clara County Committee on School District Organization to disapprove a transfer of territory from the Santa Clara USD to the Cupertino Union School District and the Fremont Union High School District, CDE Responses to the Appeal (p 7) and (p 8, last paragraph).
Similarly, if the Territory transfer were to be finalized, both districts would fully conform to the identified “Sphere of Influence” for each community as determined by the Local Agency Formation Commission for Los Angeles County (“LALAFCO”), which clearly places the Territory within the sphere of influence of LCF while Glendale’s sphere of influence includes the totality of the City of Glendale and the unincorporated communities of La Crescenta and Montrose.5

2. **Coterminous boundaries are not the issue**: GUSD and Staff have stated that “There is no necessity for coterminous boundaries” and “the Committee is not charged with creating coterminous boundaries.” Petitioners have no disagreement with these points and the Petition makes no mention of a goal to create coterminous boundaries.

Instead, the Petition clearly identified its primary goals to “unite and strengthen a fractured community” and “nurture and promote student safety and achievement.” Territory residents merely seek the opportunity and right to permanently attend their hometown schools and to unite a fractured community where a 10% minority of its population is denied the irrevocable right to attend the same public schools as their fellow LCF residents.

**The concept of coterminous boundaries is irrelevant to this Petition** as neither district is coterminous today and neither would be coterminous if the transfer were to take effect. GUSD’s boundaries would continue to include all of the City of Glendale plus all of the unincorporated communities of Montrose and La Crescenta. LCUSD’s boundaries (currently 144 sq. miles, excluding the Territory) would include all of LCF (just 8.5 sq. miles, including the Territory) as well as the Mt. Wilson Observatory and areas extending far into the National Forest well beyond LCF boundaries.

**The more-relevant point** is that GUSD would continue to be responsible for educating 100% of the student population residing within City of Glendale boundaries, plus 100% of the student population residing in unincorporated Montrose and La Crescenta after the transfer. Meanwhile, LCUSD would be responsible for educating 100% of the student population residing within LCF boundaries and the sparsely populated National Forest.

While many school districts cross municipal boundaries, they often do so without dividing municipalities among multiple school districts, thereby averting the community fragmentation that burdens LCF and the Territory residents. Even unincorporated areas in Los Angeles County including Altadena, La Crescenta, Montrose and Rowland Heights are not carved-up among several school districts, whereas LCF continues to endure fragmentation and inequity among its residents.

---

Even a large number of the 31 incorporated cities served by Los Angeles Unified are not
fractured and split among multiple school districts including the cities of San Fernando,
West Hollywood, Lomita, Carson, Gardena, South Gate, Bell, Cudahy, Huntington Park
and Vernon.

3. **Community identity:** The Territory’s identity and its affinity with LCF cannot be
  measured simply by distance to shopping centers, churches, ATMs or other physical
  amenities. LCF residents liken their city to a “factory town”, where the benefits most
  cherished in their community flow from the “factory”, being in this case the hometown
  LCUSD schools and the deep ties and collaborations it has nurtured with LCF and which
  collectively weave the social fabric of the community.

  To support its assertion that the Territory today doesn’t have a strong sense of
  community identity, GUSD references language from the Staff report that stated “Staff’s
  examination of the petition area does not indicate a substantially stronger community
  identity with the La Cañada USD than with the Glendale USD.” It is unclear to Petitioners
  how this was ascertained by Staff, other than comparing distances to physical amenities,
  which would not change after an approved transfer and therefore would not have a
  negative effect on the resulting school districts. Petitioners ask, what “examination” did
  Staff perform to make this claim? Staff performed no survey or outreach to the
  residents of the Territory to ascertain their sense of community identity nor their
  affinity to LCF and its school district versus toward Glendale and its school district.

  The only recent survey of the Territory was the GUSD-conducted survey in May 2014
  regarding the Territory residents’ collective desire to transfer to LCUSD. With more than
  85% of Territory respondents indicating a preference to formally align their community
  with LCUSD, the survey clearly demonstrated the high affinity residents hold toward
  their hometown school district.

  Besides the physical criteria suggested for consideration when reviewing this Condition,
  the California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Section 18573(a)(2)(G) “Criteria for
  Reorganization of School Districts” suggests that “Community, school, and social ties
  and other circumstances peculiar to the area” also be considered.

  At both public hearings on the Petition, as well as in subsequent meetings of this
  Committee, Territory residents in large numbers spoke of their greater affinity to LCF
  and its schools than to Glendale and its schools. Plus, approximately 50% of Territory
  registered voters signed the official Petition in both the 1990s and the current Petition,
  nearly twice the number required to advance the Petition and further evidence of the
  deep “community, school and social ties” residents harbor for their City and its
  hometown school district.
Perhaps the most relevant evidence of the Territory’s alignment with LCF and its hometown school district is the fact that 215 Territory students are currently enrolled in LCUSD schools; these students have purposefully pursued, navigated and taken advantage of the permissive transfer process between the two districts currently in place—effectively “voting with their feet.”

4. The Territory’s undeniable identification with its city of residence and its hometown schools is substantiated by:
   a. The depth and intensity of Territory residents’ efforts to formally unite with its hometown school district dating back to LCUSD’s unification in 1961, which includes multiple petitions and legislative efforts, survey results, and tremendous support of registered voters,
   b. The majority of Territory students having permissively transferred to LCUSD,
   c. The Territory is a clearly demarcated neighborhood fully within LCF boundaries, which is flanked by a formidable natural canyon with no direct motor vehicle access for the entire two miles of its western boundary that creates physical distance and isolation from GUSD communities and
   d. The lack of evidence to refute that the Territory transfer is not primarily designed to increase property values, as Staff concluded in its Condition 8 recommendation.

Time and again Petitioners have demonstrated that the Territory has a unique community affinity with the residents of LCUSD before a proposed transfer and would still afterwards. In 1979, the Committee affirmed the petition to transfer the Territory from GUSD to LCUSD and confirmed that Condition 2 was met at that time.\(^6\) In 1992, Staff recommended that Condition 2 had been substantially met and the Committee unanimously agreed.

CDE also confirmed the Territory’s community identity in response to GUSD’s 1992 appeal on this issue, stating:

“... there is little doubt of the sense of community identity on the part of the residents in the Area.”

Contrary to GUSD and Staff assertions that community identity is highly subjective and unpersuasive—it is readily discernable with regard to the Territory and it should form the basis for good public policy. Furthermore, in each of these prior actions, no concern

---

\(^6\) Although the local County Committee voted to approve the petition in 1979, it was denied by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors to avoid the cost of an election covering the entirety of both districts, which was required under the rules pertaining to territory transfer elections at that time. Then Chairman of the LA County Board of Supervisors stated in his official letter of denial that there was little reason to incur election costs when the outcome appeared to be a foregone conclusion given GUSD’s overwhelming voting base relative to LCUSD.
was raised by the Committee or Staff that the community identity of GUSD would be negatively impacted after a similar Territory transfer.

Petitioners believe Condition 2 has been met and that the community identity of both districts would remain intact and not be negatively affected after a transfer, should the Petition be approved.

Given the supporting evidence provided, Petitioners respectfully request the Committee affirm Condition 2 as being substantially met.

CONDITION 3: The proposal will result in an equitable division of property and facilities of the original district or districts.

Summary Points:

- No transfer of property or school facilities would occur should this Petition be approved. In such cases, Ed Code prescribes the required process and allocation of the Territory’s tax base or assessed valuation (“AV”) to transfer from GUSD to LCUSD.

- This Condition relates specifically to a “division of property and facilities.” Thus, when NO property or facilities transfer between districts and neither is a “basic aid/excess revenue” district, the Condition’s threshold of “equitable division” is generally a non-issue.

- The Territory’s AV is a mere 1.85% of GUSD’s total AV and therefore not significant, especially given the massive growth in GUSD’s total AV over the past few years.

- Staff’s conclusion that “it is not possible to determine the financial impact of an alteration of [GUSD’s] bonding capacity” has been fully set aside by 1) GUSD’s credit rating being upgraded to “Aa1” from “Aa2” in 2016 and its reaffirmation of the “Aa1” rating in Sept. 2018 that included a “Stable Outlook”, 2) GUSD’s highly successful bond issuances in 2016 and 2018 and 3) updated disclosures in GUSD’s Official Statement for its bond issuance dated September 13, 2018 that included the following facts:
  - GUSD’s AV increased by nearly $6.9 billion (23.9%) since 2014-15.
    - This four-year increase exceeds the totality of the Territory’s AV by more than 10 times. (Last year’s increase alone exceeded the Territory’s total AV by more than 2.5 times.)
  - GUSD’s 2018-19 tax rate is $50.455 per $100,000 AV.
    - An increase of 1.85% in GUSD’s AV resulting from the Territory transfer would increase the current GUSD tax rate to $51.39, which does not create an “enormous” tax burden to GUSD’s taxpayers and is substantially below the $60 per $100,000 AV maximum “promised” to its taxpayers by GUSD.
1. **Impact on GUSD's bonding capacity.** The Petitioners intentionally excluded the GUSD-owned lot located in LCF from the defined Territory boundaries out of respect for the Mountain Avenue Elementary community and to avoid any harm to our neighbors. Consequently, this transfer has been greatly simplified and streamlined.

While GUSD and Staff acknowledge that no property or facilities would transfer, GUSD claims that its financial impact would be significant (although the criteria to review this Condition is “equitable”, not “significant” and specifically addresses only “property and facilities”). Petitioners question how GUSD would suffer a significant financial impact related to the transfer of property or facilities when no property or school facilities would be transferred.

### GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Assessed Valuations By Jurisdiction
Fiscal Year 2018-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Assessed Valuation</th>
<th>% of Assessed Valuation</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Assessed Valuation</th>
<th>% of Jurisdiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Glendale</td>
<td>$31,787,486,672</td>
<td>89.14%</td>
<td>City of La Cañada-Flintridge</td>
<td>$31,923,405,024</td>
<td>99.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Cañada-Flintridge</td>
<td>660,165,464</td>
<td><strong>1.85</strong></td>
<td>City of La Cañada-Flintridge</td>
<td>$8,021,748,824</td>
<td>8.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Los Angeles Co.</td>
<td>3,212,627,278</td>
<td>9.01%</td>
<td>Unincorporated Los Angeles Co.</td>
<td>$107,666,068,683</td>
<td>2.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total District</td>
<td>$35,660,279,414</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>Total District</td>
<td>$35,660,279,414</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: California Municipal Statistics, Inc.*

Given that the Territory's assessed valuation is only 1.85% of GUSD's AV (See Condition 9), there would be no inequity under any circumstance. Furthermore, the Ed Code provision related to transfers that do not include property or school facilities is clear and straightforward. If no property or facilities transfer, then the Territory’s tax base shall transfer to the receiving district. The concept of “equity” and allocation of bond indebtedness typically arises when school property or facilities are being transferred, which in this case is not applicable.

CDE makes this point crystal clear in its District Organization Handbook. If no property or buildings transfer, consideration of bond assumption and related compensation is not relevant. To cite the Handbook:

**Annexing Territory with No Property or Buildings** - Annexed territory with no school property or buildings drops all liability to the former district, but shall

---

automatically assume a proportionate share of the new school district’s bonded indebtedness. (EC 35575)

Meanwhile, Staff registered concerns about GUSD’s bonding capacity claiming an inability to determine its financial impact. The most direct and compelling evidence that the potential loss of 1.85% of GUSD’s AV would not significantly impact GUSD’s bonding capacity includes the following information:

- GUSD’s highly successful $70 million bond sale in August 2016 was oversubscribed by 3.3 times (GUSD had 3.3 times more buy orders than the bonds offered for sale), thereby allowing it “to achieve even lower interest rates than projected” of 2.78% when compared to the more-than-double projected interest rate of 6%.  

- GUSD concluded another highly successful oversubscribed $50+ million bond sale in September 2018, again backed by its “Aa1” credit rating that was reaffirmed by Moody’s who also assigned a “Stable Outlook” to the District’s long-term ratings with full knowledge of the Petition’s status as disclosed by GUSD in its bond sale Official Statement.  

2. Impact on GUSD’s taxpayers: GUSD claims an “enormous” tax increase would burden its taxpayers with a projected rate of $61.11 per $100,000 of AV following a transfer, and exceed its “promised” maximum of $60 per $100,000 of AV. In direct contradiction to GUSD’s assertions to the Committee, GUSD’s Official Statement dated September 13, 2018 disclosed its 2018-19 tax rate to be just $50.455. Certainly, an increase in GUSD’s tax rate from $50.455 to $51.39 (+1.85%) would not be an “enormous” tax burden, and is clearly less than GUSD’s “promised” maximum $60 tax rate and would have no significant impact on GUSD’s taxpayers.

GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Typical Tax Rates  
Dollars per $100 of Assessed Valuation  
Fiscal Years 2014-15 through 2018-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glendale Unified School District</td>
<td>0.050455</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


GUSD’s lower-than-predicted $50.455 tax rate is due primarily to the continuing robust real estate development activity within the City of Glendale, which caused GUSD’s AV to jump by nearly $6.9 billion over the past four years (averaging approximately 5.5% increases annually). GUSD’s four-year increase in its AV alone exceeds the entirety of the Territory’s current AV by more than 10 times.

### Glendale Unified School District
#### Assessed Valuation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Local Secured</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Unsecured</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>$24,593,237,046</td>
<td>$—</td>
<td>$664,835,315</td>
<td>$25,258,072,361</td>
<td>—%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>24,536,551,743</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>717,158,709</td>
<td>25,253,710,452</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>24,844,233,103</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>726,383,603</td>
<td>25,570,616,706</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>25,298,457,210</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>728,780,539</td>
<td>26,025,237,749</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>25,529,821,269</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>756,530,032</td>
<td>26,286,351,301</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>26,646,883,528</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>766,214,818</td>
<td>27,413,098,346</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2014-15</strong></td>
<td>27,958,799,498</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>829,368,564</td>
<td><strong>28,788,168,062</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>29,571,064,920</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>829,721,717</td>
<td>30,400,786,637</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>31,233,634,015</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>813,616,263</td>
<td>32,047,250,278</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>33,150,959,813</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>829,493,092</td>
<td>33,980,452,905</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018-19</strong></td>
<td>34,875,065,297</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>785,214,117</td>
<td><strong>35,660,279,414</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Municipal Statistics, Inc.

The median and average assessed value of GUSD taxpayers’ homes is currently $485,057 and $536,950, respectively, according to GUSD’s Sept. 2018 Official Statement for its bond sale.12 Even using the “promised” not to exceed $60 tax rate, an increase in the tax rate of 1.85% would result in an annual increase to the GUSD taxpayer of between $5.39 (median AV) and $5.96 (average AV). This 1.85% increase to the GUSD taxpayer would not be significant and certainly not “enormous”.

GUSD’s claims of an “enormous” tax burden is striking given its successful restructuring in 2014 of its bonds, which were originally structured as capital appreciation bonds (known as CABs) to comply with AB 182. GUSD’s 2014 bond restructuring raised its taxpayer rate by 30%, from $46 to $60 per $100,000 of assessed value. There was no taxpayer vote, virtually no “push-back” from its taxpayers, no appeal filed, no organized opposition and no negative letters to the editor. Yet, GUSD asserts that a potential increase in its taxpayer rate of less than 2% is suddenly “enormous” and would threaten taxpayers’ support for future bonds.

---

11 Ibid., p 16.
12 Ibid., p 18.
3. **GUSD’s solvency plan**: GUSD further claims significant financial impact by referencing its Solvency Plan, which has no connection to a transfer with no property or facilities involved and thereby fully irrelevant to this Condition. This “concern” is more applicable to Condition 9 and is addressed by Petitioners in its comments regarding that Condition.

4. **Prior petitions were deemed “equitable”**: Petitioners note that predecessor Committees approved Condition 3 in the 1970s and the 1990s (also affirmed by CDE in the 90s on appeal) when a transfer of property - the GUSD-owned drop-off/pick-up lot within LCF boundaries - was included in the Territory to be transferred. Certainly, zero property and school facilities being transferred today makes analysis of this Condition even more simplified and straightforward.

*Given the supporting evidence provided by Petitioners, they respectfully request the Committee affirm Condition 3 as being 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.

Summary Points:

- An approved Petition transfer **will not** impact the racial and ethnic diversity at GUSD schools as GUSD asserts. The same data GUSD provides to assert that it would, quite to the contrary, demonstrates that it clearly would not. Staff agreed with Petitioners’ position.
- LCUSD’s strong academic programs address all student subgroups – including English language learners.

1. **GUSD’s own data indicates no change**: GUSD refers to the identical “Enrollment by Ethnicity” data in its brief dated November 2, 2016 (“GUSD Brief”) and in its Opposition Letter (Page 20, Section A). In both documents, GUSD claims that “the Transfer would result in the loss of approximately 25.90% of minority students currently attending GUSD’s Mountain Avenue Elementary School”.

However, GUSD fails to mention that an approved transfer would also reduce white enrollment by ~25%, which means the overall ratio of minority to non-minority students would stay approximately the same. Therefore, **students currently attending GUSD Mountain Avenue Elementary would experience an identical mix of racial/ethnic identities in their experience as they would after the transfer was fully completed.**
Regarding Condition 4, Staff concluded that:

“The potential shift of the students from the petition area within the Glendale USD to the La Cañada 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 [a] transfer resulting from approval of this petition. Further, many of the students residing in the petition area already enroll in La Cañada 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.”

Staff went on to state:

“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”.

2. English Learners are well provided for: LCUSD has a demonstrated history of strong academic programs that address all student subgroups – including English language learners. GUSD states that “LCUSD provides no structured dual language programs to its English Learner students” and that “The transfer will result in English Learners residing in the Territory being transferred to a school environment lacking academic and instructional support that has been targeted to each student’s unique English proficiency, and is designed to ensure that those students are provided an equal and meaningful education.” (GUSD Opposition Letter Page 21, Section B)

A 2012 research study funded by the U.S. Department of Education, “Raising All Boats: Identifying and Profiling High-Performing California School Districts” identified both LCUSD and GUSD as among the 30 highest performing K-12 districts in California.”

Importantly, the researchers addressed concerns that strong performance for the majority of students alone can mask relatively poor performance for individual schools

---

13 “Raising All Boats: Identifying and Profiling High-Performing California School Districts”; by Mette Huberman, Tom Parrish, Melissa Arellanes, Raquel Gonzalez & Jenny Scala (American Institutes of Research and California Comprehensive Center at WestEd); September 2012; Appendix A; p. 26. According to the study, La Cañada Unified was the top performing district in California with an average District Achievement Index (DAI) of 1.49, which measured the difference between the district’s actual and predicted performance; http://cacompcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/CA_CC_HP_District_Report_9-26-12.pdf.
or some group of students. Therefore, the researchers added additional criteria known as “raising all boats” that evaluated performance of student subgroups: African Americans, Asians, Hispanics, Caucasians, English learners, low income and special education students.

The report’s findings strongly support LCUSD initiatives emphasizing best practices in instruction for all students. Providing teachers with time to refine their instructional practices via collaboration; adopting the tools to review student achievement data in order to inform and adjust instructional strategies; soliciting the feedback of all stakeholders via teacher, staff, student and parent surveys – have all been efforts designed by LCUSD to “raise all boats.”

GUSD’s claim that LCUSD doesn’t have strong academic programs that address all student subgroups – including English language learners – is without merit.

Given the supporting evidence provided by Petitioners, they respectfully request the Committee accept the Staff recommendation and affirm Condition 4 as being substantially met.

CONDITION 5: Any increase in costs to the state as a result of the reorganization will be insignificant and otherwise incidental to the reorganization.

Summary Points:

- LCUSD is one of the lowest per-student state-funded unified school districts in California. Since the lower funded district would be the “receiving” district, the Territory transfer would result in marginally LOWER costs to the state of California.
- LCFF “base grant” funding is the same for all K-12 districts. However, GUSD receives substantial supplemental and concentration grants from the state to serve its student population whereas LCUSD does not.
- GUSD makes unfounded claims that LCUSD “undoubtedly needs to seek significant State funds” to cover necessary facilities costs, which LCUSD has forcefully refuted.

1. Loss of enrollment-based revenue: Both GUSD and Staff refer to GUSD’s loss of enrollment-based revenue as a cause of significant additional cost to the state. This assertion is demonstrably false.

GUSD and LCUSD entered into a permissive permit process in 2014-15 for a) Territory students to transfer from GUSD to LCUSD prior to a formal transfer and b) Territory students (and their siblings) wishing to remain in GUSD schools to do so afterwards should the Petition be approved. (LCUSD formalized its support for continuing the
permissive permit process via Governing Board Resolution 5-18-19, dated November 27, 2018).14

Currently, 215 Territory students are enrolled in LCUSD schools. Despite the transfer of these Territory students to LCUSD, GUSD had successfully maintained a four-year “improving trend” of its enrollment through 2017-18. In the current year, GUSD registered a 1.08% decline in enrollment. This enrollment loss appears to have little to do with Territory students transferring to LCUSD since more than two-thirds of the transferred Territory students were TK-8th grade students and the vast majority of GUSD’s enrollment decline occurred at its senior high schools. Furthermore, GUSD released 186 of its resident students to other districts in 2018-19, but only 30% were Territory residents (and only 50 of the 55 released actually enrolled at LCUSD).15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>GUSD</th>
<th>MOUNTAIN AVE ELEM</th>
<th>ROSEMONT MIDDLE</th>
<th>CVHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>26,182</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>2,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>26,119</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>2,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>26,075</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>2,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>26,071</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>1,316</td>
<td>2,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>25,790</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>1,208</td>
<td>2,566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of critical importance, GUSD ignores CDE’s criterion, in compliance with Ed Code §41372, for districts to offset its estimated loss of enrollment-based revenue with the appropriate education expense savings related to the transferred students. CDE maintains on its website the amount of “Current Expense of Education — Cost per ADA” for each district in the State to be used for this and other purposes. The most recent amount posted for GUSD is $10,937 per student.16 Once education expense savings is considered, it is clear that GUSD’s claims of significant financial impact related to lost enrollment funding is without merit.

14 LCUSD’s most recent resolution in support of the transfer was amended to acknowledge that LCUSD would honor any request by a Territory resident to remain enrolled within GUSD. LCUSD would also release the siblings of Territory student once they reach school age whose parents applied for an inter-district permit to attend a school within GUSD; http://files.constantcontact.com/1ab77ceb401/1344b157a4b1-4ca7-b25e-ce77a087cd4e.pdf.
2. **LCUSD's newly approved facilities bond**: GUSD makes the inauthentic claim that LCUSD's $149 million school facilities bond is insufficient to cover its facilities costs by claiming that LCUSD’s “total construction cost” is $251.9 million (GUSD Opposition Letter Page 10, Section B). In fact, the $251.9 million amount was the visionary “wish-list” amount identified by LCUSD’s Facilities Master Plan Committee as the initial step in its process to establish a fully vetted proposal for community buy-in and approval. **LCUSD has made it clear in writing and in presentations to the Committee that it has no need or intent to seek significant state funding for housing-related costs.**

3. **Claims of “Classroom Crisis”**: Separately, Staff alleges that LCUSD would need to seek significant state funding for additional facilities without any supporting analysis. GUSD went so far as to charge LCUSD with having a “classroom crisis”.

LCUSD has effectively and efficiently managed to enroll from 120 to 180+ new permit students annually for more than a decade to maintain (not expand) its total enrollment at approximately 4,050 to 4,150 students – while fully adhering to its class size caps as documented in its LCAP. In the 2018-2019 school year, **LCUSD has enrolled 600+ permit students including 215 Territory students. Only about 150 Territory students remain in GUSD schools** (See table at Condition 7).

Other considerations that would likely lower the number of Territory students who would transfer following an approved Petition include: 1) some of those remaining Territory students will certainly choose not to transfer and LCUSD has agreed by a Board-approved resolution to let them do so should they want to remain, and 2) there would be at least one additional year of transfers under the current permissive permit process before a formal Territory transfer could be affected.

LCUSD has vigorously rendered its endorsement and support for the transfer and its agreement to the CEQA mitigation proposed by the IS/MND if the transfer were to be effectuated with the following written statement:

> “LCUSD wishes to make it clear the district does not have a “classroom crisis” as asserted by GUSD. Instead, **LCUSD has the flexibility and capacity to accommodate all students affected by the Petition**. It is prepared to provide portable classrooms, if needed, and has the support and guarantee of the City of La Cañada Flintridge to house any students involved in the matter.

**Contrary to faulty assertions in the GUSD Opposition Letter regarding LCUSD’s Measure LCF bond dollars, LCUSD has the financial resources to address all anticipated needs related to a territory transfer in both the short term and the future.**
4. **Delayed implementation plan.** Both GUSD and Staff refer to a delayed implementation plan as “inappropriate” and/or “not part of the calculus”. The Petitioners and LCUSD are in full agreement.

*Previously, both districts had entertained the concept of a delayed implementation of the transfer as part of a negotiated agreement between the districts, but no agreement was finalized. Currently, a delayed implementation plan is no longer relevant since:*

a. There are relatively few remaining Territory students attending GUSD schools,

b. The effective date of the transfer would be dependent on a Petitionary vote and its timing would provide at least one additional permit transfer cycle, further reducing the number of Territory students to transfer and

c. The knowledge that not all Territory students (especially high school students) would choose to transfer and LCUSD has agreed to offer releases to any Territory student currently attending GUSD, as well as their siblings, should they request one.

As stated above, LCUSD is on record emphatically affirming that “**LCUSD has the financial resources to address all anticipated needs related to a territory transfer in both the short term and the future.**” (See Condition 7 for more commentary specifically related to housing costs.)

*Given the supporting evidence provided, Petitioners respectfully request the Committee affirm Condition 5 as being 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.

**Summary Points:**

- GUSD provides no substantive evidence that its programs have been impacted, despite the significant number of Territory students who have already transferred, or that its programs would be impacted in the future.

- GUSD’s continued affirmation of its stated practice to permissively release all Territory students seeking to transfer to LCUSD speaks volumes on the minimal expected impacts of such transfers.
1. **GUSD has experienced no substantial enrollment drop or program impacts.** GUSD stated in its Opposition Letter (Page 12, Section VI) regarding this Condition that “there is no compelling, academic need for the Territory Transfer.” However, Condition 6 does not address nor require a determination of a “compelling academic need” for a transfer, only that the “reorganization will continue to promote sound education performance and will not significantly disrupt” educational programs.

Currently, 215 Territory students attend LCUSD schools yet GUSD has not asserted that its programs have been significantly impacted to date. Condition 6 is focused on the “affected district’s” ability to promote sound education performance and avoid significant disruption to programs. There is no indication that there has been such impact or that there would be even if GUSD were to lose all of the remaining Territory students, which currently make up about 0.6% of GUSD’s enrollment.

Consistent with prior challenges to this Condition, GUSD uses percentages rather than actual numbers of Territory students who participate in various programs to support its assertions that the “Territory Transfer will have a significant negative impact on the programs offered at GUSD Mountain Avenue Elementary School.” Yet, it provides no actual numbers of either total or Territory-specific student participation in these programs.

Its statement that significant percentages of students residing in the Territory participate in advanced courses, by itself, means little. If the “significant percentage” of Territory students who participate make up only a small fraction of the total students who participate in advanced courses and other programs, then the overall impact of such loss would be far less that what GUSD asserts.

Furthermore, GUSD has efficiently backfilled nearly all openings created by transferred Territory students. Since enrollment at GUSD Mountain Avenue Elementary has held relatively steady throughout the permissive transfer of Territory students, why would there be any less participation in various programs offered at GUSD Mountain Avenue Elementary. Surely GUSD is not suggesting that students from the 91011 (LCF) zip code are more active participants in advanced educational and extra-curricular programs than students from the 91214 (La Crescenta) and 91020 (Montrose) zip codes.

2. **By its own actions GUSD demonstrates no significant impacts.** GUSD continues to assert that a loss of Territory students and related per-pupil State funding would be devastating to its enrollment, the viability of its current educational programs and its financial stability. Yet, GUSD continues to publicly pronounce its willingness to permissively release all requesting Territory students and its support for a “permissive boundary” alternative, which would allow Territory students to attend LCUSD schools with no reimbursement of lost revenue related to transferred Territory students.
Petitioners have repeatedly brought this contradiction to the attention of Staff and the Committee and questioned how these two conflicting GUSD positions can possibly be reconciled.

Also, GUSD officials themselves have publicly stated that the middle and high school students would more likely remain in GUSD schools, further reducing the likely impacts.

As stated by GUSD Superintendent Winfred Roberson on 9/14/16 at a meeting of GUSD Mountain Avenue Elementary families:

"If a transfer was successful ... we suspect that some of those (Territory) students would elect to stay in the Glendale Unified School District especially if they are participating at the secondary level in sports and clubs and they may not want to transfer. We expect that the immediate impact would be felt at the elementary school level."

Additionally, enrollment at GUSD Mountain Avenue Elementary has remained quite stable (+/- 2%) over the past 5 years, during which time a significant number of Territory students transferred to LCUSD. Yet, with the transfer of a significant portion of its students to LCUSD, GUSD makes no claims today that programs at its schools have been significantly impacted, citing no examples, but only asserts that the loss of remaining students “may threaten GUSD’s ability to continue to provide these courses and programs” (GUSD Opposition Letter Page 2, Condition 6).

In its report to the Committee dated February 10, 2017, Staff concluded, regarding this Condition, that “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.”

Given the supporting evidence provided, Petitioners respectfully request the Committee affirm Condition 6 as being 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.

Summary Points:

- Currently, 215 Territory students are enrolled in LCUSD schools.
- Currently, an estimated 150 Territory students are enrolled in GUSD schools.
- The CEQA Initial Study determination was a Mitigated Negative Declaration with a single mitigation measure requiring portable classrooms to be placed on two LCUSD school sites to accommodate the remaining Territory students, if needed.
• The CEQA report generated a “theoretical worst-case” scenario of 411 potential Territory students to attend LCUSD schools, which at a minimum, is certainly overstated by the 50 Territory students who transferred to LCUSD in 2018-19, a reduction not reflected in the CEQA “theoretical worst-case” calculation.

• Petitioners and its environmental consultant challenged the use of the “student generation factor” used in the CEQA review as being inappropriate in the context of the proposed transfer.

• LCUSD’s response at the CEQA Public Hearing on Oct. 3, 2018 included the following declarations:
  o “There is anticipated capacity within the existing system [at LCUSD] to accommodate the proposed transfer of territory.”
  o “LCUSD ... supports the use of portable classrooms as may be necessary to accommodate temporary demand at site-specific school locations as may be required.”
  o “The project will not have a significant, adverse impact on the environment, and appropriate mitigation has been proposed. At its heart, this project is essentially an administrative transfer of territory from one school district to another. Such a transfer is supported by the City of La Cañada Flintridge and many members of the community. LCUSD supports the approval of the proposed project.”

1. Currently, there are 215 Territory students enrolled in LCUSD schools with about 150 Territory students remaining at GUSD: The two districts have effectively managed a controlled permissive transfer of students from GUSD to LCUSD since the Territory transfer discussions began in mid-2013 – without incurring a significant increase in school facilities costs to either district.

Today, there are an estimated 150 Territory students enrolled in GUSD schools (as shown below), which is less than six-tenths of one percent (<.006) of GUSD’s enrollment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Territory Students Attending GUSD Schools in 2018-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Avenue Elementary in 2017-18 per GUSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemont Middle in 2017-18 per GUSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescenta Valley HS in 2017-18 per GUSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Territory Students Attending GUSD Schools in 2017-18 per GUSD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Territory Seniors at CVHS Who Graduated Last Year per GUSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add: Estimated TK/K Territory Students Enrolled in GUSD in 2018/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Territory transfers to LCUSD in 2018-19 per LCUSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Est'd Total Territory Students Attending GUSD Schools in 2018-19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. LCUSD enrolled 181 new non-resident permit students in 2018-19: LCUSD has a documented history of proficiently enrolling about 120 to 180+ new permit students annually for more than a decade. This longstanding policy was designed to maintain its total enrollment at approximately 4,050 to 4,150 – not to increase enrollment. In 2018-19, LCUSD enrolled a total of 181 permit students including 50 Territory students while fully maintaining its caps on class size consistent with its LCAP goals.

This powerful piece of evidence provides real-time confirmation that LCUSD has the capability and experience to enroll large numbers of non-resident permit students without increased facilities costs.

3. LCUSD has capacity: LCUSD forcefully affirmed that it does not have a “classroom crisis” as asserted by GUSD in its Opposition Letter. Instead, LCUSD has flexibility and capacity to accommodate all students affected by the Petition. LCUSD is prepared to provide portable classrooms if needed and has the support and guarantee of LCF to house any students involved in the matter. In direct response to faulty assertions made by GUSD, LCUSD has affirmed to the Committee that it has the financial resources to address all needs related to a Territory transfer, in both the short term and the future without causing a significant increase in school facilities costs.

It should be noted that LCUSD is a well-managed and financially strong district with the same “Aa1” credit rating and “Stable Outlook” as GUSD. The rating agency recognized LCUSD for its healthy reserve and liquidity levels, stable positive enrollment and a below average debt burden that has rapid payout, an average pension burden and a low unfunded Post-Employment Benefits liability.  

4. Delayed implementation is no longer needed: Previously both districts entertained the concept of a delayed implementation. That is no longer the case since:

   a. There are relatively few remaining Territory students attending GUSD schools,

   b. The effective date of the transfer would be dependent on a Petitionary vote that would provide at least one additional permit transfer cycle further reducing the number of students to be transferred, and

   c. The expectation, based on experience throughout the permissive transfer process, that some Territory students (especially high school students) would choose not to transfer since LCUSD has agreed to offer releases to any Territory students currently attending GUSD, as well as their siblings, should they request one.

---

5. **GUSD misrepresents LCUSD's facilities needs:** GUSD references $251.9 million from the LCUSD Facilities Master Plan as "necessary facilities" when in fact it represents the initial "visionary" input from the members of the Facilities Master Plan Committee as part of a consultant-led process to envision improvements without constraint. Later in the process, this "wish list" of projects was prioritized and narrowed down to reflect the truly needed projects from the "nice-to-have" projects. The ultimate decision of LCUSD to proceed with the voter-approved $149 million bond in 2017 was intended to address all "necessary facilities" and more.

*Given the supporting evidence provided, Petitioners respectfully request the Committee affirm Condition 7 as being substantially met.*

**CONDITION 8:** The proposed reorganization is primarily designed for purposes other than to significantly increase property values.

**Summary Points:**

- **GUSD speculates that a primary motive of the Petition is to increase property values but provides no substantive evidence to support this assertion.**

- **The real estate appraisal commissioned by GUSD to support this assertion was flawed in that it failed to account for differing lot sizes in the areas examined, which in California is a primary driver of real estate values.**

- **In similarly speculative fashion, GUSD seeks to impugn the motivations of the Petition signatories based, in part, on its "analysis" of Petition signatory data — an analysis the Counsel for this Committee referred to as "... nothing more than a fishing expedition."**

1. **GUSD’s speculative assertions as to Petitioners’ motivation:** GUSD does little more than assert in its Opposition Letter that the true motivation of the Petitioners is to enrich themselves through higher property values, which GUSD theorizes would come with a successful transfer. These assertions were rebutted by Petitioners in their Petitioners’ Brief (Pages 69 – 73) and in their Petitioners’ Response (Pages 13 – 18), which the Committee members have available to review.

Additionally, in its Report to the County Committee dated February 10, 2017, Staff stated that “By policy, to evaluate this condition, the County Committee should analyze the rationale presented in the petition for transfer” and that “Nothing in the petition language indicated a motive to increase real estate values.” Staff goes on to state that “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 . . .”

Staff goes on to conclude that “. . . 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.” [Emphasis added]

2. **Appraisal assertions based on a faulty report:** GUSD refers to an appraisal report prepared by Curtis-Rosenthal, Inc. (CRI) which examined property values both within and outside the Territory boundaries, concluding that there was an approximate 14% price difference between the two areas, with the outside-Territory values being higher. CRI goes on to attribute this primarily to the differing school districts.

A glaring omission of the CRI analysis is that it ignores differences in average lot sizes between the two study areas, i.e. the Territory (non-LCUSD within LCF) and the neighboring LCF area (LCUSD). In its description of the paired sale data analysis used by CRI, the report states that “Lot sizes not adjusted because similar usable site area is assumed” (CRI report Page 35) even though in some cases those differences are significant, ranging from -21% to as much as +275%, with an average difference of +43.4%, the Outside-Territory lots being significantly larger, on average, than the Territory lots.

GUSD also asserts that increasing property values is the primary motivation behind the Petition in its comments regarding what it refers to as the Petition “Signatory Data”. Despite Petitioners’ challenge that such data was private and protected voter information, GUSD successfully sued to obtain access to the names and addresses of the Petition signatories. GUSD stated that “78% of [Petition] signers do not have children who are students at Sagebrush schools” and from that, asserts that “Petition signatories have no true interest in the Territory students attending GUSD, but instead are motivated by the promise of increasing their property values and significantly lowering their tax burden.”

There is no test or requirement that a signatory to a petition for a school district territory transfer must have children currently attending public schools in either of the affected school districts, only that they be registered voters residing in the area to be transferred. A survey of the Territory registered voters conducted for GUSD by True North in May 2014, indicated that the vast majority either currently had or once had children attending GUSD schools and that they overwhelmingly (+85%) supported a transfer, despite the increase in taxes (LCUSD’s parcel tax) that would come with it.

At the GUSD Board meeting on May 20, 2014, in response to a question by a GUSD Board member, then-Chief Business Officer Eva Lueck stated that “whenever you go out
to the voters, when we [GUSD] did with Measure S, the vast majority of the population do not have children in our schools”. Hence, the property owners and registered voters in the Territory are no different in this respect than those in the GUSD area.

Clearly, GUSD has no prerequisite that its voters must have children attending GUSD schools when it seeks voter approval of a bond measure, yet it infers that voters who don’t have children attending GUSD schools should somehow not have a voice in this Petition or that they have ulterior motives in supporting this Petition.

Petitioners restate their position that GUSD presents no substantive evidence that pursuit of higher property values is the primary purpose of the Petitioners and/or Territory residents and respectfully ask the Committee to accept the Staff recommendation and affirm Condition 8 as having been substantially met.

CONDITION 9: The proposed reorganization will continue to promote sound fiscal management and not cause substantial negative effect on the fiscal status of any existing district affected by the proposed reorganization.

Summary Points:

- There would be no substantial negative financial impact to either district resulting from the Territory transfer as evidenced by the following:
  - The remaining number of Territory students who could transfer is not substantial (less than six-tenths of one percent - 0.006 - of GUSD’s total enrollment and about 3.6% of LCUSD’s total enrollment),
  - No property or school facilities would transfer,
  - The Territory’s assessed valuation is just 1.85% of GUSD’s total assessed valuation,
  - GUSD’s AV increased by nearly $6.9 billion (+23.9%) since 2014-15, a four-year increase that dwarfs the totality of the Territory’s AV by more than 10 times,
  - GUSD’s 2018-19 tax rate of $50.455 per $100,000 of assessed valuation is far below the maximum rate of $60 per $100,000 of assessed valuation that GUSD “promised” to its taxpayers,
  - GUSD conducted highly successful bond sales in 2016 and in 2018; both were oversubscribed and achieved significantly better-than-projected interest rates, and
  - Moody’s upgraded GUSD’s credit rating to “Aa1” from “Aa2” in 2016 and reaffirmed its “Aa1” credit rating along with a long-term “Stable Outlook” in 2018, even after GUSD provided regulatory-required disclosures regarding the status of its solvency plan and the Territory petition itself.
1. **The Territory represents less than 2% of GUSD by all metrics:** With any transfer of territory, it can be reasonably assumed that there will be some negative effect on the fiscal status of a district that loses students and territory. However, the threshold for consideration is whether the negative fiscal impact is “substantial”.

The Petitioners maintain that there is no evidence that the Territory transfer would cause a “substantial” negative effect on the fiscal status of either GUSD or LCUSD - a position bolstered by CDE’s declarative statement in May 2016 overturning a local County Committee’s decision regarding one of the conditions stating that “a 2.4 percent loss of AV … would not translate into a significant increase in state costs”.  

The graphics below clearly illustrate that 1) GUSD is a giant compared to LCUSD and 2) the Territory is statistically inconsequential to GUSD.

![Bar Graphs: Number of Students, Population, Assessed Valuation](image)

2. **Loss of Enrollment Revenue to GUSD is insignificant:** GUSD claims significant fiscal harm from loss of enrollment revenue. This assertion has been materially diminished with the current enrollment of 215 Territory students at LCUSD, with more than two-thirds being elementary students. As a result, the Petitioners believe **an estimated 150 Territory students currently attend GUSD schools** (See table at Condition 7) and not all of them would seek to transfer to LCUSD schools.

GUSD has released Territory students seeking to attend LCUSD schools consistent with its preference for a “permissive” permitting agreement. **Effectively, GUSD voluntarily relinquished all claims for ADA reimbursement for these Territory students who**

---

18 CA SBE Agenda for May 2016, Item 09, Appeal from an action of the Santa Clara County Committee on School District Organization to disapprove a transfer of territory from the Campbell Union School District and the Campbell Union High School District to the Santa Clara Unified School District, CDE Responses to the Appeal §7.2, CDE Response (p 12, first full paragraph).
transferred to LCUSD schools thereby rendering its assertions of monetary losses for future transfers in conflict with its stated preference and its current practice.

Furthermore, GUSD’s total enrollment has held relatively steady since it began to release Territory students to LCUSD. (See table at Condition 3.) It seems highly doubtful that GUSD has suffered any negative fiscal effect from the transfer of such a small percentage of its 26,000+ students especially since its total enrollment has remained relatively stable.

Specifically, GUSD calculates its loss of enrollment revenue at $2.7 million annually assuming all 350 Territory students transfer, which is less than 1% of its 2018-17 adopted budget revenue of $292 million. **Most notably, conspicuously absent in GUSD’s calculation is an offset for the expense of no longer educating these transferred students, which CDE requires in accordance with Ed Code §41372.**

CDE points districts to its website to identify its most recent year “Current Expense per Average ADA”. CDE lists GUSD’s most recent (2016-17) “Expense of Education” at $10,937 per student. **Offsetting its lost enrollment revenue with its related costs savings per CDE-provided data effectively negates the entire claim made by GUSD relative to lost enrollment-related revenue.**

**By all metrics, any monetary impact to GUSD from the Territory transfer would not cause a “substantial negative effect” on its fiscal status due to 1) the immateriality of the number of Territory students who would transfer and 2) CDE’s position that the educational cost savings offset related to the transferred students must be considered when determining financial impact.**

3. **Loss of Territory Assessed Valuation has minimal impact on GUSD’s bonding capacity:**

In deference to the GUSD Mountain Avenue Elementary community and the GUSD school board, Petitioners intentionally removed the GUSD-owned “Pickens Canyon” lot from the defined territory boundaries to be transferred to LCUSD as reflected in the Petition documents approved for signature-gathering. Therefore, it is clear that **there will be no property or school facilities transferred or distributed under any circumstance** and GUSD will retain legal ownership of the “Pickens Canyon” drop-off/pick-up lot with no change to GUSD’s existing access and emergency ingress and egress for the GUSD Mountain Avenue Elementary campus.

As such, the only way GUSD itself could be negatively impacted with respect to taxes would be due to a reduction of its assessed valuation (loss of Territory AV transferring to LCUSD) necessary to secure future bonds, i.e. its bonding capacity. However, any impact would be minimal at best and definitely not substantial since the 2018-19 assessed

---

19 Ibid. CDE Responses to the Appeal §7.3, CDE Response (p 14, third paragraph); “EC Section 41372 requires that a “current expense of education” for each school district be calculated based on information submitted to the CDE by the district”.

20 Ibid. See p. 18, Fn 15 for citation.
valuation of the Territory is such a small percentage of GUSD’s tax base - only 1.85%.
(See table at Condition 3)

The Territory’s relative insignificance to GUSD’s tax base is made clear by the fact that
the assessed valuation of just two of GUSD’s more than 50,000 taxpayers (a two-phase
regional mall and a movie studio) is 56% greater than the entirety of the Territory’s total
assessed valuation.21

The increase of $6.9 billion (+23.9%) in GUSD’s tax base from 2014-15 to 2018-19 was
more than ten times greater than the entirety of the Territory’s current tax base,
which clearly demonstrates the immateriality of the Territory to GUSD AV. Even after
a transfer, GUSD’s AV would exceed $35 billion.

Regarding GUSD’s bonding capacity specifically, the financial strength of GUSD was fully
evidenced in 2016 by its oversubscribed $70 million bond issuance, which achieved
significantly lower-than-expected interest rates. Immediately prior to that bond
issuance, Moody’s raised GUSD’s credit rating from ‘Aa2’ to “Aa1” with a Stable Outlook
and specifically highlighted GUSD’s financial strengths as follows22:

- Very large tax base,

21 Official Statement dated September 13, 2018 for Glendale Unified School District’s $50,885,000 bond issuance;
22 “Moody’s upgrades Glendale Unified School District, CA’s GO Bonds to Aa1”, July 26, 2016,
https://www.moodys.com/research/Moodys-upgrades-Glendale-Unified-School-District-CAs-GO-Bonds-to-
PR_903482819.
- Healthy reserves and strong liquidity,
- Low debt burden,
- Good income indicators,
- Stable and very diverse property tax base, and
- Maintenance of strong reserves.

(Both GUSD and LCUSD are recognized as among the few California school districts to maintain a Moody’s “Aa1” credit rating.)

GUSD’s September 13, 2018 Official Statement related to its bond issuance included the following legal disclosure pertaining specifically to the Petition to transfer the Territory:

“On May 3, 2017, the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (the “County Committee”) voted to preliminarily approve a petition to transfer approximately 350 District students living in the City of La Canada-Flintridge to the La Canada Unified School District. Following a CEQA review, the County Committee will hold a second vote to uphold or change the preliminary decision. The District opposed the proposal and may appeal the County Committee’s final decision to the State Board of Education.”

This perfunctory legal disclosure to GUSD’s future bondholders, rating agency, bond counsel and the public makes no mention of any exposure to a substantial negative fiscal impact related to the Petition to transfer territory.

Importantly, the above-noted disclosure regarding the status of the Petition had no negative impact on GUSD’s credit rating as Moody’s reaffirmed GUSD’s “Aa1” credit rating and assigned a “Stable Outlook” to the District’s long-term ratings and its newly-sold bonds began trading on September 27, 2018.

Meanwhile, in great contrast, just one day after Moody’s reaffirmed GUSD’s “Aa1” credit rating and within a week of the September 13, 2018 Official Statement for its bond sale, GUSD stated in its Opposition Letter dated September 6, 2018 that 1) “this [Territory transfer] will severely undermine GUSD’s ability to obtain future school facility bonds”, 2) will produce a “significant negative effect” to the district from the loss of the Territory’s AV and 3) will trigger an “enormous burden” to its taxpayers. Moody’s reaffirmation of GUSD’s credit rating and the successful issuance of its latest bond sale in 2018 fully undermine these assertions by GUSD to the Committee.

As noted, GUSD provided no disclosure in its September 13, 2018 Official Statement whatsoever of a claimed “significant financial impact” related to the Petition. Likewise,

---

24 Ratings Action: Moody’s assigns Aa1 to Glendale USD (CA) ... Outlook is stable; September 5, 2018; https://www.moodys.com/research/Moodys-assigns-Aa1-to-Glendale-USD-CA-2011-Series-D---PR_904410366.
there was no disclosure in GUSD’s 2018-19 audit report dated November 26, 2018 or its 2017-18 audit report dated November 28, 2017 of a potential significant financial impact related to this Petition (a copy of the 2017-18 audit report was included as an exhibit to the Official Statement for the bond offering). While GUSD asserts to this Committee and to Staff that “the financial impact to GUSD will be terrible” and “this tax burden is enormous [to taxpayers]”, it made no similar warnings to its auditors in November 2017 or to its bond counsel, credit rating agency, future bondholders and the public in September 2018.

GUSD’s highly successful bond sales in 2016 and 2018 were oversubscribed and achieved significantly better-than-projected interest rates. Importantly, Moody’s reaffirmed GUSD’s “Aa1” credit rating and assigned a “Stable Outlook” for its long-term ratings in 2018 after its review of GUSD’s regulatory disclosures which acknowledged its solvency plan and the status of the Petition itself. Moody’s September 2018 reaffirmation of GUSD’s credit rating provides third-party expert evidence that GUSD’s creditworthiness has been unaffected by its solvency plan and by any financial exposure to the Petition itself.

4. Loss of Territory Assessed Valuation has minimal impact on GUSD’s taxpayers: Of great importance, the Official Statement dated September 13, 2018 provides two informative disclosures that directly contradict GUSD’s claims of “significant financial impact” to its taxpayers.

a. GUSD’s 2018-19 tax rate is $50.455 per $100,000 of AV (See chart at Condition 3). If that rate were to increase, post-transfer, by 1.85% to $51.39 in accordance with Ed Code when no property transfers, then GUSD’s claims of 1) an “enormous” tax burden to its taxpayers and 2) “that it exceeds the $60 per $100,000 of AV that GUSD promised its residents would not exceed” would be without merit.

An increase in the tax rate of 1.85% would result in an annual increase to the GUSD taxpayer of between $5.39 (median AV) and $5.96 (average AV). This 1.85% increase to the GUSD taxpayer would not be significant and certainly not “enormous”.

b. GUSD’s current AV is $35.66 billion, which is nearly $6.9 billion greater (24% greater) than its AV in 2014-15. GUSD’s AV increase of $6.9 billion since 2014-15 is more than 10 times the entirety of the current Territory AV, which makes GUSD’s claims related to the loss of the Territory’s AV and its impact on the District’s bonding capacity lacking legitimacy.

c. GUSD’s Solvency Plan. Recently, GUSD has introduced the novel concept of supporting its claims of “significant financial impact” by referencing its “solvency plan”. As background, GUSD disclosed in its Bond Issuance Official Statement dated September 13, 2018 that it:
“first received a qualified certification for its fiscal year 2014-15 second interim report but received positive certifications on its most recent interim reports in 2016-17 and 2017-18. GUSD first submitted its board approved fiscal stabilization plan to LACOE with its 2017-18 budget.”

In its solvency plan, GUSD identified specific areas to reduce expenses “up to the $7.6 million of ongoing expenditures and increased revenues.” Included in the Management’s Discussion and Analysis, Financial Highlights section of GUSD’s 2018 Audit Report was this disclosure:

“Due to the state’s fiscal issues and the subsequent impact on the District’s fiscal health, the District has implemented changes to minimize the decrease in its fund balance to ensure solvency in future years. Some of these changes include implementing energy conservation strategies, consolidating facilities to eliminate rental fees, transferring of monies from other funds as well as, the approval of the Solvency Plan to maximize income and lower expenditures.”

More recently, GUSD self-certified its 2018 First Interim report indicating that it may not meet its financial obligations within the subsequent two years. Its Board reviewed a “comprehensive budget review” prepared by School Services of California, Inc. (“SSC”) at a special board meeting on December 18, 2018.

As part of its review, SSC presented a comparative analysis of revenues, expenditures, fund balance reserves, staffing ratios, and teacher salaries and benefits, as compared to 21 school districts of like size and with comparable resources (including LCUSD). Among its key findings:

- GUSD’s personnel salary and benefits comprise 89% of its unrestricted budget (leaving only 11% for all other expenditures) compared to an average of 86% for California unified districts
- Only four of the 21 comparative districts have managed its Average Daily Attendance (“ADA”) from 2012/13 to 2016/17 more effectively than GUSD with a decline of just .37% compared to a 7.06% decline in ADA among the comparative group average

---

• GUSD’s ranked second highest among the 21 districts in comparison for the amount spent on personnel health and welfare benefits per ADA, 17% higher than the comparative group average

• GUSD ranked third highest among the 21 in the comparative group for the percentage of budget committed to personnel salaries and benefits overall

• GUSD’s Unrestricted Net Ending Balance as a Percent of Total Expenditures, Transfers, and Other Uses for 2016-17 was 16.78% compared to a comparative group average of 21.5%.

SSC’s recommendation to GUSD was “to take action to stem the deficit spending trend and exercise caution at the bargaining table in order to maintain an appropriate level of reserves and ensure fiscal stability”. The Territory transfer was never mentioned in the SSC report.

GUSD makes no mention whatsoever to its consultants, auditors, bond counsel, rating agency, potential bondholders and the public of a “significant” financial impact linking the Territory transfer to its solvency plan. Yet, GUSD makes these assertions to the Committee and to Staff.

5. Capitol Advisors Report: Staff and GUSD point to the Capitol Advisors report and the inability of the two districts to come to a mutual agreement as indicative of the Petition’s negative effect on both districts’ fiscal management. The former GUSD board president fully misrepresented the Capitol Advisors conclusion when she stated publicly: “Capitol Advisors has ... determined that removing the Territory residents from the GUSD would have significant negative impact upon GUSD and LCUSD.” This statement was largely repeated by GUSD’s superintendent in an email dated May 31, 2016 to Tom Smith, former Chief Petitioner.

Yet, Capitol Advisors never conducted a feasibility analysis or a financial analysis and never considered the magnitude of GUSD’s claimed monetary impacts, which 1) were based on faulty student enrollment transfer metrics that ignored related education expense savings and 2) fully ignored the fact that no property or facilities would be transferred. While the words “significant negative impacts” do not appear anywhere in the Capitol Advisors report, the phrase “lack of agreement on the financial impacts to both districts” is included.

GUSD’s monetary claims are simply not supportable. The true impact of the Territory transfer would not cause a substantial negative effect on GUSD’s financial status since:

- the number of students who would transfer is insignificant relative to GUSD’s enrollment (less than six-tenths of 1%, or 0.006),
GUSD fails to offset its expense savings against lost revenue from transferred students,
no property or school facilities would be transferred,
the Territory represents only 1.85% of GUSD’s tax base,
GUSD’s total tax base has grown dramatically by $6.9 billion (up 24%) over the past four years, which outstrips the entirety of the Territory tax base by more than ten times and
GUSD continues to retain its “Aa1” credit rating with a long-term “Stable Outlook”, notwithstanding GUSD’s public disclosures regarding its solvency plan and the current status of this petition itself.

Given the supporting evidence provided, Petitioners respectfully request the Committee affirm Condition 9 as being substantially met.

Additional Considerations

Petitioners included a “Petitioner’s Rationale” section in its Petitioners’ Brief containing additional considerations that Petitioners felt were relevant to the Committee’s deliberations.

Similarly, Petitioners provide the following additional comments for consideration by the Committee:

1. Compelling Local Educational Needs and Concerns are authentic and legitimate:

GUSD has asserted that “there is no educational reason or any other valid reason for the transfer to be approved” and “there is no evidence that the Territory students would experience any greater achievement in La Cañada schools than in Glendale schools.” (GUSD Brief, Page 73, Section A1)

Petitioners provided an extensive discussion of its rationale regarding this issue in its Petitioners’ Brief affirming that “the Territory transfer Petition fully addresses identified local educational needs and concerns.” (Petitioners’ Brief Page 10) Petitioners have put forth a number of specific local circumstances that would yield educational benefits to Territory students if the transfer were to take effect, even though both districts may be considered high performing.

Petitioners firmly believe that having Territory children benefit fully from the truly exceptional educational programs and services provided by LCF’s hometown schools genuinely reflects and addresses local educational needs and concerns. Further, Petitioners assert that this excellence is, to a great degree, the byproduct of LCF’s (our hometown) collective social and community capital devoted to its children and its local
public schools and that student educational achievement is optimized when their school experience is fully integrated into other educational opportunities in their local community.

While the La Cañada City/Schools partnership is united by common goals and purpose, the Glendale City/Schools relationship is fractured as evidenced by this December 18, 2018 headline in the local paper: “Glendale Unified board lashes out at City Council over decision that effectively nixes property transfer.” While LCUSD students derive great benefit from the social and community capital stemming from the LCF/LCUSD partnership, GUSD students do not.

LCUSD and the Petitioners have acknowledged that both school districts are high-performing but they are not “equal” as GUSD asserts. In reality, every school district is unique in the totality of its academic and social environment provided to its students. Furthermore, there are multiple measures of school district performance including student academic performance, graduation rates, college and career readiness, English learner progress, suspension rates and chronic absenteeism.

In terms of academic performance, LCUSD students at Palm Crest Elementary, LCHS 7-8 and LCHS 9-12 outperformed their GUSD counterparts at Mountain Avenue Elementary, Rosemont Middle and Crescenta Valley High School in both the 2016 Common Core test results and the most current 2018 CAASPP results by substantial margins at every grade level, subject matter, and category (“exceeded” and “met or exceeded”).

LCUSD outperforms GUSD on most, if not all, of the other aforementioned measures at the district level. The same is true when limiting the comparisons to the three LCUSD schools mentioned above and their counterpart GUSD schools.

Even so, Territory families look far beyond traditional performance measures when they focus on student emotional health and wellness, student-school connectedness, parent engagement and student access to a broad course of study – all of which are fully aligned with the community goals and interests of their hometown LCUSD schools, as well as the civic goals and priorities of the City where they reside.

Specific examples of local educational needs and concerns related to student wellness being addressed by LCUSD include the previously mentioned participation in Challenge Success, the Stanford University program that has been expanded to include all LCUSD campuses and the district’s groundbreaking commitment to provide school-based professional counseling services for students in grades 7-12 commencing in the 2019-20 school year as a part of its Wellness Plan.

---

Another program unique to LCUSD is the JPL Space Academy – an after-school engineering program with a space exploration focus that offers students the opportunity to learn from professionals at the NASA Jet Propulsion Lab “(JPL”). In its fifth year, nearly 150 LCUSD students applied to participate in the Academy. Students build launchers, pitch their “companies” to investors, wire circuits for the onboard sensors, make predictions based on physics and test their predictions in a series of launches. In 2018, the Academy teamed up with a school in Spain, near the European Space Astronomy Centre, to create the opportunity for international student collaboration in building projects together. This program is supported by the La Cañada Flintridge Sister Cities Assn. and JPL.

Further evidence of LCUSD’s commitment to serve all of its student population is a new program that has been preliminarily approved by its Board to move forward. As a mission-driven district responsive to community needs and concerns, LCUSD is moving forward with a proposal for formal guidelines regarding the identification, assessment and instructional planning provided for students with Dyslexia (a specific learning disability in reading). The formal plan to support the community’s students at-risk for Dyslexia presented to the LCUSD Board includes teacher training, universal screening of TK-3rd grade students, differentiated standards-based instruction in reading with benchmark assessments, targeted intervention with remediation programs and access to appropriate assistive technology.

Finally, Territory residents are fully aligned with LCUSD’s LCAP goals and priorities pertaining to class size reduction and reduced caseloads for high school counselors as just two of many significant and compelling educational needs and concerns that are not a part of GUSD’s LCAP goals and priorities.

2. Student Safety First

A primary benefit of the Territory transfer as highlighted in the Petition itself and the resolutions of both LCF and LCUSD is an appreciably safer environment for Territory students and their families during an emergency or crisis, which is certainly not a rare event for hillside communities abutting the National Forest.

In the event that the GUSD-owned pedestrian bridge spanning Pickens Canyon, which is the primary access to-and-from GUSD Mountain Avenue Elementary and the Territory, was inaccessible in an emergency, Territory students would be isolated from their families. Parents and students from Territory homes primarily access the school site via the pedestrian bridge over Pickens Canyon. The vast majority of Territory families with students attending GUSD Mountain Avenue Elementary would have an immensely challenging time trying to reach each other in an extreme emergency situation due to access limitations. Contrast the situation, during an emergency, of the limited-access path from the Territory to the local GUSD elementary school versus the multiple-access
paths to the nearby LCUSD elementary school and the increased safety aspects are clear.

Petitioners are not suggesting that GUSD Mountain Avenue Elementary is inherently unsafe. Instead, the concerns relate to access of Territory families to their children in a natural disaster, emergency or other crisis. In April 2014, the then president of the Crescenta Valley Town Council told the GUSD board “this [the pedestrian bridge] is the only access ... In an emergency, lack of access could be disastrous”.

Also, the Petitioners believe that Territory students would be safer under LCUSD’s jurisdiction due to the elimination of an entire layer of government bureaucracy involved with safety-related communication and coordination among multiple municipal and emergency-responder agencies.

LCF has little or no connection with GUSD. In contrast, LCF and LCUSD have a close and effective working relationship, especially concerning safety matters. When Territory residents were disproportionately impacted by the 2009 and 2010 natural disasters locally, LCF fully recognized the inefficiencies in trying to coordinate with GUSD, whose district office is located nine miles away. With the Territory being within the sphere of influence of LCF as defined by LALAFCO” (See citation #5), LCF was better equipped to rapidly and efficiently assist the impacted Territory residents.

3. Petition approval would reflect good Public Policy:

The Territory transfer takes into account broader public policy concerns including greater public civic engagement, participation in the governance process and avoidance of “piecemeal” territory transfers that result in boundary changes that make little sense.

GUSD has claimed that public policy matters (i.e. the “domino effect”) caused it to oppose the Petitioners’ efforts to transfer to LCUSD in the past. More recent justifications to repel the current Petitioners’ efforts appear to revolve around preventing the erosion of its boundaries and assertions of a lack of educational reason.

The Petitioners believe GUSD’s opposition arguments are self-serving, intended to defend what it controls today at the expense of others while turning a deaf ear to the interests of Territory students and their families.

Petitioner’s believe the relevant and timely public policy issue would be to “help make California government more accessible, responsive and transparent”, which is fully consistent with the findings of the State of California’s Commission on Local Governance for the 21st Century.

One of its major recommendations designed to address increasing voter apathy was “that opportunities for public involvement, active participation and information
regarding government decision-making be increased." With 30% of California’s eligible voters failing to register to vote and the percentage of registered voters going to the polls plummeting, policies to increase the public’s civic engagement and participation in the governance process should be prioritized, not demonized. The goal of increasing public participation applies just as well to local school district governance as it does to state-wide elections and serves to further align community priorities with the LCAP priorities established by their hometown schools.

Specifically, with respect to school district reorganizations, this State Commission recommended in its report “that county committees on school district reorganization be required to consider, to the extent feasible, making school district boundary changes respect city and special district boundaries.” This recommendation specifically addressed the Commission’s concerns revolving around insufficient coordination among cities, counties and school districts and its impact on government inefficiency and safety.

There is no risk of a “domino effect” with this petition and the transfer cannot be characterized as “piecemeal” since the transfer would not establish precedent for a future transfer into LCUSD or away from GUSD. The Territory seeking to transfer to LCUSD presents a unique situation that cannot be duplicated within any part of GUSD. The Territory is fully within the boundaries of LCF, does not abut the City of Glendale, and is the only portion of GUSD outside of the City of Glendale and the unincorporated communities of La Crescenta and Montrose. Plus, the Territory is geographically isolated from all other GUSD constituents by Pickens Canyon, a formidable natural barrier that drains a large section of the upper San Gabriel Mountains National Monument watershed to the north.

Finally, there is anecdotal evidence from several years of permissive student transfers into LCUSD that a formalized Territory transfer may draw students back to the public education system from private schools.

4. A permissive attendance policy is not a viable long-term solution:

GSUD has stated on numerous occasions that there is no need for the proposed Territory transfer, stating that Territory students already have what the Petition seeks –

---


namely the ability to attend LCUSD schools should they choose to do so. This argument fully ignores the distinct difference between having the ability to attend LCUSD schools subject to GUSD’s permission versus the right to permanently attend LCUSD schools.

The current permissive transfer process is cumbersome and challenging for students and families as it takes place only in April and students may not be notified if they have been accepted by LCUSD and released by GUSD until one or two weeks prior to the start of the new school year. Some families face hard choices when one sibling is released but the other is not.

**GUSD could, at any time, change its current practice and cease granting releases to Territory students who prefer to attend LCUSD schools, as it has in the past.** As evidence, GUSD released Territory students to attend GUSD schools throughout the duration of the 1990s transfer petition but “shut the door” once that transfer effort failed. As another example, prior to the initiation of the current petition efforts that led to the permissive transfer arrangement in place today, there were only a handful of Territory students released to attend LCUSD schools in contrast to several hundred that attend today.

Furthermore, school districts are prohibited by Ed Code from entering into formal District-to-District agreements for a period greater than five years. Therefore, even if the two affected districts reached an agreement that codified their respective permit and release policies, it would need reaffirming every five years or be revoked at the end of each term. This would not provide the stability and assurance Territory residents and parents seek to ensure their ability to seamlessly and confidently plan their children’s educational path and experience.

**CONCLUSION**

Petitioners firmly believe that the supporting facts, arguments, and additional information provided in the original Petitioner’s Brief dated November 2, 2016, the Petitioner’s Response dated February 13, 2017 and this Petitioners’ Supplemental Response demonstrate that the nine Conditions **have been substantially met** and respectfully request that the Committee conclude the same and render its approval of the Territory transfer Petition.

**PROPOSED ELECTION AREA**

Should there be a favorable ruling for the Territory transfer, Petitioners believe that the Committee should follow the legal precedent known as the LAFCO decision (Local Agency Formation Commission), which is consistent with the Committee’s recent Wiseburn decision and CDE’s history of recommending to SBE that it follow the LAFCO decision on appeals. LAFCO holds that elections may be confined to within the boundaries of the territory proposed for transfer (the “default” area) provided there is a rational basis for doing so.
The proposed transfer does not reflect any genuinely different interests between Territory voters and non-Territory GUSD voters since it has been established that the Territory is a small sliver of land representing less than 2% of GUSD by all measures and any impact to GUSD stakeholders would be insignificant.

In several recent appeals (2016 – 2018), CDE has demonstrated a preference for limiting the election area to the proposed transfer area, when no genuinely different interests exist between the affected areas, as is the case here.33 In addition, the proposed Territory transfer has been simplified by specifically excluding any property or school facilities.

Furthermore, CDE has opined that “[a] reduced voting area has a fair relationship to a legitimate public purpose.” These individuals have a greater than incidental interest in the well-being, safety and education of their children, enhanced social and community capital and in strengthening overall community cohesion in their hometown, which would inure to the best interests and educational experience of their children. Plus, only Territory residents would incur significantly higher taxes related to an approved transfer as they would assume the same $450 parcel tax currently paid by LCUSD taxpayers, which expires June 30, 2021. GUSD does not have a parcel tax.

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

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

---

Appendix
Territory is outside City of Glendale Sphere of Influence
APPENDIX E
Dear Members of the Los Angeles County Committee of Education:

I am a Sagebrush, La Cañada Flintridge parent of a 4-year old daughter whom we hope can attend La Canada Unified School District (LCUSD)’s Kindergarten in Aug 2020. However, we are greatly distressed that she may not be given that opportunity if Glendale Unified (GUSD) changes its undocumented policy to release Sagebrush kids to LCUSD as it did in the 1990’s after that Territory Transfer Petition process ended. I say undocumented policy because GUSD, unlike LCUSD, has not passed any resolution confirming it will continue to safeguard our opportunity to permit into LCUSD. So, I am hopeful you will approve this petition and give our neighborhood the choice and opportunity to vote on a territory transfer.

At the September 2019 County Committee meeting, GUSD representatives made many statements that either their schools are equal or superior to LCUSD. From that they drew the false conclusion that they are better stewards of the Sagebrush students’ education than LCUSD. As a parent of a Sagebrush preschooler, I find that wrong. First, we are not part of the La Crescenta community and I want to make sure my child has the sense of belonging and emotional well-being that comes from being educated within her own community of La Cañada Flintridge. Moreover, the reason GUSD’s assertions are wrong is that factually the data shows that GUSD schools are not equal or superior to LCUSD.

One of our local papers featured an article with the latest independent ranking of elementary schools, released in August 2019. According to Niche’s 2020 School Rankings, GUSD’s Mountain Avenue Elementary was only ranked 157th in LA County and 850th in the state. By contrast, LCUSD’s Palm Crest Elementary was ranked 12th in LA County and 32nd in the state. (Source: https://www.niche.com/?ref=k12.)
I was stunned at the disparate rankings for these two neighboring schools about a half mile apart with similar demographics, so I checked the state standardized test scores to better understand the objective discrepancy.

I studied the 2018 (the most recent available) California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) test results for both schools. The discrepancy in the Mathematics scores particularly jumped out at me. The percentage of GUSD’s Mountain Avenue 5th graders who met or exceeded state math standards was only 42.3%. By contrast, the percentage of LCUSD’s Palm Crest 5th graders who did so was a whopping 87.5%, over twice as high as Mountain Avenue! (Source: https://caaspp.cde.ca.gov)

The percentage of GUSD’s Mountain Avenue 6th graders who met or exceeded state math standards was only 62.5%. By contrast, the percentage of LCUSD’s Palm Crest 6th graders who did so was 86.6%!

Similarly, I wondered about the differences between the 2 districts’ high schools and reviewed the US News & World Report 2019 rankings. GUSD’s Crescenta Valley High only ranked 89th in the state (50th excluding charters and magnet schools). By contrast, LCUSD’s La Canada High School ranked 26th in the state (13th excluding charters and magnet schools). (Source: https://www.usnews.com/education/best-high-schools/national-rankings)

Also, hugely important to my family — my husband is a physician — was the 1st ever US News & World Report 2019 ranking of the top 250 STEM high schools in the nation. GUSD’s Crescenta Valley High was not even listed among the nation’s top 250 STEM high schools. Astonishingly, nor was GUSD’s dedicated STEM magnet high school, the Anderson W. Clark Magnet. By contrast, La Cañada High School was listed at #148 (#49 excluding charters and magnets).

### 2019 Best High Schools Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GUSD Crescenta Valley HS</th>
<th>LCUSD La Cañada HS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Schools in LA Metro</td>
<td>#19</td>
<td>#4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Charters/Magnets in LA Metro</td>
<td>#34</td>
<td>#9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Schools in California</td>
<td>#50</td>
<td>#13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Charters/Magnets in California</td>
<td>#89</td>
<td>#26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Schools in Nation</td>
<td>#405</td>
<td>#106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Charters/Magnets in Nation</td>
<td>#631</td>
<td>#218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional STEM Schools in Nation</td>
<td>Not Ranked</td>
<td>#49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Charters/Magnets in Nation</td>
<td>Not Ranked</td>
<td>#148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fact that La Cañada High School — a traditional comprehensive high school where more than 330 of its students are members of La Cañada High School’s 6 choirs and more than 50% of its students participate as a CIF athlete — was ranked among the top STEM high schools in the nation indisputably speaks volumes about LCUSD’s educational priorities and achievements. (Source: https://outlooknewspapers.com/brookey-keeps-lchs-choral-music-program-humming/)

While rankings and test scores do not necessarily define the greatness of schools, they undeniably provide an objective, meaningful snapshot of student outcomes and acknowledge schools which provide an educational environment that maximizes student potential.

For my family, LCUSD’s local educational needs and concerns — as reflected in its smaller class sizes, greater number of school counselors, absence of split classes, and massive parent engagement and community involvement — are reasons why we resolutely support the petition to transfer our “Sagebrush” area within the city of La Cañada Flintridge into LCUSD.

Very truly yours,

_Catherine Wong_

Catherine Wong, Esq.
-----Original Message-----
From: Christina Tus <sagebrushresidents@gmx.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 3:14 PM
To: Deegan_Allison <Deegan_Allison@lacoe.edu>
Subject: Fw: LCUSD territory transfer letter

Dr. Deegan,

I would appreciate you providing this email along with the attached to the County Committee.

Thank you - Christina

Dear County Committee Members

I am a parent living in Sagebrush and my children have attended both school districts. I support the petition and hope you approve our efforts to have a choice and get the opportunity to vote for a territory transfer.

I have included in this email 2 recent articles which are pertinent to your assessment of the Sagebrush Territory Transfer Petition.

The first article is LCUSD ‘ready, willing and able’ to accommodate Sagebrush transfer (9-11-19 La Canada Valley Sun). It reports on LCUSD adoption of the most recent resolution in support of the transfer. There they reconfirm their pledge to provide choice to Sagebrush families, post a transfer, for them to be given a release to attend GUSD if they so choose. Also of note is LCUSD’s confidence in their ability to house and educate all Sagebrush students post transfer.

According to the Glendale News Press, the Majority of Glendale Unified secondary students surveyed lack sense of belonging (8-21-19 Glendale News Press). The second article reports on a recent survey which showed a lack of feeling of belonging at GUSD secondary level.

Thank you for your time.

Christina Tusun
La Cañada Valley Sun

By Sara Cardine

Sep. 11, 2019

LCUSD ‘ready, willing and able’ to accommodate Sagebrush transfer

A public hearing on whether students living in the La Cañada’s westernmost “Sagebrush” area should be transferred from Glendale Unified to La Cañada Unified is scheduled to go before the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization Oct. 2.

La Cañada Unified school officials reaffirmed their commitment to supporting the potential transfer of students in the city’s westernmost “Sagebrush” territory in district boundaries Tuesday, in advance of an Oct. 2 hearing by a county committee on district reorganization.

Members of the La Cañada school board unanimously passed a resolution, their fifth since 2013, declaring their support for transferring students into LCUSD who live in La Cañada Flintridge but whose homes lie within the boundaries of the Glendale Unified schools.

The transfer is being considered by the county at the request of resident group Unite LCF, who petitioned the county in 2013 — the most recent of several such attempts filed since 1961.

Past efforts were appealed and put before the state, after GUSD claimed the loss of students would be a significant financial hardship for the district, which receives per-pupil funding based on attendance and also relies on assessed property valuation of district homes for bond funding.
A few of the 800 residents who signed the petition requesting to be rezoned spoke at Tuesday’s board meeting, where LCUSD Supt. Wendy Sinnette assured residents the district was “ready, willing and able” to accommodate the transfer and noted how a family identifies plays a significant role in the debate.

“As supporters of the petitioners we’re mostly respectful of their right to identify with their city and their right to have a voice in the district that they choose or are allowed to attend,” Sinnette said. “It seems like there’s a real need to listen to the residents and allow them to shape their destiny.”

The superintendent said about 221 of an estimated 400 Sagebrush students already attend LCUSD schools. If a transfer were to be approved, the district would honor all requests from families wishing to remain in GUSD.

Sagebrush resident Nick Karapetian, the father of twin La Cañada High School freshmen, said students like his sons now make up 5% of the district.

“It’s about giving them a sense of belonging and wholeness in their community that they didn’t feel before,” he said of the transfer. “That’s what Sagebrush has been fighting for for 60 years.”

A public hearing before the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization has been scheduled for an Oct. 2 meeting, which begins at 9:30 a.m., 9300 Imperial Highway, in Downey.
Glendale Unified board member Nayiri Nahabedian said she thinks the district continues "to have work to do" in making all students feel a sense of belonging after a majority of secondary students said they did not feel positively in a recent socio-emotional survey.

(Tim Berger / Glendale News-Press)

Some Glendale Unified secondary students are struggling to find a sense of belonging and social awareness, while many of their elementary peers are performing better, according to results from a survey conducted last spring.

Stephen Mekhitarian, the district's assessment and accountability coordinator, presented a report about the survey during the most recent board meeting held last week.

The district's socio-emotional survey is conducted by an educational advocacy group called Panorama twice a year, interviewing students in fourth through 12th grades.

Although the surveys are separate for elementary and secondary students, the questionnaire covers similar issues, such as a student's ability to bounce back from a setback, growth mindset and teacher-student relationships.

Glendale Unified highlighted results in six categories: self-efficacy, social awareness, sense of belonging, growth mindset, school safety and emotional regulation, which monitors how well a student handles their emotions.

Self-efficacy, according to Panorama, measures "how much students believe they can succeed in achieving academic outcomes."

Another factor, growth mindset, deals with "student perceptions of whether they have the potential to change those factors that are central to their performance in school."

Mekhitarian said the results were broken into a five-point scale, ranging from strongly agree to agree to neutral, then disagree or strongly disagree.

Glendale Unified combined "strongly agree" and "agree" results into a "percent favorable," which never crept above 69% in any category.
“This just reminds me that we continue to have work to do, we really do,” board member Nayiri Nahabedian said.

District students in sixth through 12th grades scored particularly low in one area.

Only 42% of district secondary students felt a “sense of belonging,” which put Glendale Unified in the zero to 19th percentile nationally.

Questions under that category included, “how well do people at your school understand you as a person,” and “how much do you matter to others at this school?”

Students were then asked to select a response, from “do not understand at all,” to “understand a little” all the way to “completely understand.”

In the emotion regulation category, 49% of Glendale Unified secondary students responded favorably, good enough to reach the 60th to 79th percentile.

While Glendale secondary students performed best in social awareness, at 63%, that score still put the district in the 20th to 39th percentile.

Glendale Unified secondary students posted scores of 52% in self-efficacy, 56% in school safety and 55% in growth mindset.

The district’s fourth- and fifth-grade students reported different experiences, with a high of 69% favorable rating on “social awareness,” which was in Panorama’s 60th to 79th percentile.

The best score, percentile-wise, was a 61% under growth mindset, which put the district in the 80th to 99th percentile for younger students.

Elementary students also posted percentages of 64% in self-efficacy, 65% in belonging, 63% in school safety and 49% in emotion regulation.

“Even something we’ve identified as a strength, which is the fourth- and fifth-grade sense of belonging, we’re talking about 65% of students … so we still have [35%] of students who responded not positively,” Nahabedian said.

Mekhitarian said district staff members are conducting data-analysis meetings on school sites to identify what’s been working and what needs a fresh perspective.

Glendale Unified also plans to work with Panorama to see what the organization can offer in terms of “concrete next steps,” such as strategies moving forward, Mekhitarian said. Those strategies are expected to be reviewed by Glendale Unified officials in November, looking to make improvements before another round of surveys.

“After those initiatives are implemented in the spring, we’ll give the survey again to assess how successful those were,” Mekhitarian said.
LA CAÑADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
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

RESOLUTION 3-19-20

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 Rosebank 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;
WHEREAS, the Governing Board commits to honoring any request by a resident of the “Sagebrush” Territory to release their student in order that he or she may continue to attend their school within the Glendale Unified School District if the Territory Transfer is effected. This commitment to release via the interdistrict permit process will also be extended to siblings of Sagebrush residents attending Glendale Unified School District schools once they reach school-age, if requested by the parent or guardian.

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, and the community’s request to explore 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

3. between the community and its schools, thereby creating and strengthening “social capital” which

4. research demonstrates directly and positively supports improved student academic achievement;

5. 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;

6. 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;

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

8. 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 10th day of September, 2019.

Governing Board Members

Brent Kuszyk, President

Joe Radabaugh, Vice President

Ellen Mullari, Clerk

Kahnzer Pasha, Member

Dan Jeffries, Member
Proposed Sagebrush Territory Transfer
LCUSD’s Rationale for Support

LCUSD Governing Board Meeting
September 10, 2019

History of the Proposed Territory Transfer

• The proposed Territory Transfer was introduced with the first petition in 1961;
• It resurfaced again with a second petition in 1978;
• A third petition was initiated in 1991;
• The Territory Transfer in its current iteration began in July of 2013 with Superintendents and a Board Member from both LCUSD and GUSD meeting and committing to work together in efforts to avoid disruption to students, families, and local schools in relation to the petition being put forward by Sagebrush residents. This led to the permissive student transfer agreement currently in place.
The Compelling Issue of Community Identity

- The citizens of the Sagebrush Territory are citizens of the City of La Canada Flintridge and they identify with their City community, who largely attend LCUSD – they share a common voice/interest with their City neighbors who help guide the priorities within LCUSD
- The petitioners' efforts have persisted for over 50 years – how they identify is not changing (1992 CDE statement: “there is little doubt of the present community identity on part of residents in the area”)
- Community identity presents a compelling educational reason

Compelling Educational Reasons Supporting the Transfer

- Through the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) and the Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP), the state by design has highlighted and standardized the defining nature of the local community on its school district – the community determines the school district’s priorities and all members of a community should be able to cohesively voice these priorities
LCUSD’s LCAP – Community Voice In Action

• Academic research supports that a cohesive community promotes student achievement
• LCAP Designed Actions and Services are developed by the LCAP Oversight Committee (comprised of Parents, Teachers, Staff, Administrators, and Students) and survey data from the entire district community

LCUSD’s LCAP – Community Voice In Action

• All District’s are guided by the LCAP process and their constituents guide the actions and services which drive the LCAP and determine how LCFF dollars are spent
• The compelling educational reason which moves LCUSD to support the Territory Transfer is that the residents of the Sagebrush Territory identify with the voice of their City neighbors and wish to strengthen the ties between families within a community, allowing all residents greater involvement and engagement with each other in civic activities which are aligned with school activities, having a direct and positive effect on student academic achievement.
Respect for Community Cohesion – LCUSD
Resolution Originally Dated 11-27-2018;
Reaffirmed 9-10-19

• “WHEREAS, the Governing Board commits to honoring any request by a resident of the “Sagebrush” Territory to release their student in order that he or she may continue to attend their school within the Glendale Unified School District if the Territory Transfer is effected. This commitment to release via the inter-district permit process will also be extended to siblings of the Sagebrush residents attending Glendale Unified School District schools once they reach school-age, if requested by the parent or guardian.”

Condition #7 – Would the Territory Transfer cause a significant increase in school facility costs?

• No. To understand why, one needs to review LCUSD’s inter-district permit history and process.

• Number of Permit Students Attending from Sagebrush = 221
• Number of All Permit Students Enrolling in 2018-19 = 181
• Number of All Permit Students Enrolling in 2019-2020 = 92
• Number of 2018-19 Sagebrush Permits Accepted = 59
• Number of 2019-2020 Sagebrush Permits Accepted = 28 (34 applied)
Condition #7 – Would the Territory Transfer cause a significant increase in school facility costs? No.

- Given the estimated number of Sagebrush students currently enrolled in GUSD (~200), if the Territory transfer is effected:
- Some students will elect to remain in GUSD (Approximate Numbers - 2018-19 Mountain Avenue Elementary = 84; 2018-19 Rosemont Middle School = 37; 2018-19 Crescenta Valley HS = 68)
- Transfer would not commence immediately, more students will be enrolled in LCUSD via inter-district permits to mitigate impacts
- LCUSD will maintain its class size commitments
- Anticipate NO temporary/portable housing would be required

Condition #7 – Would the Territory Transfer cause a significant increase in school facility costs?

- By managing our enrollment via the Inter-district permit process and Allen Bill, LCUSD has a thorough understanding of its enrollment trends (Allen Bill District since 2009)
- Quoted as grade levels being “full” in grades 3, 4, 5 – LCUSD has managed those enrollment numbers via permit or Allen Bill students to maximize efficiencies (73 in Grade 3, 75 in Grade 4, 66 in Grade 5)
- IF temporary housing was required (portables), the City of LCF has demonstrated its financial support in its recent budget allocations and the district could access developer fees (NO costs borne by the state – Condition #5)
- There is no “classroom crisis” within LCUSD
History of Inter-district Permit Process

- Since 2011, LCUSD has managed its intra-district permit process and Allen Bill enrollments to maintain a total enrollment between 4050 and 4150.
- Senior classes exit with approximately 340-350 students and resident Kindergarteners average 180-230 students; 1st Grade resident enrollment averages 200-240

Condition #7 – Would the Territory Transfer cause a significant increase in school facility costs?

- Any housing costs related to this reorganization would be insignificant or otherwise incidental
- Enrolling students from our own city reduces the environmental impact relative to enrolling permit students traveling a greater home-to-school distance
- No existing Allen Bill permit students will be disrupted by the reorganization
September 28, 2018

Members of the Los Angeles County Committee on
School District Organization
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242-2890

RE: Transfer of Territory from Glendale Unified School District to La Cañada Unified
School District – Glendale Unified School District’s Supplemental Letter In
Opposition

Dear County Committee Members:

Thank you for your consideration of the Transfer Petition (Petition) seeking to transfer of
territory from the Glendale Unified School District (GUSD) to La Cañada Unified School
District (LCUSD). Not only is the proposed transfer consistent with the nine conditions of EDC
Section 35753, and not only does it have the support of LCUSD and the City of La Cañada
Flintridge, but it also has broad support from members of the territory. LCUSD looks forward to
your approval of the Petition.

We recognize that transfer of territory petitions can often involve passionate comments from a
variety of sources, and sometimes that misinformation or inadvertent mistakes may make their
way into the process. We appreciate your continued willingness to focus on the evidence and
disregard erroneous and inaccurate information that may arise.

In this regard, GUSD recently submitted a supplemental letter and material in opposition to the
Petition. Unfortunately, the letter is replete with inaccurate information and erroneous
assertions, often based on hearsay or other unreliable sources (if sourced at all). Given GUSD
waited to submit this supplemental objection until almost the completion of the process, and
given LCUSD just received this letter and approximately nine inches of material, at this late date
LCUSD does not have a reasonable opportunity to fully address each of the points raised by
GUSD. Suffice it to say, LCUSD disputes these erroneous assertions and wishes to clarify the
record.
The most accurate and complete source of information as to LCUSD’s capacity is not another district or third party, but LCUSD itself. LCUSD is in the best position to know its own finances, enrollment trends, and priorities. In contrast, GUSD or any other party is not in such a position and lacks full and complete information. Likewise, accuracy of statements as to another’s fiscal condition can be tempered by considerations such as whether the asserting party has challenges in assessing and managing their own financial resources.

As the most accurate source of information regarding its own resources, LCUSD wishes to make clear the district does not have a “classroom crises” as asserted by GUSD. Instead, LCUSD has flexibility and capacity to accommodate all students affected by the Petition. It is prepared to provide portable classrooms if needed, and has the support and guarantee of the City of La Cañada Flintridge to house any students involved in the matter. Contrary to the apparently inadvertent, and persistent, mischaracterizations regarding bond revenues asserted in the supplemental opposition letter, LCUSD also has the financial resources to address all anticipated needs both in the short term and in the future.

The County Committee’s own consultants have also assessed this project under CEQA, and have independently determined that there will be adequate public services, including classrooms and school resources, available for all students associated with the transfer, etc. LCUSD supports the conclusion of the County Committee’s independent consultants.

Thank you for your consideration of these clarifications. If you have any questions, please contact my office at (818) 952-8300.

Sincerely,

Wendy K. Sinnette
Superintendent
La Cañada Unified School District
It Takes A Village
The La Cañada Unified School District

Testimony to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District organization
October 26, 2016

What You Will Hear Tonight

- **Condition #2**: A transfer will help promote school districts "organized on the basis of substantial community identity"

A transfer can be effectuated in a way that:
- **Condition #7**: Accounts for and mitigates net school costs.
- **Condition #5**: Avoids any substantial increase to state costs.
- **Condition #9**: Protects the fiscal status of the district
- **Condition #6**: Maintains and does not disrupt the educational performance of all children we are trusted to serve.

*City + Schools = Community*
City + Schools = Community
LCUSD Supports a Delayed Implementation Transfer

- Passed 3 Resolutions supporting a territory transfer:
  - June 18, 2013
  - January 7, 2014
  - October 24, 2016

- Engaged in earnest but unsuccessful negotiations with GUSD since 2013 on the terms of a transfer

- 177 Sagebrush students already transferred
Our Analysis

- Expenditures
- Revenue
- Foundation
- Parcel Tax
- LCFF

Facilities

Teachers

Largely one-time costs

City + Schools = Community

Most Conservative Analysis

Assumptions

- 300 Additional Students
- No Phase-in Implementation
- ~417 Total Sagebrush Students
- 10% Inflation Factor

Ongoing Costs

- $2,818,212

Ongoing Revenue

- $3,045,521

Net Annual General Fund Impact: -$231,000

One Time Capital Costs

- 10% Efficiency
- No Efficiency
- ~$700,000
- ~$774,000

City + Schools = Community
The City of La Cañada Supports a Territory Transfer

On June 3, 2013 the City of La Cañada Flintridge Passed a Resolution supporting and calling for the territory transfer.

- Needless exclusion of a piece of our city from full participation in our community
- City of LCF is committed to doing its part to unify the community
- City will work with LCUSD to identify additional resources and implement financial solutions should any be necessary to eliminate any disruption to the educational program
- We encourage the County Committee to approve the transfer

City + Schools = Community
LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION (COUNTY COMMITTEE)
LEGISLATIVE REVIEW – OCTOBER 2019

BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR: Senate Bill 47 / Allen
INTRODUCTION DATE: 12/03/18
LAST ACTIVITY/DATE: 09/12/19 – Awaiting Governor’s signature

DESCRIPTION OF BILL

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

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

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

RECOMMENDED POSITION
Staff recommends the following position:

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

INTRODUCTION DATE:  
02/04/19

LAST ACTIVITY/DATE:  
09/13/19 – Awaiting Governor’s signature

DESCRIPTION OF BILL

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

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

This bill could possibly have a large impact on Los Angeles County school districts who receive a demand letter to implement trustee area voting, depending whether or not the parties agree on ranked choice voting being a viable alternative.

RECOMMENDED POSITION

Staff recommends the following position:

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

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

☐ Support
  County Committee actively supports the bill.

☐ Oppose
  County Committee actively opposes the bill.

☐ Disapprove
  County Committee disapproves of the bill’s concept, but will not actively oppose passage.
BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR:  
Senate Bill 585 / Wieckowski  

INTRODUCTION DATE:  
02/22/19

LAST ACTIVITY/DATE:  
05/16/19 – Held in Committee under submission

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

POTENTIAL IMPACT OF BILL ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE, SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION PROCESS AND/OR LOS ANGELES COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS
This bill would likely have a significant impact on territory transfer petitions between elementary and high school districts, when seeking to transfer territory out of a unified school district.

RECOMMENDED POSITION
Staff recommends the following position:

☑ Watch Bill should be monitored by County Committee staff, but no action taken at this time.
☐ Approve County Committee supports the bill’s concept, but will not actively work for passage.
☐ Support County Committee actively supports the bill.
☐ Oppose County Committee actively opposes the bill.
☐ Disapprove County Committee disapproves of the bill’s concept, but will not actively oppose passage.
BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR:  
Assembly Bill 849 / Bonta

INTRODUCTION DATE:  
02/20/19

LAST ACTIVITY/DATE:  
09/13/19 – Awaiting Governor’s signature

DESCRIPTION OF BILL

This bill would specify procedures for how cities and counties update their trustee area boundary maps after each census.

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

This bill would likely not have a significant impact on school districts who are not under a city charter.

RECOMMENDED POSITION

Staff recommends the following position:

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

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

☐ Support  County Committee actively supports the bill.

☐ Oppose  County Committee actively opposes the bill.

☐ Disapprove  County Committee disapproves of the bill’s concept, but will not actively oppose passage.

AMENDMENTS REQUIRED

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

CORRESPONDENCE REQUIRED

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

Please direct all comments to Mr. Keith D. Crafton at (562) 922-6131.
Attachment 4

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR:</th>
<th>INTRODUCTION DATE:</th>
<th>LAST ACTIVITY/DATE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senate Bill 47 / Allen</td>
<td>12/03/18</td>
<td>09/12/19 – Awaiting Governor’s signature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DESCRIPTION OF BILL

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

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

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

RECOMMENDED POSITION

Staff recommends the following position:

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

INTRODUCTION DATE: 
02/04/19

LAST ACTIVITY/DATE: 
09/13/19 – Awaiting Governor’s signature

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

POTENTIAL IMPACT OF BILL ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE, SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION PROCESS AND/OR LOS ANGELES COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS
This bill could possibly have a large impact on Los Angeles County school districts who receive a demand letter to implement trustee area voting, depending whether or not the parties agree on ranked choice voting being a viable alternative.

RECOMMENDED POSITION
Staff recommends the following position:

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

**INTRODUCTION DATE:**  
02/22/19  

**LAST ACTIVITY/DATE:**  
05/16/19 – Held in Committee under submission

**DESCRIPTION OF BILL**

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

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

This bill would likely have a significant impact on territory transfer petitions between elementary and high school districts, when seeking to transfer territory out of a unified school district.

**RECOMMENDED POSITION**

Staff recommends the following position:

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

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

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

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

- **Disapprove**  
  County Committee disapproves of the bill’s concept, but will not actively oppose passage.
BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR: Assembly Bill 849 / Bonta

INTRODUCTION DATE: 02/20/19

LAST ACTIVITY/DATE: 09/13/19 — Awaiting Governor’s signature

DESCRIPTION OF BILL

This bill would specify procedures for how cities and counties update their trustee area boundary maps after each census.

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

This bill would likely not have a significant impact on school districts who are not under a city charter.

RECOMMENDED POSITION

Staff recommends the following position:

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

AMENDMENTS REQUIRED

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

CORRESPONDENCE REQUIRED

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

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

October 2019

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District (USD) that were at various stages in the school district organization process as of September 18, 2019.

PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORY FROM THE LOS ANGELES USD (LAUSD) TO PALOS VERDES PENINSULA USD (PVPUSD)

On July 10, 2019, Chadmar/Colfin Rolling Hills LLC submitted an owner petition to transfer five parcels of uninhabited territory from LAUSD to PVPUSD. At the September 4, 2019, regularly scheduled County Committee meeting, the petition was to be introduced to the County Committee. However, Chadmar’s new counsel, David Soldani, addressed the County Committee and requested that the petition be withdrawn at this time, and that it would be resubmitted in the near future.

Status: Petition temporarily withdrawn, to be resubmitted
Status Date: *September 18, 2019

RECENT INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last two years)

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Inner City USD / January 2016

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- *LAUSD to Palos Verdes Peninsula USD / September 2019

* = indicates activity since last meeting

This document was prepared by staff to the County Committee.
Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals
(Excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District)

October 2019

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals [exclusive of those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District (USD)] that are at various stages in the school district reorganization process as of September 18, 2019.

PETITION TO IMPLEMENT TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING IN THE COMPTON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (USD)

On September 10, 2019, the Compton USD was ordered by the Superior Court to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting within the district. The district will be petitioning in the form of a board resolution and an adopted trustee area map which will be introduced to the County Committee, and a public hearing will be scheduled in the district.

Status: Petition to be introduced
Status Date: *September 18, 2019

PETITION TO IMPLEMENT TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING IN THE LITTLE LAKE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT (SD)

On June 12, 2019, the Little Lake City SD submitted a petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting within the district. The petition, in the form of a board resolution and an adopted trustee area map, were introduced to the County Committee at its regularly scheduled meeting on September 4, 2019, and a public hearing is being scheduled in the district.

Status: Public hearing to be conducted
Status Date: *September 18, 2019
PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORY FROM TORRANCE USD TO PALOS VERDES PENINSULA USD (PVPUSD)

On May 15, 2019, the Torrance USD and PVPUSD submitted a joint petition to transfer twenty-nine parcels from Torrance USD to PVPUSD. The petition was introduced to the County Committee at its regularly scheduled meeting on September 4, 2019, and public hearings are being scheduled in each school district.

Status: Public hearings to be conducted
Status Date: *September 18, 2019

PETITION TO IMPLEMENT TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING IN THE SOUTH WHITTIER SD

On May 15, 2019, the South Whittier SD submitted a petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting within the district. The petition, in the form of a board resolution and an adopted trustee area map, were introduced to the County Committee at its regularly scheduled meeting on September 4, 2019, and a public hearing is being scheduled in the district.

Status: Public hearing to be conducted
Status Date: *September 18, 2019

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

On March 6, 2019, the Sulphur Springs Union School District (SD) submitted their final board resolution as part of a series of resolutions spanning the past eleven years, culminating in the formal introduction of a petition to transfer (exchange) certain parcels between Sulphur Springs Union SD and Saugus Union SD. Public hearings were held in each district on May 2, 2019, both of which are within the William S. Hart Union High School District (HSD). A feasibility study was conducted, and was presented to the County Committee at its regularly scheduled meeting on September 4, 2019. The committee then preliminarily approved the petition so that the committee’s own environmental study may be conducted, as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The petition shall be held until its CEQA study is conducted, after which the committee will reconvene to provide a final vote on the matter.

Status: CEQA study to be conducted
Status Date: *September 18, 2019
FORMATION—MALIBU USD (CURRENTLY LIES WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES
OF THE SANTA MONICA-MALIBU USD)

On September 1, 2017, LACOE received a petition in the form of a 2015 resolution from the
City of Malibu to form a separate Malibu USD from territory within the boundaries of the
existing Santa Monica-Malibu USD. The petition was introduced at the November 1, 2017
regular County Committee meeting, and at least one public hearing will be scheduled. After
this local agency petition was introduced, however, the City of Malibu sent a letter requesting
that the County Committee postpone the scheduling of its preliminary hearing to allow the
stakeholders more time to discuss further options and details regarding the petition. On
February 28, 2018, however, the City of Malibu apprised the committee of their interest in
pursuing the preliminary public hearing. Then, in April 2018, the City resolved to further
investigate options before asking the County Committee to proceed. At its May 2, 2018 regular
meeting, the County Committee voted to delay scheduling the preliminary public hearing until
after getting an update on negotiations at its regularly scheduled meeting on September 5,
2018. On September 5, 2018, representatives from the City of Malibu and the Santa Monica-
Malibu USD apprised the County Committee of their negotiations, and again at the March 6,
2019 meeting. On May 10, 2019, staff met with the district to ascertain the status of its ongoing
study and analyses. The parties to the petition returned to the committee on September 4, 2019,
provided on update on their studies, and intend to provide another update in early 2020.

Status: Preliminary public hearing to be scheduled, pending negotiations
Status Date: *September 18, 2019

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

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

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

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

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

The County Committee continued to review the petition. On February 20, 2019, they received a request from Dr. Kelly King, Interim Superintendent of the Glendale USD, to delay final review so that she may become familiar with the relevant issues following her recent appointment. In February 2019, staff received a request from the chief petitioners that the final review of the petition not take place at the April 3, 2019 meeting because that date falls during spring break and may impact participation by the public. In April 2019, the chief petitioners requested the June meeting date be changed due to coinciding with the school year ending, which would affect some parents from attending the meeting.

At the October 2, 2019 regularly scheduled meeting, the County Committee intends to vote on whether to accept the CEQA findings, and if affirmed, may conduct a final vote on the petition.

Status: County Committee may adopt CEQA findings and take final vote on petition, unless it requests additional information from petitioners, districts, or staff
Status Date: *September 18, 2019

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

On May 15, 2014, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §35700, to transfer territory from the Centinela Valley Union HSD and the Lawndale SD to the Wiseburn USD. The request was submitted by chief petitioners Ms. Shavonda Webber-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 in Spring of 2020.

Status: Future ballot measure preparations suspended until appeal process concludes
Status Date: *September 18, 2019

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

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

Staff reviewed the request and forwarded a draft petition to County Counsel on July 27, 2015, for a legal compliance review regarding format and content. We received notification on July 30, 2015, from County Counsel informing us that the draft petition was legally acceptable. The petition was mailed to the chief 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: *July 10, 2019

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
- Torrance USD to Palos Verdes Peninsula USD/September 2019

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Malibu USD (Santa Monica-Malibu USD)/September 2019

Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

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

* = indicates activity since last meeting