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I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND
I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

On November 6, 1991, staff received a request from a group of citizens from the City of La Canada Flintridge to prepare a petition for the transfer of territory from the Glendale Unified School District (USD) to the La Canada USD. The petitioners had formed a group and identified themselves as the “Sagebrush Committee.” The petition was drafted, approved by County Counsel, County Engineer, and forwarded to the petitioners to collect signatures of the registered voters in the area proposed for transfer.

The petitioners submitted the signed petitions to the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) on January 13, 1992, and the petition was forwarded to the office of the Registrar-Recorder for verification of signatures. On January 29, 1992, the Registrar-Recorder returned the petition to LACOE and advised staff that the petition contained 744 valid signatures out of a potential 1,455 registered voters residing in the area proposed for transfer. A valid petition requires signatures of 25 percent of the registered voters. This petition met that requirement with signatures of 51.13 percent of the registered voters.

The area proposed for transfer consists of approximately 386 acres located entirely within the city boundaries on the eastern border of the city of La Canada Flintridge. This area was incorporated as part of the city of La Canada Flintridge in 1976. The territory remained within the boundaries of the Glendale USD. The territory consists of approximately 1,000 single family residences. It also includes some apartments, condominiums, and commercial structures, which are located on and in the vicinity of Foothill Boulevard. Approximately 241 public school students reside in the area. These students consist of 134 elementary students, 39 junior high school students, and 68 high school students. There is a small parcel of land (approximately 165’ x 327’) which is the property of the Glendale USD and located in the area proposed for transfer. This property provides access to a pedestrian bridge which is used by students to cross Pickens Canyon flood channel. If the transfer is approved, the property would become the property of the La Canada USD.

The schools in the Glendale USD directly affected by the proposed transfer would be Mountain Avenue Elementary School, Rosemont Junior High School, and Crescenta Valley High School. The schools in the La Canada USD directly affected by the proposed transfer would be Palm Crest Elementary School and La Canada High School.

The petition was presented to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) at the regular meeting on February 5, 1992. Public hearings were held on March 9, 1992, at Mountain Avenue Elementary School in the Glendale USD and on March 16, 1992, at Palm Crest Elementary School in the La Canada USD.
II. PETITION
PETITION FOR A CHANGE OF SCHOOL DISTRICT BOUNDARIES

EDUCATION CODE SECTIONS 35700 et seq

The proposed change of boundaries is to take from the Glendale Unified School District and annex to the La Canada Unified School District the territory particularly described as follows, to wit:

SEE ATTACHED MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.

The reasons for petitioning for this change are as follows:

1. To unify all parts of the city of La Canada Flintridge into one school district. The area proposed for transfer represents approximately five percent of the population of the city of La Canada Flintridge, would increase by five percent the enrollment of the La Canada Unified School District, and would decrease by less than one percent the enrollment of the Glendale Unified School District.

2. To strengthen the community identity between the city of La Canada Flintridge and the area to be transferred and to provide a community environment for the children of the area.

3. To enable the children of the area to participate in local La Canada Flintridge school-promoted sports activities as well as musical, civic, scouting, and other functions.

4. To improve local control over educational matters, consolidating a portion of the community into a smaller district more able to respond to local input.

5. To balance school populations, taking advantage of underutilized facilities in the La Canada Unified School District and reducing overcrowding in the Glendale Unified School District.

6. To align the school and city boundaries along a natural feature by making Pickens Canyon the school district boundary rather than an arbitrary line drawn in the 1880's.
III. MAPS
TRANSFER OF TERRITORY NO. 2-91
FROM GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
TO LA CANADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

LEGEND:
Boundary of Annexation
Existing District Boundary
Containing: 386.10 Acres, 0.603 Sq. Mi. Scale: 1"=1000'

RECEIVED DEC. 26, 1991
IV. SCHOOL DISTRICTS DESCRIPTIONS
IV. SCHOOL DISTRICTS DESCRIPTIONS

GLENDALE USD

The Glendale USD is a charter city school district which serves the city of Glendale and the communities of La Crescenta and Montrose. The district operates 19 elementary schools, 4 junior high schools, 3 comprehensive high schools, and a continuation high school. The district has an enrollment of approximately 27,100 students and a budget of $105 million.

The Glendale USD was formed on July 1, 1936. The original Glendale School District was formed on May 9, 1882, based on a petition to separate it from the Sepulveda School District. On December 4, 1911, the West Glendale School District, and on March 15, 1918, the Tropico School District were annexed to the Glendale School District. The La Crescenta School District joined the Glendale School District in 1931.

LA CANADA USD

The La Canada USD serves all areas of the city of La Canada Flintridge with the exception of 386 acres of the eastern portion (proposed transfer area) which is within the boundaries of the Glendale USD. The district operates three elementary schools, a high school (which includes grades 7-12), and a continuation high school. The district has an enrollment of 3,713 students and an annual budget of $17 million.

The La Canada USD was formed on July 1, 1961, from the La Canada Elementary School District which was a component of the Pasadena High School District. The formation resulted from a recommendation of the County Committee at an election held on October 18, 1960. The original La Canada School District was formed on July 6, 1885, upon a petition of Mr. T. J. Martin and 13 others.
V. BOARD POSITIONS
V. BOARD POSITIONS

GLENDALE USD

At the regular meeting of the Glendale Board of Education on March 3, 1992, the members approved a resolution opposing the transfer of territory from Glendale USD to La Canada USD.

At the public hearings held on March 9, 1992, and March 16, 1992, Ms. Blanch J. Greenwood, president, Glendale Board of Education, expressed the board's opposition to the proposed transfer as stated in the resolution which appears below.

RESOLUTION NO. 5
Glendale Unified School District

RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE PROPOSED TRANSFER OF TERRITORY
TO THE LA CANADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

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

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

WHEREAS, approximately 282 students now attending Glendale public schools reside in the affected area, including 133 at Mountain Avenue Elementary, 38 at Rosemont Junior High, 73 at Crescenta Valley High, and 16 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 school district; and

WHEREAS, if approved, the transfer would create a number of uncertainties for the district, including: (1) A potential reduction of up to 30% of the student population at Mountain Avenue Elementary School; (2) A decision whether to close the school due to its resulting insufficient size and inconvenient location on the easternmost edge of its "reconfigured" attendance area; (3) A decision whether to disrupt students attending adjacent schools in order to adjust attendance boundaries to replace Mountain Avenue students who transfer to La Canada Schools; 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 $400,000 annually at a time when unstable economic conditions have created one of the most serious budget deficits in the district's history;

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 Canada Unified School District, as having significant negative impact upon the students of the Glendale Schools and the school district; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board is justly proud of the achievements of Mountain Avenue Elementary, Rosemont Junior High, and Crescenta Valley High, and believes strongly that the quality of education, student services, and community involvement supporting these three campuses is among the finest quality anywhere in California.

Adopted this third day of March, nineteen-hundred, ninety-two.

Blanch M. Greenwood, President

Jane P. Swainson, Vice President

Sharon R. Beaschamp, Member

Charles E. Whiteaker, Clerk

Jane M. Whiting, Member
At the regular meeting of the La Canada Board of Education on March 31, 1992, the members unanimously approved a resolution in support of the proposed transfer of territory from Glendale USD to La Canada USD.

At the public hearings held on March 9, 1992, and March 16, 1992, Ms. Carole Siegler, vice president, La Canada Board of Education, expressed the board’s support for the transfer as stated in the resolution which appears below.

LA CANADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

RESOLUTION #14-91-92
FOR
SAGEBRUSH ANNEXATION

WHEREAS, the public school system is an important and integral part of community life; and

WHEREAS, the area designated as the “Sagebrush” area is a part of the City of La Canada Flintridge but is served by the Glendale Unified School District; and

WHEREAS, the “Sagebrush” area is the only portion of the City of La Canada Flintridge not served by the La Canada Unified School District; and

WHEREAS, the residents of “Sagebrush” have presented a petition to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization requesting that the designated area be placed within the jurisdiction of the La Canada Unified School District; and

WHEREAS, the Governing Board of the La Canada Unified School District recognizes the communal benefits to the “Sagebrush” area of becoming a part of the La Canada Unified school District; and

WHEREAS, the Governing Board of the La Canada Unified School District finds no detrimental impact on its existing program of instruction by transferring the “Sagebrush” area into its District; and

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Governing Board of the La Canada Unified School District supports the transfer of the “Sagebrush” territory from the jurisdiction of the Glendale Unified School District to that of the La Canada Unified School District.

[Signatures of Governing Board members]

President - Governing Board
Vice President - Governing Board
Clerk - Governing Board
Member - Governing Board
Member - Governing Board
Secretary - Governing Board
VI. ANALYSIS OF CRITERIA AND RECOMMENDATIONS
VI. ANALYSIS OF CRITERIA AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Education Code (EC) Section 35753 describes nine conditions or criteria which must be reviewed by the County Committee as part of the decision-making process regarding proposed school district reorganizations. The County Committee must determine, based on the data contained in this report, if the conditions are substantially met.

The County Committee has some discretion in this decision-making process. If the County Committee determines that the proposal is not in the best interest for all those affected, or if there is not a compelling reason for the change, the proposal may be disapproved although all conditions are substantially met.

Conversely, the County Committee has the discretion to approve a proposal if it is determined that it is not practical or possible to apply the criteria literally, and that unique circumstances provide an exceptional situation to justify approval of the reorganization.

CRITERION 1

The new districts will be adequate in terms of the number of pupils enrolled.

The proposal for the transfer of territory from Glendale USD to La Canada USD does not result in the formation of a new district. The Glendale USD reports an enrollment of 27,100 students. The La Canada USD reports an enrollment of 3,713. There are approximately 241 public school students who reside in the area proposed for transfer and attend schools in the Glendale USD. The transfer of these students will not have a significant district-wide impact on either of the districts.

The following enrollment information has been provided by the districts. Table I shows actual enrollment for the last three years and projected enrollment for the next three years on a district-wide basis.

| TABLE I |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCUSD</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>3,291</td>
<td>3,339</td>
<td>3,492</td>
<td>3,708</td>
<td>3,479</td>
<td>3,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>+1.5</td>
<td>+4.6</td>
<td>+6.2</td>
<td>-6.2</td>
<td>+1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUSD</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>22,586</td>
<td>24,057</td>
<td>25,324</td>
<td>27,060</td>
<td>28,539</td>
<td>30,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>+6.5</td>
<td>+5.3</td>
<td>+6.9</td>
<td>+5.5</td>
<td>+5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Enrollment Data Provided by Districts
During the six-year period shown in Table I, which includes actual and projected enrollment data, the La Canada USD had an average annual increase in enrollment of 1.4 percent. During the same period, the Glendale USD experienced annual increases of 6.7 percent.

If the proposed transfer of territory was approved in the 1991-92 fiscal year, the Glendale USD enrollment would decrease by 0.88 percent and the La Canada USD enrollment would increase by 6.57 percent.

A major concern expressed by the Glendale USD Board of Education and citizens opposed to the transfer was the potential impact on the enrollment of the elementary schools directly affected by the transfer. The Mountain Avenue Elementary School with a current enrollment of 470 students would potentially lose 134 students which would result in a 28.3 percent decrease in enrollment to 337 students. The average enrollment of elementary schools, not on a year-round schedule, is 564 students. The Glendale USD administration and board have indicated that it may not be cost-effective to continue to operate the Mountain Avenue Elementary School with the reduced enrollment.

Table II shows the change in enrollment of the affected schools if the proposal was approved and attendance boundaries remained the same and interdistrict permits were not accepted.

**Table II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment and Capacity of Schools Affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glendale USD</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Ave</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>-28.3</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemont</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>-03.5</td>
<td>1,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescenda Valley HS</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>1,692</td>
<td>-04.1</td>
<td>2,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Canada USD</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>After</td>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Crest</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>+22.2</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Canada HS</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>1,778</td>
<td>+06.6</td>
<td>1,850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of the residents of the area proposed for transfer have expressed an interest in having their children continue to attend Mountain Avenue Elementary School on interdistrict permits. The La Canada USD has stated such request would be approved. The Glendale USD has responded that the students may not be accepted "...due to the uncertainties in the proposal" and it may be necessary to consider school closure.
The Glendale USD is currently in the process of realigning attendance boundaries in areas of the district which are experiencing overcrowding. However, the area proposed for transfer is not affected by these boundary changes which are located in the southern portion of the district. It has been suggested by the petitioners that attendance boundaries for the Mountain Avenue Elementary School could be modified and additional students would have an opportunity to participate in the programs of Mountain Avenue Elementary School which has been recognized as a California distinguished school.

RECOMMENDATION: The transfer of the territory will not have a significant impact on the size of either district. It is recommended that the County Committee find that this criterion is substantially met.

CRITERION 2

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

The area proposed for transfer is known as the “Sagebrush” area and is located within the western border of the city of La Canada Flintridge. The western border of the proposed transfer area is the Pickens Canyon Wash which forms a natural boundary and extends from the mountains to the southern border of the city. It can be crossed by automobile on Foothill Boulevard and there is a pedestrian access bridge located adjacent to Mountain Avenue Elementary School. The area is the only portion of the city of La Canada Flintridge which is not in the La Canada USD.

All municipal services in the area are provided through the city of La Canada Flintridge. The elected city officials support the proposed transfer and the city council has passed a resolution in favor of the transfer.

Petitioners and residents supporting the transfer have indicated in public hearing testimony and in correspondence that they closely identify with the city and community of La Canada Flintridge through attendance at La Canada churches, the use of La Canada recreational facilities, and the patronizing of La Canada merchants.

Many La Canada community organizations offer special recognition awards and scholarships to students who live in the city of La Canada Flintridge. Information concerning these awards and scholarships are distributed through the La Canada schools and the Parent-Teacher-Student Association. The La Canada residents who are students in the Glendale USD are usually not aware of these programs for which they may be eligible as residents of the city of La Canada Flintridge.

The transfer of territory would result in changes in the home-to-school distances traveled by the students. Table III illustrates the change in travel distances:
TABLE III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Home-to-School Travel Distances</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>After</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the proposed transfer is approved, the home-to-school distance traveled by elementary students will be reduced slightly. The maximum distance travelled by secondary students will increase by 2.6 miles. Neither of the school districts affected provide home-to-school transportation. The students would continue to provide their own transportation as necessary.

RECOMMENDATION: Based on the data presented, the proposal would enhance the community identity of those directly affected. The students would attend school in the city of which they are residents. It is recommended that the County Committee find that this criterion is substantially met.

CRITERION 3

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

There are no school facilities located within the boundaries of the area proposed for transfer. There is a parcel of land approximately 165’ x 327’ that is located in the area proposed for transfer which is the property of the Glendale USD. This property is located on Ocean View Boulevard and provides access to a pedestrian bridge across the Pickens Canyon Wash. Students, parents, and residents use this bridge for access to Mountain Avenue and Rosemont Junior High School.

If the proposal is approved, the property would become the property of the La Canada USD. The district has indicated the property could continue to be used by the public as a small park and would continue to provide access to the bridge. There have been no discussions concerning disposing of the property or converting it to residential use. The Glendale USD will realize a small savings because they will no longer have to maintain the property.
The La Canada USD has bonded indebtedness of $480,000 which is due to be retired by July 4, 1994. If the proposed transfer is approved, the residents of the area transferred will assume liability for their proportionate share of the outstanding debt.

The Glendale USD has no outstanding bonded indebtedness.

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that the County Committee find that this criterion is substantially met.

CRITERION 4

The reorganization of the districts will not promote racial or ethnic discrimination or segregation.

Tables IV and V show the district-wide ethnicity of Glendale USD and La Canada USD and the ethnicity ratios of the schools directly affected.

TABLE IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District-Wide Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA CANADA USD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLENDALE USD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>3,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnicity by Schools Affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GLENDALE USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mountain Avenue Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rosemont Junior High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crescenta Valley High High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LA CANADA USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palm Crest Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La Canada High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On a district-wide basis, the transfer of approximately 241 students from a district with a total enrollment of over 27,000 students would not have a significant or measurable impact on the ethnic ratios of either district. This transfer represents 0.8 percent of the enrollment of the Glendale USD. The percentage of minority students in Glendale USD is 41 percent and La Canada USD has a 25 percent minority enrollment. Neither of the districts has an active program for student integration. The area proposed for transfer has a relatively homogeneous population. The ethnic ratios of the two schools which would be most significantly affected, Mountain Avenue Elementary and Palm Crest Elementary, have almost identical ethnic ratios.

Rosemont Junior High School could loose 38 students from an enrollment of 1,087 which is equivalent to 3.5 percent. Crescenta Valley High School could loose 73 students for an enrollment of 1,760 which is a decrease of 4 percent. Those decreases will not have a significant impact on the ethnicity ratios of either of those schools.

Fifty-five percent of the students residing in the area proposed for transfer attend Mountain Avenue Elementary School and, if the transfer was approved, they would be in the attendance boundaries of Palm Crest Elementary School in the La Canada USD. Table VI illustrates the effect on the ethnicity ratio in these two schools:
### TABLE VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mountain Avenue Elementary School</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Total Minority</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFER</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFTER</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Palm Crest Elementary School</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Total Minority</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFER</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFTER</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The minority ratio of Mountain Avenue Elementary School would decline from 26.0 percent to 22.8 percent. The white student enrollment would increase from 74.0 percent to 77.2 percent. The Palm Crest Elementary School would increase the minority enrollment from 27.0 percent to 28.0 percent and the white student enrollment would decrease by 1.0 percent. These changes will not have a significant impact on ethnicity ratios in either school.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The proposed transfer of territory involving approximately 241 students would not have a significant or measurable impact on the ethnicity ratios of the districts. It is recommended that the County Committee find that the criterion is substantially met.
CRITERION 5

The proposed reorganization will not result in any substantial increase in costs to the state.

Title V of the California Administrative Code, Section 18573, specifies that the revenue limit between the districts affected may not vary by more than 15 percent and that the proposal does not increase the costs to the state for the affected district by more than 10 percent.

The 1991-92 base revenue limit for the Glendale USD is $3,206.01 per average daily attendance (ADA) and for the La Canada USD $3,412.65 per ADA. This represents a difference of $206.64 per ADA. The 241 students residing in the transfer area, if the proposal is approved, will assume the revenue limit per ADA of the La Canada USD.

The current costs to the state for the students in the Glendale USD and La Canada USD is approximately $122.9 million. The transfer of the territory, if approved, would increase costs by $49,800 due to the difference in revenue limits per ADA between the two districts. This represents a cost increase of approximately 0.4 percent.

It should be noted that the actual dollar amounts specified above may be lower. The revenue limits used in these calculations are the base revenue limits before deficit factors were applied by the state. The actual revenue limits for students in each district are approximately $200 per student lower.

RECOMMENDATION: Based on these data, the increased cost to the state as the result of this proposed transfer will be minimal. The increase is within the limits specified in Title V of the Administrative Code. It is recommended that the County Committee find that the criterion is substantially met.

CRITERION 6

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

On a district-wide basis, the proposed transfer of territory and the potential relocation of 241 students would not have a significant impact on the instructional programs. Each district would continue to provide the programs which are currently available.

On an individual school basis, the Glendale USD has indicated it may be required to take action which would affect the students enrolled at Mountain Avenue Elementary School. Approximately 133 students who attend Mountain Avenue Elementary School reside in the area proposed for transfer. Glendale USD has indicated it may be necessary to close Mountain Avenue Elementary School due to low enrollment.

Mountain Avenue Elementary School is approximately 25 years old and is the newest elementary school in the district. School enrollment has ranged from a high of 480 students to a low of 404. The school currently operates 15 regular classrooms and 3 classrooms are used to provide day
care. The school also has a library and a computer lab which have been largely funded by parents. The school provides an excellent instructional program and has been recognized as a California Distinguished School. There is no question that the closure of this school would have a major negative impact on the remaining 341 students.

The Glendale USD is currently evaluating proposed boundary changes for ten schools in the southern part of the district. The proposed changes will affect over 400 students. These boundary changes are necessary to relieve overcrowding in this area of the district. These boundary changes will have no impact on the schools located in the Crescenta Valley area or the area proposed for transfer.

However, in order to avoid the closure of Mountain Avenue Elementary School as part of the district's overall plan to realign school attendance boundaries, the Glendale USD might evaluate attendance boundary changes as a possible option in maintaining an adequate enrollment level at Mountain Avenue Elementary School.

As indicated earlier in this report, several residents of the area proposed for transfer have expressed a desire to have their children remain in the schools in the Glendale USD. La Canada USD representatives have indicated that interdistrict attendance permits would be approved. However, Glendale USD has stated that the district may not accept these students due to unspecified "uncertainties" associated with the proposed transfer.

RECOMMENDATION: The Glendale USD should be strongly encouraged to explore all options in order to maintain the educational program at Mountain Avenue Elementary School. In all other aspects of the instructional program, sound educational performance would continue in both districts if the proposal is approved. It is recommended that the County Committee find that the criterion is substantially met.

CRITERION 7

The proposed reorganization will not result in a significant increase in school housing costs.

As indicated previously, there are approximately 241 public school students; 133 are elementary students. If these students were transferred to La Canada USD, they would attend Palm Crest Elementary School. Information provided by the La Canada USD indicates the school has a current enrollment of 599 students. The school has the capacity for more than 850 students (through the use of relocatables).

There are 108 high school and junior high school students residing in the transfer area. These students would attend La Canada High School if the transfer was approved. The current enrollment of La Canada High School is 1,671 and the school has an enrollment capacity for 1,850 students (with relocatables).

RECOMMENDATION: New school facilities would not be required, therefore, the proposed reorganization will not result in significant increase in school housing costs. It is recommended that the County Committee find that the criterion is substantially met.
CRITERION 8

The proposed reorganization is not primarily designed to result in a significant increase in property values causing financial advantage to property owners because territory was transferred from one school district to an adjoining district.

During the public hearings, in media articles and in correspondence from residents on the area proposed for transfer, there has been an extremely high level of interest on the impact of the proposed transfer on property values. Opponents of the transfer have raised questions concerning the motivation of the petitioners.

In the public hearings, in written reports, and in conversations with staff, the petitioners have categorically denied that potential property value increases have had any influence on their decision to pursue the transfer of territory.

There is no question that, if approved, the proposed transfer could result in an increase in property values. The magnitude of the increase is extremely difficult to project due to the state of the economy, the uncertainty of interest rates, and the changes occurring in the housing market.

The Los Angeles Times publishes monthly statistical tables which reflect median home prices and the percent of change during the reporting period. Table VII summarizes the information for the affected area for the month of February 1992.

**TABLE VII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP CODE</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>MEDIAN HOME PRICE</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91011</td>
<td>La Canada/Flintridge</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
<td>+21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91214</td>
<td>La Crescenta</td>
<td>$306,000</td>
<td>+18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91208</td>
<td>Verdugo North Glendale</td>
<td>$289,000</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information does not specifically isolate the proposed transfer area. However, there is a significant difference in median prices between the La Crescenta and La Canada zip codes. The median price in La Canada is 46 percent higher than La Crescenta.

An attempt was made to obtain comparative data from the Foothill Reality Association, an
organization of real estate brokers in the area. Representatives of the association stated the
association was neutral on the proposed transfer and declined to provide any information.

Two real estate offices in the area, Dilbeck and Dickinson, were contacted and asked for their
professional opinion regarding the property value impact of the proposed transfer.

In a telephone conversation, Mr. Chris Dickinson of Dickinson Real Estate, stated it was difficult
to precisely project the effect of the transfer. In his opinion, there could be an increase in market
value in the range of 7.5 percent to 10.0 percent.

In a written response, Ms. Denise Johnson, a licensed Realtor with Dilbeck Realtors, estimated
property values would increase by less than 10.0 percent.

Mrs. Pat Larsen of Dilbeck Realtors, a licensed Realtor for over 15 years, expressed the opinion
that there would be an increase of from 5.0 percent to a maximum of 10.0 percent in the market
price of single family residences in the Sagebrush area.

Mrs. Lauren Oakes, a Realtor with Dilbeck Realty, obtained data from the Moore Data Systems
which is the database information system used by the Foothill Association of Realtors. In the
analysis, she included all sales since 1990 in the La Canada USD and all sales in the "Sagebrush"
area for the same period.

The analysis yielded an average cost per square foot of homes within La Canada USD boundaries
of $244 per square foot. Using the same formula for the "Sagebrush" area, the average cost per
square foot was $259 per square foot which is 5.8 percent higher than homes within the
boundaries of the La Canada USD. In the opinion of Mrs. Oakes, asking prices might increase
approximately 5.0 percent as the result of the transfer. She doubted if sales prices would also
increase.

It was the consensus of the professional realtors that were contacted that there might be an increase
in property values in the range of 5 to 10 percent. It would appear that it is extremely difficult, if
not impossible, to accurately project the impact on real estate values particularly on a long-range
basis.

Additionally, during the public hearings, a representative of the Cresenta-Canada Committee
which opposes the transfer submitted a comparative analysis of property values in the Glendale
USD and the La Canada USD. This analysis used sales price data to calculate an average sales
price per square foot in the respective areas. The result indicated the average dollar per square foot
in Glendale USD was $222.19 and $274.22 in the La Canada USD. The result of the analysis
prepared by Ann Verde Reality, Inc., indicated an increase in value of 22 percent.

It should be noted that EC Section 35753(b) does not state that transfers should be denied if
property value increases are projected. The code states that "...the proposed reorganization is not
primarily designed to result in a significant increase in property values...”

RECOMMENDATION: Based on the data available, it appears there will be a
property value increase if the transfer is approved. It is
possible that some of the registered voters who signed
the petition may have been influenced by this
possibility. It does not appear that the petition was
"primarily designed” for this purpose. It is
recommended that the County Committee find that this
criterion is substantially met.
CRITERION 9

The proposed reorganization will not negatively affect the fiscal management or fiscal status of the proposed district or any existing district affected by the proposed reorganization.

The analysis of the financial impact of the proposed transfer of territory is based on: a review of the financial data submitted by both districts and the petitioners; annual audit reports submitted by the district independent auditors; and, the 1991-92 Budget (Form J-201) submitted by each district. Table VIII is a summary of financial data for both districts for the last four years.

**TABLE VIII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four Year Financial Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Attendance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the four-year period, revenues and expenditures in the Glendale USD have increased by 25.0 percent. The district’s ending balance has decreased by 53.5 percent due to deficit spending. The district is projecting a 1991-92 ending balance of $3.7 million which is slightly below the 3.0 percent recommended by the state.
The district budget was based on a projected ADA of 25,687. The most recent attendance report submitted by the district (J-18 P-2) indicates ADA of 26,889 as of April 15, 1992, which is an increase of 1,202 above the projected budget. Translated into revenue using the district's $3,008 revenue limit (with deficit factor applied), amounts to $3,615,616 in additional income.

The Glendale USD states that the potential loss of 262 students who reside in the area proposed for transfer would result in $788,000 loss in revenue. The staff would be reduced by nine teaching positions (average annual salary $41,000) and expenditures would decrease by $370,000. The district would, therefore, experience an annual operating shortfall of $400,000. This represents a decrease of 0.37 percent in relation to the district budget submitted using the 25,687 ADA projection.

During the four-year period, the La Canada USD has an 18.3 percent increase in revenue and a 19.8 percent increase in expenditures. The district's ending balance has increase substantially due to the closing of a reserve fund for capital outlay and transferring the balance to the General Fund.

RECOMMENDATION: Most school districts in the state are experiencing financial problems of varying magnitudes. Glendale USD is currently in the process of implementing major budget reductions. This is not a unique situation. It is recommended that the County Committee find that this criterion has been substantially met.
VII. AREA OF ELECTION
VII. AREA OF ELECTION

Pursuant to EC Section 35710, if the petition is approved, an election shall be called in the territory of the districts as determined by the County Committee.

The Fullerton Decision specified that all electors with greater than an incidental interest in the reorganization proposal should have the opportunity to vote on it. The following three-step process has been developed by the California Department of Education to assist in determining the area of election.

STEP I

Step I is to identify all affected school districts. This proposal affects the Glendale USD and the La Canada USD.

STEP II

The County Committee must determine whether there is a compelling reason to reduce the area of election. A determination must also be made if a reduction is necessary to further the purpose of the proposed reorganization. Table IX contains data concerning the number of registered voters in the transfer area and adjacent areas.

TABLE IX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>REGISTERED VOTERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glendale USD</td>
<td>71,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Canada USD</td>
<td>11,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Glendale</td>
<td>61,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Canada</td>
<td>13,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagebrush Transfer Area</td>
<td>1,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescenta Valley High School</td>
<td>22,470*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Avenue Elementary School</td>
<td>3,544*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Crest Elementary School</td>
<td>Information pending from Registrar-Recorder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Registered voters within school attendance boundaries
Within the boundaries of the Glendale USD, there are 71,713 registered voters, including 1,464 in the area proposed for transfer. Within the boundaries of the La Canada USD, there are 11,710 registered voters. Clearly, an election which includes all of the electors in either district/both districts would overwhelm the voters in the transfer area who are directly affected. Therefore, there is a compelling interest to reduce the area of election to include only the proposed transfer area.

**STEP III**

If the County Committee determines there is a compelling interest to reduce the area of election, it then determines if that interest would be outweighed by any substantial interest of the voters who would be disenfranchised by the proposed reductions.

If, in fact, there is a realistic possibility that the Glendale USD would consider closing Mountain Avenue Elementary School, the electors residing in the school attendance boundary would be affected. However, if the Glendale USD would accept interdistrict transfers and realign attendance boundaries, the impact would be minimal and school closure would not be necessary. This course of action would appear to be in the best interests of the students and the educational program. It would also minimize any potential revenue loss.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The proposal meets all of the criteria in EC Section 35753. It is recommended that the County Committee designate the area proposed for transfer as the area of election.
VIII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS
VIII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Table X is a summary of the legal criteria as related to the proposed transfer of territory from Glendale USD to La Canada USD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERION</th>
<th>MET?</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1—District Size</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2—Community Identity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Area is within the city boundary of La Canada Flintridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3—Division of Property</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No school facility within proposed transfer area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4—Ethnic Discrimination and Segregation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No measurable impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5—Increased Costs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cost increase less than 0.4 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6—Impact on Educational Programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Current programs will continue to be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7—School Housing Costs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Existing schools can accommodate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8—Property Values</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Proposal not designed to increase property values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9—Fiscal Impact</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Financial impact will be minor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AREA OF ELECTION

The area proposed for transfer should be determined as the area for election for the following reasons:

- transfer area residents are the only ones with more than a substantial interest;
- including a larger area would overwhelm the voters in the transfer area; and
- it does not appear that others outside the transfer area have more than only an incidental interest.
ATTACHMENTS
Legal Description of Territory
TRANSFER OF TERRITORY NO. 2-91
FROM GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
TO LA CANADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

Beginning at the southeasterly corner of Tract No. 7116, as shown on map
filed in Book 106, page 89 of Maps, in the office of the Recorder of the County
of Los Angeles; thence northerly along the easterly boundary of said tract to
the northerly terminus of that certain course having a length of 582.02 feet in
said easterly boundary; thence northerly in a direct line to the intersection of
the northeasterly line of said tract with the southerly prolongation of the
easterly line of Parcel 2 of Lot 24 of Beach's Addition to Crescenta Canada, as
shown on map recorded in Book 7, page 25 of Miscellaneous Records, in the office
of said recorder; thence northerly in a direct line through the northeasterly
corner of Parcel 20 of said lot to the northeasterly line of that certain
1.82 acre parcel of land, as shown on map of Tract No. 519 filed in Book 15,
page 45 of said Maps; thence northerly along said northeasterly line to the west
line of Fractional Section 26, Township 2 North, Range 13 West, S.B.M.; thence
northerly along said west line to the northwest corner of said fractional
section; thence northerly along the boundary of the City of La Canada-Flintridge,
as same existed on October 10, 1991 and following the same in all its various
courses and curves to the point of beginning.

Containing: 386.10 Acres
0.603 Square Miles

Description Approved
OCT 24 1991
T. A. TIDEANSON
County Engineer

By
Deputy

AE:ayc/MPM277/DESCRIP

RECEIVED DEC 28 1991

A-1
Questionnaire Responses
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF TERRITORY BETWEEN
GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT AND
LA CANADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Petitioner

1A. What elementary school(s) would students from the transfer areas attend under this proposal? Palm Crest Elementary in La Canada
What are the school's:
- grade levels? K thru 6
- enrollment? 599 students.
- capacity? Room is available on the unused upper yard to add portables, if they are needed
- racial/ethnic makeup? (Obtain information from CBEDS) See table below.

1B. What elementary school(s) do students from the transfer areas presently attend? Mountain Ave Elementary in La Crescenta
What are the school's:
- grade levels? K thru 6
- enrollment? 479 students.
- capacity? Room is available to add portables, if they are needed
- racial/ethnic makeup? (Obtain information from CBEDS) See table below.

• What is the closest and furthest distance from the homes to the school (miles, blocks)? Closest: 0.2 mi and furthest: 2.0 mi to Palm Crest
  Closest: 0.1 mi and furthest: 2.6 mi to Mountain
  See table below

• Is bussing an option to transport pupils to and from the school? How long is the bus ride? Busing of the children of the Sagebrush area to Mountain Ave school is not performed presently and it would not be instituted after the transfer to Palm Crest.

• If the pupils can walk to school, are there any major intersections or other safety hazards along the way? Are there crossing guards? Although some children walk to school, most are driven presently to Mountain Ave School. (There was a survey taken of parents of how their children get to school which confirmed that fact.) It is expected that this practice would continue after the transfer. Ocean View Ave is a moderate sized, north-to-south street to cross. At present, the majority of the children attending Mountain Ave School have to cross the street as they travel west. After the transfer, a minority of the children (those living on the west side of Ocean View) will have to cross the same street but in an easterly direction. There is one crossing guard on Ocean View Ave at Cross St provided by the City of La Canada-Flintridge. Foothill Blvd is a major east-west street and children
have to cross it regardless of which school they attend. There are no crossing guards over Foothill. At Palm Crest, the majority of the children are driven to school. Regardless of which school the children attend, if they walk, some children will have to walk streets not having sidewalks. Sidewalks in the Sagebrush area are shown on the attached map. There are two crosswalks across Ocean View Ave.

• What types of recreational activities, after-school programs are offered? The La Canada School District contracts with the local YMCA to provide both before and after school on-site care for the children. The Y also offers transportation after school to their facility for special programs such as swimming and gymnastics.

2A. What junior high school(s) would students from the transfer area attend under this proposal? The students will attend La Canada High School.
• What are the school’s:
  • grade levels? 7 thru 12. La Canada has a special educational program known as "a school within a school" which provides greater interaction between students and students and between students and teachers.
  • enrollment? Total school enrollment is 1671
  • capacity? Not Known
  • racial/ethnic makeup? (Obtain information from CBEDS) See table below.

2B. What junior high school(s) do students from the transfer area presently attend? The students attend Rosemont JHS in La Crescenta
• What are the school’s:
  • grade levels? 7 and 8
  • enrollment? Total school enrollment is 1109
  • capacity? Not Known
  • racial/ethnic makeup? (Obtain information from CBEDS) See table below. With reference to the table, it should be noted that 131 students, which are presently transferred to Rosemont from Toll Jr High, will be returned next year, bringing the racial/ethnic ratio of Rosemont in line with the local elementary schools and the high school in the district. These children were bussed to Rosemont because construction at Hoover HS limited the space available at that site. The construction will be completed in time for the next school year.

• What is the closest and furthest distance from the homes to the school (miles, blocks)? Closest: 3.1 mi and furthest: 5.3 mi to La Canada HS
  Closest: 0.7 mi and furthest: 2.7 mi to Rosemont JH
  See table below.

• Is busing an option to transport pupils to and from the school? How long is the bus ride? Busing of the children of the Sagebrush area to Rosemont JH is not performed presently and it would not be instituted after the transfer to La Canada HS.
• If the pupils can walk to school, are there any major intersections or other safety hazards along the way? Are there crossing guards? The vast majority of the students do not walk to Rosemont JH. They have several moderate to major intersections to cross including Ocean View Ave, Briggs Ave, and Foothill Blvd. Students attending grades 7 and 8 at La Canada High will have to be driven to school. Should the La Canada School District chose to open Foothill Intermediate School, the distances will be closest: 1.4 mi and furthest: 3.5 mi.

• What types of recreational activities, after-school programs are offered? Various fine arts and athletic programs are offered at La Canada in addition to other community sports programs.

3A. What high school(s) would students from the transfer areas attend under this proposal? The students will attend La Canada High School

• What are the school's:
  • grade levels? 7 thru 12
  • enrollment? 1671
  • capacity'? Not Known
  • racial/ethnic makeup? (Obtain information from CBEDS) See table below

3B. What high school(s) do students from the transfer areas presently attend? The students attend Crescenta Valley HS in La Crescenta

• What are the school's:
  • grade levels? 9 thru 12
  • enrollment? 1737
  • capacity'? Not Known
  • racial/ethnic makeup? (Obtain information from CBEDS) See table below

• What is the closest and furthest distance from the homes to the school (miles, blocks)? Closest: 3.1 mi and furthest: 5.3 mi to La Canada HS
  Closest: 1.1 mi and furthest: 3.1 mi to Crescenta Valley HS

• Is bussing an option to transport pupils to and from the school? How long is the bus ride? Busing of the children of the Sagebrush area to CV High School is not performed presently and it would not be instituted after the transfer to La Canada HS.

• If the pupils can walk to school, are there any major intersections or other safety hazards along the way? Are there crossing guards? A vast majority of the students do not walk to school presently and this practice would not change after the transfer.
• What types of recreational activities, after-school programs are offered? Various fine arts and athletic programs are offered at La Canada in addition to other community sports programs.

4. What is the district's:
   • enrollment? La Canada USD: 3713 (Oct 1991) and Glendale USD: 27,545 (Feb 92, all schools were called and results summed)
   • ADA? Not Known
   • racial/ethnic makeup? (Obtain information from CBEDS) See table below.
   • revenue limit? $3412.65 in La Canada

5. Approximately how many students reside in the transfer area? Total: 244 regular plus 18 special program children. Present makeup includes the following:
   • 133 attend Mountain Ave Elementary School (out of 479 or 28%) and they will attend Palm Crest Elementary School (599 or 22%). La Canada may readjust boundaries to balance school populations or may add portables on the upper yard at the Palm Crest site. Mountain Ave's boundary can be adjusted to account for the loss of students.
   • 38 attend Rosemont JHS out of 1109 (3%)
   • 73 attend CV High School out of 1737 (4%). Both the junior and high school students will attend La Canada High school (1671 or 7%)
   • In addition, there 18 other students enrolled in handicapped or other day and special classes. Many of these children are presently educated under a special agreement between La Canada, Glendale, and Burbank Unifieds and their education would not be affected by this transfer.

6. Does the area proposed for transfer have a particular "community identity" which makes the proposal more or less logical? Traditionally, family, education (both public and religious) and community mold a child's values, self confidence, and relationship to the world. This triad provides a nurturing environment with solid foundations in which the children can grow and become good parents and citizens. Although we strive to provide our children a solid base which contains all three of these elements, the area in which we live lacks community identity and the children are not receiving that third critical element; the sense of community. This transfer will correct that problem. La Canada-Flintridge is a small community and, in any community of this size, the schools play a key, unifying role. Although the area has always been a part of the City of La Canada-Flintridge, the children and families have not participated in many school, civic, and recreational activities due to their attendance in another school district. Parents of children not in the school district don't get to meet other town parents and have little opportunity to find out about events or activities that
they or their children could participate in. In joining the La Canada Unified School District, the children and parents of our area will have greater participation in local activities, thereby unifying a divided city, and allowing our children to acquire a sense of community which is presently missing.

7 Would the transfer cause significant disruption of the educational programs of the La Canada Unified School District as a whole or the impacted schools in particular? If yes, explain. (attach additional sheets, if necessary) The transfer will not significantly disrupt educational programs in either district. The total percent change to the GUSD regular enrollment will be 244 out of 27,545 or 0.9%. The percentage change to the Glendale high school and the junior high involved are at or under 4% and are not significant. The change to the Glendale elementary school is higher and, if not compensated for, will return the enrollment in the school back to levels of six years ago - at which time the school operated successfully. A change of boundary, involving only a few streets close to Mountain Ave School, will more than compensate for the transfer of the western La Canada children. This boundary change will be discussed in detail in the Memo to be delivered to the Office Of Education shortly.

The total percent change to La Canada will be 244 out of 3,713 or 6.6% and the largest change will be at the elementary school level, 22%. This increase will strengthen La Canada's enrollment which will decrease next year.

8. Are there any particular geographical factors which make the proposal more or less logical (e.g., isolation)? Pickens Canyon has always been the dividing line between the City of La Canada-Flintridge and the incorporated town of La Crescenta. It runs in a general north-south direction and it is impassable except at one location where a school footbridge crosses it and at Foothill Blvd. We propose that this natural feature become the school boundary, making the school and city boundaries coterminous.

9. Does any projected future growth or change in the area (e.g., new development) make the proposal more or less logical? Glendale Unified is the sixth largest Unified school district in the County. It is already overcrowded and the growth in the district will exacerbate the situation. Enrollment in '91/'92 is up six percent or 1648 students over last year's levels. The school population has risen over 42% in the last six years. The Glendale District projects that the growth will continue at a rate of over 4000 students, or 16%, over the next three years and has reinstated the Future's Task Force. This Task Force recommends modifications to enrollment boundaries, building of new classrooms, and instituting year-round education. There are a number of developments being planned in the La Crescenta area. One development alone, at the top of Lowell, will build 47 single-family homes. Many condo developments are being planned with one condo development under construction at Pennsylvania Ave.

Glendale Unified's action plan for '91/92 (Attachment 7) shows that the three elementary schools adjacent to Mountain Avenue, La Crescenta,
Fremont, and Monte Vista all needed additional space this year. Their plan for '92/93 (Attachment 8) shows that the same three schools need, respectfully 28, 17, and 20 additional spaces next year and that the District will "add portables as needed," losing more playground space. In actual fact, these schools are growing even more rapidly than the District planned. Fremont and La Crescenta have each grown by over 14% and Monte Vista by 13% in the last eighteen months alone and are now beyond next year's projections. Mountain Ave has grown by 9% over the same time span and it too is beyond the projections for next year. There is growth in the area, both in the population and the schools, that will more than offset the loss of students involved in this transfer. Glendale Unified may choose to redraw its own boundaries between the schools with special emphasis on accommodating the students from the new developments in the area and on equalizing enrollment values.

La Canada Unified is the third smallest district in the County and, although it has experienced some growth over the last few years, it will see a reduction in enrollment of 6% next year. The City itself has no major developments ongoing and has no large areas for future growth.

10. Does the La Canada Unified School District Governing Board support the transfer proposal? Yes, the board does support the transfer and endorsed a resolution calling for the transfer to take place. In addition, the La Canada-Flintridge City Council and the Chamber of Commerce have supported the transfer by voting their own resolutions.

11. Any additional, information. In the November 4, 1991 Glendale School Board meeting, the Superintendent's Office announced that, in August - only one month before the school year began - they had underestimated that September's enrollment by more than 800 students. The uncertainty that Glendale Unified had this past summer in enrollment population is 3.5 times greater than the number of students in the proposed transfer. The district-wide impact of a transfer of this size is below Glendale's planning uncertainty.

Glendale Unified has made accusations that the petitioners are attempting this transfer solely to increase property values. This accusation is false and it will be addressed in the public County meetings and in the Memo to be provided to County Committee members and Office of Education on March 16, 1992.

The bulk of the children attending Mountain Ave school don't walk but are driven to school. A survey was made by the Mountain Ave administration and PTA which confirmed this fact.

It should be noted that the school capacities stated by Glendale Unified in their answer to the County questionnaire are not the capacity of the existing physical structures. In Glendale's "Action Plan", it is clear that these numbers include "existing portables ... plus added portables when space available" and in the case of Mountain Ave school a relocation of the CDP.
The using of all existing playground area, except the minimum required by law, to house portables is an extreme measure. There have been a great number of portables added to the Foothill elementary schools with 6 at La Crescenta, 6 at Fremont, and 2 at Monte Vista.

Glendale Unified mentions in their answer to the questionnaire that they may open two closed schools. These schools are rented presently at a positive cash flow to the district and reopening them would lose this benefit. In addition, the expense required to bring them up to Code may be large (i.e. $250,000 to $1,000,000). Key issues in bringing the schools up to Code include asbestos removal and earthquake standards.

*Glendale also mentions in their response that changing boundaries will be "a very disruptive process" and, yet, the Glendale district has already put in place a task force to study how to deal with the overcrowding by modifying school boundaries and moving to additional year-round schools. This task force is already in place even without this transfer taking place.*

The increase of 4000 students to Glendale will result in an increase of ADA funds of $12,000,000 per year. Since Glendale has projected impacts over ten years, we also do so here. The ten year impact is a whopping increase of $120,000,000.

There are 2210 housing units in the Mountain Ave attendance district. 1413 are in La Crescenta and 797 are in La Canada. In the La Canada portion, multiple unit housing is restricted to one small area (due to sanitation and zoning regulations) south of Foothill and all of the rest is fully developed with no room for growth. La Canada's future contribution to Mountain Ave is fixed at roughly its present level. In La Crescenta, numerous condo, apartment, and housing developments either are underway or are being planned. The Crescenta Valley Town Council is concerned about this growth. The La Crescenta percentage of the Mountain Ave enrollment will grow. Since people live in houses, Glendale's claim that "half of the current attendance area for Mountain Ave would be lost" is false. The largest contribution that La Canada can physically make in terms of housing units is one third and that ratio will decrease with the new buildings in La Crescenta.

A Memo to the County committee members will be provided at the March 16 public meeting and that Memo should be considered as part of this response to the questionnaire.
### Racial and Ethnic Mix of Schools Involved (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>GLENDALE UNIFIED (1991-92)</th>
<th>LA CANADA UNIFIED (1990-91)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Ave</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Crest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemont</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescenta Valley</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Canada (inc 7 &amp;8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Distance to Schools (mi)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>BEFORE TRANSFER</th>
<th>AFTER TRANSFER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Ave</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Crest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemont</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescenta Valley</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Canada (inc 7 &amp;8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) From 4292 Ocean View Blvd via Pickens Canyon footbridge  
b) From 2101 Highrium Rd via Foothill Blvd  
c) From 2129 Cross St via footpath by Hall's Canyon Debris Basin  
d) From 2101 Highrium Rd via Los Amigos St  
e) From 4465 Briggs Ave via Foothill Blvd  
f) From 4503 Leata Lane via Foothill Blvd

1.) Glendale Unified School District, Comparison of First Month Enrollment for School Years 1990-91 and 1991-92  
4. All racial and ethnic data compiled from "Reports To Parents" or School Report" pamphlets available to parents, from **Daily News**, January 13, 1992 and from inputs to County by the school districts involved.

Los Angeles County Office of Education
Division of Business Advisory Services
1/14/92
February 28, 1992

James R. Marlatt, Management Consultant
Regionalized Business Services
Division of Business Advisory Services
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 East Imperial Highway
Downey, California 90242-2890

Dear Mr. Marlatt:

The following is in response to your letter of January 15, 1992 regarding the proposed transfer of territory from the Glendale Unified School District to the La Canada Unified School District.

Before responding to your specific questions, I wish to emphasize to you and the committee that the Board of Education, above all else, is concerned with providing the best education possible for all of the students in our school district. Acting in the best interest of our students has--and always will be--the Board's number one priority. While this document addresses several complex issues with legal and financial implications, we must not lose sight that these and other matters affect our students.

I would also like to bring to your attention the February 6, 1992 Court of Appeals decision which overturned a Superior Court decision involving a similar transfer of territory between the Pasadena Unified School District and the San Marino Unified School District.

We believe that the decision by the California Court of Appeals is applicable for consideration by the County Committee on the "Sagebrush" petition as well.

Note:

Although purposely not addressed by the Sagebrush petitioners, it is a matter of public record that property values within the proposed transfer area would significantly increase as a result of the annexation, causing financial advantage to property owners. This is contrary to Education Code Section 35753, and is supported in the above noted decision by the Court of Appeals---in that decision, the
Appellate Court wrote that approval of the transfer would "...result in significant financial gain to the petitioning homeowners, which is not permitted by law."

The decision also addressed the limitation of the voting area (vote of the petitioning area only) and found that it would be a violation of the equal protection guarantee "...any vote on the matter should be held throughout the entire district."

In addition, the Court of Appeals addressed racial and ethnic issues associated with the transfer of territory between Pasadena Unified School District and San Marino Unified School District. Although based on total numbers, the proposed transfer of territory between Glendale Unified School District and La Canada Unified School District represents a small portion of the Glendale district; we believe that any reduction in the number of students from the transfer area would adversely impact and further increase the percentage of Limited-English Proficient students within the district (please see page 10 of this letter for a more definitive analysis of this factor).

1. What elementary school do students from the proposed transfer area currently attend?

   o Mountain Avenue Elementary School
     . Grades: K-6
     . Enrollment: 470 students
     . School capacity: 655
     . Racial ethnic makeup:
       American Indian: 0
       Black: 1
       Hispanic: 33
       Asian: 75
       Filipino: 13
       Pacific Islander: 0
       Middle Eastern: 22
       Caucasian: 324

   o Distances:
     Closest: Approximately 100 yards
     Farthest: 1.4 miles

   o No busing is available for regular students.

   o Most students walk to school. Crossing guards are provided at two locations: the intersections of Briggs
and Mountain Avenue, and Ocean View Blvd. and Cross Street. Not all of the streets in this transfer territory have sidewalks which is typical of both the La Crescenta and La Canada-Flintridge area.

**Recreation:**

There are no formal interscholastic recreation activities provided at this school. However, Mountain Avenue does offer an extended day-care program.

2. What junior high school do students from the proposed transfer area attend?

- Rosemont Junior High School
  - Grades: 7-8
  - Enrollment: 1,090 students*
  - School capacity: 1,235
  - Racial ethnic makeup:
    - American Indian: 3
    - Black: 13
    - Hispanic: 127
    - Asian: 170
    - Filipino: 24
    - Pacific Islander: 1
    - Middle Eastern: 126
    - Caucasian: 626

*Special Note:

Included within this number are 131 students from the Toll Jr. High attendance area. In September 1992, these students will be returned to their original school of attendance (Toll or Hoover).

- Distances:
  - Closest: Approximately .6 mile (walking)
  - Farthest: Approximately 2 miles (walking)
  - Approximately 3.1 miles (driving)

Walking distance utilizes the foot bridge adjacent to Mountain Avenue School. Busing for regular students is not available. Most of the students walk to school. Students may use the crossing guards at Briggs and Mountain Avenue, and at Ocean View Blvd. and Cross Street. There are no major signalized intersections. Not all of the streets in this transfer territory have sidewalks which is typical of both the La Crescenta and La Canada-Flintridge areas.
Rosemont Junior High School (continued)

- Recreation:
  The school offers numerous after-school clubs and intramural athletic activities.

3. What high school do students from the proposed transfer areas attend?

- Crescenta Valley High School
  - Grades: 9-12
  - Enrollment: 1,760 students
  - School capacity: 2,182
  - Racial ethnic makeup:
    American Indian: 2
    Black: 8
    Hispanic: 138
    Asian: 277
    Filipino: 17
    Pacific Islander: 2
    Middle Eastern: 262
    Caucasian: 1,316

- Distances:
  Closest: 1.6 miles (walking or driving)
  Farthest: 3.1 miles

- Busing is not available for regular students.

- Students walk, bicycle, are driven, or drive to school.

- Recreation

A comprehensive athletic program and wide array of student clubs and similar activities are available at Crescenta Valley High School.

- High school interscholastic activities and other events that are specifically school-sponsored are based on local school attendance. Crescenta Valley High School students currently living in the affected area would, however, have an additional two miles (approximate) traveling distance each way from home to school in order to participate in after-school activities.

Note: In the Canada/Crescenta Valley area (Crescenta Valley High School attendance area), approximately 1,500 additional students could be housed.
Mr. James Marlatt
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This number would include the reopening of two schools currently closed (Valley View Elementary and Clark Junior High).

4. Is information on petition regarding the Glendale Unified School District correct? If not, what is incorrect?

Four of the six reasons given by the petitioners contain misleading or false information. The following are district replies to the petitioners' statements.

Reason #2 - Community Environment: The district takes exception to the statement that relates to providing a "community environment for the children of the area." The notion of a "community environment" for the children of the area in reality has little to do with differences in city-school district boundaries. Some "Sagebrush" residents may perceive that their area lacks identity or an appropriate community environment for students. In fact, the community environment, to which the Glendale Schools contribute significantly, is one of the most desirable of any area in the school district.

Reason #3 - Participation in Recreation and Other Functions: Annexation would allow the affected students to participate in school-sponsored sports and other activities in the La Canada Unified School District, provided they attend La Canada schools. The petitioners imply, however, that students residing in the "Sagebrush" area are denied the opportunity to take part in other functions and activities. This is false.

Most activities, recreational, civic and related activities across the foothills communities are open to all children, regardless of their school of attendance. This applies to such organizations as Crescenta-Canada YMCA (Crescenta-Canada Sports Assn.), Little League Baseball, AYSO Soccer, La Crescenta-Canada Babe Ruth Baseball, and scouting. The La Canada Youth League (softball and baseball) which is not part of National Little League serves only La Canada-Flintridge residents.

Reason #4 - Local Control, Ability to Respond to Local Input: The petitioners give the impression that the La Canada Unified School District would be more responsive to "Sagebrush" area residents who offer input regarding local educational matters. This has no basis in fact. Two of the five members of the Glendale Board of Education reside in La Crescenta, with one member living near Mountain Avenue School. All Board members and the Superintendent of Schools
are active in regular school visitations, parent/community meetings in the schools, and public Board meetings throughout the school year.

PTA units at Mountain Avenue Elementary, Rosemont Junior High, and Crescenta Valley High are among the busiest in the district—and communications among these units and the Board, school and central administration are excellent. Parents in the "Sagebrush" area through the years have been very active in school district-sponsored task forces, committees and projects, including the recent Glendale Schools 2000, a strategic plan for education in the school district during the next decade.

Reason #5 – Reducing Overcrowding in the Glendale Unified School District: Petitioners state that student overcrowding in the Glendale Unified School District would be relieved by the proposed annexation. The fact is that crowded conditions exist primarily in the schools located south of Verdugo Woodlands. Most campuses in the foothills are operating below their site capacities, even though portable classrooms have been placed during the past couple of years at some locations. In addition, the district currently owns two sites in La Crescenta—Valley View Elementary and Clark Junior High—that are not being used for public school purposes.

Due to the configuration of the district, adjusting school boundaries to balance enrollment between north and south is impractical. Transporting students to foothills schools from other areas in the district would be much too expensive and would be counter to the district's long-standing commitment to students attending their neighborhood schools.

5. District:

- Enrollment: 27,100
- ADA: 26,800
- Racial/ethnic makeup:
  - American Indian: 37
  - Black: 327
  - Hispanic: 6,374
  - Asian: 3,364
  - Filipino: 1,015
  - Pacific Islander: 36
  - Middle Eastern: 8,039
  - Caucasian: 15,953 (includes Middle Eastern)

- Revenue limit: $3,008
Mr. James Marlatt
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6. Approximately how many students reside in the transfer area?

A total of 262 students as of November 1991; 133 from Mountain Avenue; 38 from Rosemont; 73 at Crescenta Valley High School, and 18 at various other schools throughout the District, including 3 at College View, the school for severely handicapped.

7. Is the Glendale Unified School District a charter city district?

Glendale Unified School District is a charter city district.

8. Does the Glendale Unified School District have any outstanding bonded indebtedness or other major obligations?

The Glendale Unified School District does not have any outstanding bonded indebtedness. It does have two Certificates of Participation in the amount of $14,500,000. These are an obligation funded by the general fund of the district plus a special reserve fund established for the repayment of these obligations...no designated property-tax levies are associated with the repayment of the Certificates of Participation.

9. Does the area proposed for transfer have a particular "community identity" which makes the proposal more or less logical?

The boundaries for many area school districts, and for districts throughout Los Angeles County, do not correspond to city boundaries. This factor has not been detrimental to the overall community identity of those areas, or community sports programs, religious programs or other community-based activities. The options available to residents within the area proposed for annexation would not significantly change as claimed by the petitioners.

The proposed transfer area has been within the sphere of the La Crescenta and Glendale schools since the inception of the school district in the late 1800's. In 1967 the Glendale District constructed the district's newest, most modern elementary campus on Mountain Avenue at a cost of over $2 million. This school was specifically constructed for the residents of both the proposed transfer and surrounding areas. A pedestrian bridge was constructed over the Pickens channel to directly serve the students of the proposed
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transfer area. In 1976, the city of La Canada–Flintridge was incorporated, and at that time the area was included within the city limits.

10. Would the transfer cause significant disruption of the educational programs of the Glendale Unified School District as a whole or the impacted schools in particular?

If implemented, the annexation would redistrict homes of approximately 30 percent of the students now attending Mountain Avenue into an expanded La Canada school district. The students would no longer attend Mountain Avenue Elementary School—such a move would reduce Mountain Avenue’s student body to such a small size that operation of the campus would no longer be financially feasible.

With little or no enrollment growth projected in the existing Mountain Avenue attendance area, the Glendale Board of Education would face either: a) closing the school, or b) adding students to the campus by expanding Mountain Avenue’s attendance area. Transporting students to Mountain Avenue from other areas of the district is not feasible because it is very expensive and contradicts the District’s long-standing philosophy of children attending their neighborhood school. Either Option "a" or "b" change attendance areas and would disrupt families in adjacent elementary schools and across the La Crescenta Valley area. A redistricting of this area would impact hundreds of students in a number of schools throughout the Crescenta/Canada Valley area.

Since 1984-85, more than 90% of the District’s enrollment growth has occurred in its central and southern portions. Most campuses in the foothills have room to grow before they would be considered at or near capacity. Note: The Glendale District currently has both an elementary and a junior high school in the area which are not being utilized.

The high quality of education offered by the Glendale and La Canada school systems is not an issue—and rightly so. Glendale schools are most proud, however, of the statewide and national achievement of Mountain Avenue Elementary, Rosemont Junior High, and Crescenta Valley High. Students and their families residing in the proposed transfer area are among one of the district’s most stable neighborhoods and have contributed greatly to the success of the school district’s instructional program.
11. What are the current plans for utilization of school property and facilities which are located within the area proposed for transfer?

The Glendale Unified School District Board of Education will be faced with a number of difficult decisions regarding school property and facilities which are located in and adjacent to the area proposed for transfer. In order to prevent the possible closing of Mountain Avenue resulting from the proposed transfer, there would be a need to realign attendance areas of adjacent elementary schools, also a very disruptive process. It should be noted that if the proposed transfer were to be approved, "half" of the current attendance area for Mountain Avenue School would be lost.

Whatever decision the Board of Education would have to make would have significant impact beyond the Mountain Avenue school attendance area.

12. Are there any particular geographical factors which make the proposal more or less logical (e.g., isolation)?

The Pickens Canyon channel which serves as the proposed boundary as well as the existing western city boundary for La Canada-Flintridge has no facility for cross-traffic vehicles, but the pedestrian access bridge was specifically developed to maintain foot traffic access to Mountain Avenue and Rosemont schools.

Mountain Avenue school was specifically constructed for residents of both the proposed annexation and surrounding areas. If the transfer of territory were to be approved, the school would be geographically located in the far northeastern corner of the district and create a situation which would adversely affect schools throughout the Canada/Crescenta Valley area.

13. Does any projected future growth or change in the area (e.g., new development) make the proposal more or less logical?

This area is almost fully developed, and future housing expansion is not anticipated. Future growth or development is not a factor in making this proposal.
14. Does the Glendale Unified School District Governing Board support the transfer proposal?

The Glendale Unified School District opposes the transfer proposal.

Additional Information

Language Census Report (Relative to Limited-English Proficient [LEP] Students)

The Glendale Unified School District, on its latest R-30 Language Census Report (May 1991), has identified the following number of Limited-English Proficient (LEP) Students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Schools Serving the Proposed Transfer Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although based on total numbers, the proposed transfer area represents a small portion of the district; we believe that any reduction in the number of students within the proposed transfer area would adversely impact and further increase the percentage of Limited-English Proficient students within the district.

Financial Impact (School District)

Based on 1991-92 base revenue limits, the following financial factors must be considered:

Assuming the transfer of the current 262 students in the proposed transfer area and the 1991/92 base revenue limit of $3008 per ADA, the Glendale District would suffer a loss of approximately $788,000. The staff would be reduced by approximately nine teaching positions, equivalent to an estimated $370,000. The district could not proportionately reduce classified and management staff and utility expenses, thereby forcing the district to face an annual operating shortfall of approximately $400,000 . . . $4,000,000 over a ten-year period.
March 4, 1992

James R. Marlatt, Management Consultant
Regionalized Business Services
Division of Business Advisory Services
Los Angeles County Education Center, Room 123
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242-2890

Dear Mr. Marlatt,

Attached please find the questionnaire you requested our district complete and return to you prior to March 27, 1992.

Please let me know if you have questions or need further information regarding this task.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Andrew J. Meyer

AJM:cb

cc: Dr. Judith R. Glickman, Superintendent
La Canada Unified School District

Dr. Robert A. Sanchis, Superintendent
Glendale Unified School District

Ms. Rose McCoppin, Chief Petitioner
5034 Castle Road
La Canada Flintridge, CA 91101
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF TERRITORY BETWEEN
GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT AND
LA CANADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

La Canada Unified School District

1. What elementary school(s) would students from the transfer areas attend under this proposal?

Palm Crest Elementary School

- What are the school's:
  - Grade levels? Kindergarten through grade six
  - Enrollment? 599
  - Capacity? More than 850 through the use of relocateables
  - Racial/ethnic makeup:
    - Asian 21%
    - Hispanic 5%
    - Black 1%
    - White 73%

- What is the closest and furthest distance from the homes to the school (miles, blocks)?
  The furthest home from the school is estimated to be 2.5 miles.

- Is bussing an option to transport pupils to and from the school? How long is the bus ride?
  The La Canada Unified School District does not provide home-to-school transportation.

- If the pupils can walk to school, are there any major intersections or other safety hazards along the way? Are there crossing guards?
  The major intersections have crossing guards staffed through the support of the City of La Canada Flintridge. There are no other safety hazards.

- What types of recreational activities, after-school programs are offered?
  The Crescenta-Canada YMCA conducts an after school child care program on the campus ("The Sunshine Company"). In addition, community-based youth sports programs use the school facilities. The City of La Canada Flintridge supports the La Canada Unified School District financially in maintaining the facilities for recreational use by the city residents.
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2. What junior high school(s) would students from the homes go under this proposal?

*La Canada High School*

- What are the school's:
  - Grade levels? 7 through 12
  - Enrollment? 1671
  - Capacity? More than 1850 through the use of relocateables
  - Racial/ethnic makeup: Asian 19% Pacific Islander 1% Hispanic 3% White 77%

- What is the closest and furthest distance from the homes to the school (miles, blocks)?
  
  *The furthest home from the school is estimated to be 5.5 miles.*

- Is bussing an option to transport pupils to and from the school? How long is the bus ride?
  
  *The La Canada Unified School District does not provide home-to-school transportation.*

- If the pupils can walk to school, are there any major intersections or other safety hazards along the way? Are there crossing guards?
  
  *The major intersections have crossing guards staffed through the support of the City of La Canada Flintridge. There are no other safety hazards.*

- What types of recreational activities, after-school programs are offered?
  
  *After school athletic programs are available as well as club activities and fine art performance opportunities. In addition, community-based youth sports programs use the school facilities. The City of La Canada Flintridge supports the La Canada Unified School District financially in maintaining the facilities for recreational use by the city residents.*

3. What high school(s) would students from the transfer areas attend under this proposal?

*La Canada High School*

- What are the school's:
  - Grade levels? 7 through 12
  - Enrollment? 1671
  - Capacity? More than 1850 through the use of relocateables
  - Racial/ethnic makeup: Asian 19% Pacific Islander 1% Hispanic 3% White 77%
What is the closest and furthest distance from the homes to the school (miles, blocks)?

The furthest home from the school is estimated to be 5.5 miles.

Is bussing an option to transport pupils to and from the school? How long is the bus ride?

The La Canada Unified School District does not provide home-to-school transportation.

If the pupils can walk to school, are there any major intersections or other safety hazards along the way? Are there crossing guards?

The major intersections have crossing guards staffed through the support of the City of La Canada Flintridge. There are no other safety hazards.

What types of recreational activities, after-school programs are offered?

After school athletic programs are available as well as club activities and fine art performance opportunities. In addition, community-based youth sports programs use the school facilities. The City of La Canada Flintridge supports the La Canada Unified School District financially in maintaining the facilities for recreational use by the city residents.

Is information on petition regarding the La Canada Unified School correct? If not, what is incorrect?

The information is correct.

What is the district's:

- Enrollment? 3713 (as of CBEDS, October 16, 1991)
- ADA? 3639 (assumes 98% rate)
- Racial/ethnic Makeup?
  - Asian 19%
  - Pacific Islander 1%
  - Filipino 1%
  - Hispanic 3%
  - Black 1%
  - White 75%
- Revenue Limit? $3,412.65 (Please note that the district actually receives much less than this because of the deficit factors applied. While the State has applied COLA increases to our revenue limit, the district does not receive the increase because of the deficit factor applied by the State at the same time.)

Approximately how many students reside in the transfer area?

262 (Based on information from the Glendale Unified School District)

Is the La Canada Unified School District a charter city district?

No
8. Does the La Canada Unified School District have any outstanding bonded indebtedness or other major obligations? If yes, explain.

Yes. The district presently has $480,000 in building bonds issued to build the existing high school. These will be retired by July 1, 1994. There are no other major obligations.

9. Does the area proposed for transfer have a particular "community identity" which makes the proposal more or less logical?

Yes. The area is the only part of the City of La Canada Flintridge that is not a part of the school district. This situation has created many problems every year as residents move into the area thinking they will be attending the La Canada Unified School District when in fact they will not. In addition, there are many residents extremely unhappy that their children cannot follow the athletic and cultural programs supported by the City in the schools through their children's formal education.

10. Would the transfer cause significant disruption of the educational programs of the La Canada Unified School District as a whole or the impacted schools in particular? If yes, explain. (attach additional sheets, if necessary)

No

11. Are there any particular geographical factors which make the proposal more or less logical (e.g., isolation)?

It would be most logical to have the City and school district boundaries contiguous. There are no natural boundaries precluding this action.

12. Does any projected future growth or change in the area (e.g., new development) make the proposal more or less logical?

The area is fully developed and will not create a negative impact on the school district.

13. Does the La Canada Unified School District Governing Board support the transfer proposal?

Yes. Please see the attached resolution.

14. What school site would be available for a public hearing in March or April? Who should be contacted to schedule a hearing?

Palm Crest Elementary School. Please contact Dr. Andrew J. Meyer, Assistant Superintendent, at (818) 952-8383.

15. Any additional information?

No.
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I. INTRODUCTION

This Memorandum is submitted to the County Committee on School District Organization in support of a change in the school district boundary between the La Canada Unified School District and the Glendale Unified School District. Approximately 0.6 square mile of the western part of the City Of La Canada-Flintridge is presently included in the Glendale system and it is proposed to transfer that area to the La Canada Unified School District. A map and legal description of the area under discussion are attached to this Memorandum (Attachment 1).

II. SUMMARY

Residents, parents, and students of an area contained entirely within the City of La Canada-Flintridge are petitioning to join the La Canada Unified School District. The area has not been integrated with the rest of our community, a fact that is freely admitted to by the City leaders. In almost any small town or city, an integral part of the community is the educational system and, in this case, the prime reason for this lack of identity is the lack of participation in the local schools. Our reasons for requesting the transfer include strengthening community identity, providing a community environment for the children, and improving local control over educational matters. Glendale Unified is the sixth largest district in the County and will grow, by its own projections, by 4000 students or
16% over the next three years. This growth translates into an additional $12,000,000 per year in ADA. In the first six months of this school year alone, Glendale’s enrollment and ADA revenue increased by 467 students and approximately $1,500,000. This six month increase is almost double the number of students involved in the transfer. In contrast, the La Canada Unified is the third smallest district with only 3713 students and its enrollment next year will decrease by 6%. The transfer of the 244 students is less than 1% of the Glendale Unified population and is 6.5% of La Canada’s.

At present, our area of western La Canada lacks identity with the City of La Canada-Flintridge and this proposed transfer will enable the students and residents to unite with the rest of the City. After the transfer, the nine criteria defined by EC 35753 will be adequately met. There are no school properties involved (except an unimproved residential lot) and there is no bonded indebtedness. The ethnic/racial mix in the schools and areas involved in the transfer are homogeneous and Glendale Unified does not have a program of bussing to achieve desegregation. There is no substantial increase in costs to the state nor is the motivation for the transfer to increase property values. The transfer will slightly slow Glendale’s enormous growth in enrollment and will stabilize La Canada’s.

In summary, the transfer will unify a community, allow children to attend school in their own city and with their neighbors, and, by sheer numbers, permit better local control of educational issues. The transfer conforms to the nine criteria. It will slightly moderate the enormous growth and overcrowding in one of the largest districts in the County while stabilizing the decreasing enrollment of one of the smallest districts. The boundary change proposed herein will result in the quintessential transfer of students between school districts.

III. BACKGROUND

In November of 1976, La Canada-Flintridge residents, including those within the territory which is the subject of this Petition request, voted overwhelmingly to incorporate as a city. Unfortunately, our approximately one-half square mile of territory was not a part of the La Canada Unified School District but was, and is presently, a part of the Glendale Unified School District. In fact, this is the only area of the City that is not part of the La Canada Unified School District.

We are proud of our city, and, as residents of the City of La Canada-Flintridge, we desire to support our community in all its affairs. Immediately after incorporation, from 1977 through 1979, a similar attempt was made to make the city and school district boundaries coterminous. As a result of that process, the County Committee on School District Organization voted in favor of the petition and found that "the proposed change in boundaries would not adversely affect the
school district organization of the county, is compatible with the Master Plan adopted by the Committee and approved by the State Board of Education, and would have insignificant effect on racial integration in the schools of the districts affected." We believe that the conclusions of the Committee in 1979 still hold. Under the process in effect at that time, however, a vote by all residents of the areas served by Glendale Unified was required and, since a favorable vote was deemed unlikely, the request for a vote was denied by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.

The process has been changed since the last attempt was made to transfer this area. The voting area is now defined by Los Angeles County Committee On School District Organization and the Fullerton decision has provided direction to the Committee on the definition of the voting area. Specifically, only those individuals with "a greater than incidental interest" may vote. Since we feel that only those residents and students in the area to be transferred have "a greater than incidental interest" and that all of Glendale Unified will not vote under this process, we are again petitioning to become a part of the La Canada Unified School District.

IV. REASONS FOR TRANSFER

A. Community Identity

1. Community Segmentation.

Traditionally, family, education through the schools and churches, and community mold a child's values, self confidence, and relationship to the world. This triad provides a nurturing environment with solid foundations in which the children can grow and become good parents and citizens. Although we strive to provide our children a solid base which contains all three of these elements, the area in which we live lacks community identity and the children are not receiving that third critical element: the sense of community.

One of the reasons for requesting this change in school boundary is to allow the students, children, parents, and other residents in our area to identify with the City in which they reside. Even though geographical factors have established the area as a part of La Canada and the area has never been part of any other community, the illogical boundary line between the two school districts, which was drawn in the 1880's, is now a dividing line forcing children from homes across the street from one another and on the same short cul-de-sacs to attend schools in different districts. Accordingly, the natural neighborhood is split. This division limits social ties between the children and limits their participation in the La Canada community activities, which are generally centered around the schools (e.g. AYSO) or are publicized through the school infrastructure (e.g. Rose Parade
float fabrication and the Les Tupper community service awards). Parents do not get a chance to know other school parents and are not aware of activities and opportunities for their children in La Canada. La Canada-Flintridge Mayor John Hastings and City Council Woman Joan Feehan recognized this division when they stated "They [the residents of the western area of La Canada] are deprived of the opportunities and information which would otherwise be made part of the overall educational curricula, such as information about local events and activities, intellectual discussions on issues of concern to the community, and knowledge or access to civic leaders and other community individuals and organizations." (Attachment 2)

The City Council of La Canada-Flintridge has recognized this division and has passed a resolution (Attachment 3) supporting this transfer in an attempt to unite the community and draw the western end of the City into the main stream of the community. The Chamber of Commerce has also recognized the benefits of this change to the community and has passed its own resolution of support (Attachment 4). La Canada-Flintridge is a small community and, in any community of this size, the schools play a key, unifying role. By not being in the La Canada school district, the families in the area feel isolated from the community. Our objective is to unite a divided community, to provide community identity for the families of the area proposed in the transfer, and to provide a sense of community for our children.

2. Benefit to Students from La Canada Community Activities.

La Canadans are known for emphasis placed on their youth. Many local La Canada service groups and community organizations support school and youth activities. Yet those families in the area whose children attend Glendale schools are not fully benefited. Neither the children nor their families have the opportunity to identify with the La Canada school-promoted sports activities, athletic programs, musical, civic, scouting and other functions related to youth, since the similar Glendale school-related activities focus, quite understandably, on City of Glendale functions. Participation in these Glendale activities often involves significantly longer driving distances. In addition, even such minor considerations as competitive, cross-town and school rivalries become a problem, since residents in our area cannot have loyalties to La Canada while our children participate in the Glendale/La Crescenta functions. We would like our children to have the opportunity to participate in, identify with, and benefit from the activities of their incorporated community.

3. Improve Local Control in Educational Matters

With the sheer size of the Glendale Unified (over 27,000 students) coupled with its continued growth, the needs and desires of the parents in this isolated corner of the district can be easily overlooked.
and neglected. An example of this neglect is this petition itself. When proposed to the Glendale School Board, the Board would not act on it until forced to by the citizens through the signature process. The Board believed that this request reflected the views of a small band of residents, and not the general will of the population in the area. Yet, in a two and one half week period, the Petitioners obtained signatures in support of the transfer from over 51% of the registered voters in the area! Clearly, the Board has lost touch with the people that it is serving.

In contrast, the La Canada Unified School District has only 3713 students and does not have any growth to contend with. It is concentrating on the educational issues affecting this area. Since we are citizens of the City of La Canada-Flintridge and are interested in their school system itself, this Board listened to our request and reacted rapidly with a resolution (Attachment 5) supporting the transfer. There is no substitute for local control and involvement in educational issues and the parents of this area want a board's full undivided attention on the task of educating their children and on listening to the wants and needs of the parents.

B. Geographical and Historical Factors

The area which is the subject of the proposed transfer is a unique, narrow strip of land approximately one-quarter mile wide and one and one-half miles long. It is bordered on the west by the La Canada-Flintridge city boundary of Pickens Canyon, which is impassable by automobile and difficult to cross on foot. The only footbridge access over the Canyon is at the Mountain Avenue Elementary School. The La Canada-Flintridge city boundary forms the southern boundary; the Angeles National Forest is the northern boundary, and La Canada Unified School District adjoins on the east.

The line which now divides the La Canada and Glendale Unified School Districts on the east of the subject territory was arbitrarily drawn in the 1880's, at a time when the area was not heavily populated. Our understanding is that the line marked the beginning of the sagebrush and travel through the sagebrush was difficult and time consuming. It was decided that the children should go to La Crescenta schools rather than travel through the sagebrush every day. Over a hundred years has transpired since that time and roads and cars now make that trip across La Canada in minutes. The old line presently has no logical basis in light of the subsequent development of the area and the incorporation of the City of La Canada-Flintridge and it now is more than a boundary: it is a dividing line between streets and even adjacent houses. Moving the boundary to a logical, natural feature makes sense.

La Canada-Flintridge is a unique and relatively isolated community tucked in between hillside and mountain ranges and arroyos and
canyons. The area to be transferred has always been served by the same postal zip code (91011) as the rest of La Canada and the City of La Canada-Flintridge is a "contract city" requiring vital services such as police and fire from the County. Geographically, our area flows into La Canada-Flintridge and it has always been considered a part of La Canada. In this regard, the Pickens Canyon boundary line between the two communities of La Canada and La Crescenta was drawn in the 1870's when the Lanermans sold the La Crescenta area to Dr. Briggs. *The steep and dangerous Pickens Canyon, with its year round streams, has always been the natural western boundary of La Canada and it also should be the school district boundary.*

V. GRANDFATHER CLAUSE

As hereinafter discussed, in the change-over process, we would hope that Glendale Unified School District would allow students desiring to remain at Mountain Avenue Elementary, Rosemont Junior High and Crescenta Valley High to do so. This "Grandfather Clause" will eliminate any concerns of parents and children not wishing to transfer, slow the immediate loss of many students from Glendale Unified and dampen the increase of students transferred to the La Canada Unified, and, with Glendale's new residential developments in this area, reduce the overall impact to low levels. Pre-school aged siblings of these students would also be granted this option. We are requesting that both school districts agree to this clause. As of this date, La Canada Unified School District has stated, in writing, that it would honor the wishes of those desiring to continue enrollment at their present Glendale schools.

VI. CRITERIA AFFECTING REORGANIZATION PROPOSALS

A. The New Districts Will Be Adequate In Terms Of The Number Of Pupils Enrolled

After reorganization, both of the districts involved will be adequate in terms of the number of pupils enrolled. The number of regular day students involved in the transfer is approximately 244, which will not significantly affect enrollment in either district. In addition, there are a number of handicapped and special educational needs students from our area and, according to Glendale Assistant Superintendent S. Hodgson, they are educated under a special program between La Canada, Glendale, and Burbank Unifieds (CV Town Council meeting, Feb, 1992). We believe that their education would not be affected by this transfer.

Glendale is one of the largest cities in Los Angeles County, with a population of 180,038 as of December 31, 1990¹ and still growing. The Glendale Unified School District also includes the foothill unincorporated county areas of La Crescenta and Montrose, for a total
population of 197,005 residents. Glendale Unified is the sixth largest unified school district in the County, and its active facilities include 19 elementary schools, four junior highs, three senior highs, one continuation high school, and several day-care centers for a total K-12 grade 1991-92 enrollment (at the start of the school year) of 27,078 students and a Feb. 19, 1992 enrollment of 27,545. The loss of the petitioning students would have an impact of less than one percent on Glendale Unified enrollment. Glendale Unified also has two schools in the area, Valley View Elementary and Clark Junior High, which are presently not being used for public education. These schools are rented presently at a positive cash flow to the district and reopening them would lose this benefit. In addition, the expense required to bring them up to Code may be large (i.e. $250,000 to $1,000,000). Key issues in bringing the schools up to Code include asbestos removal and earthquake standards.

The City of La Canada-Flintridge has a total population of approximately 19,378, considerably less than the student enrollment in the Glendale Unified. In fact, La Canada Unified School District is the third smallest district in the County and some of its facilities are not being utilized due to a lack of students. The District has four elementary schools, one intermediate school and one high school, with one of the elementary schools and the intermediate school not being used for public education. The schools were closed several years ago due to the decrease in enrollment at the time and due to the loss of 550 homes to the Foothill Freeway. The total 1991-92 enrollment (at the start of the school year) is 3,713 students and the students from the petitioning area would represent a 6.5% increase. It is important to note that the City of La Canada-Flintridge does not have any significant area for future growth.

B. The Districts Are Each Organized On The Basis Of A Substantial Community Identity.

At present, the districts are not organized on the basis of substantial community identity and, as described in Section III, the proposed change will correct that injustice. Even though geographical factors have established the area as a part of La Canada and the area has never been part of any other community, because of the illogical dividing line between the two school districts, children from homes across the street from one another and on the same short cul-de-sacs attend schools in different districts, and, accordingly, the natural neighborhood is split. This division limits social ties between the children and limits participation in the La Canada community activities.

The area of western La Canada under discussion is centrally located between the two elementary schools involved in the transfer. The
E. The Proposed Reorganization Will Not Result In Any Substantial Increase In Costs To The State.

We believe the proposed reorganization will not result in any substantial increase in costs to the state. The ADA to La Canada Unified and Glendale Unified are $3,412.65 and $3,206.01, respectively, for a difference of $206.64 per student. With a total of 244 students, the transfer results in an increase to the state in ADA of $50,420.

F. The Proposed Reorganization Will Not Significantly Disrupt The Educational Programs In The Proposed Districts And Districts Affected By The Proposed Reorganization And Will Continue Or Promote Sound Education Performance In Those Districts.

The transfer will not significantly disrupt educational programs in either district. The total percent change to the GUSD regular enrollment will be 244 out of 27,545 or 0.9%. The percentage change to the Glendale high school and the junior high involved are at or under 4% and are not significant. The change to the Glendale elementary school is higher and, if not compensated for, will return the enrollment in the school back to levels of six years ago - at which time the school operated successfully. A change of boundary, involving only a few streets close to Mountain Ave School, will more than compensate for the transfer of the western La Canada children. The total percent change to La Canada will be 244 out of 3,713 or 6.6% and the largest change will be at the elementary school level, 22%. This increase will strengthen La Canada’s enrollment which will decrease next year.

Glendale Unified is overcrowded and the growth in the district will exacerbate the situation. Enrollment in '91/92 is up from six percent or over 1648 students over last year's levels. The school population has risen over 42% in the last six years. From November 1991 to when we called each school for their present enrollment on February 19, 1992, the district enrollment grew by 467 students from 27,078 to 27,545. In this six month period, the enrollment grew almost double the number of children involved in the transfer or, alternatively, Glendale Unified added a sufficient number of students to open an additional elementary school the size of Mountain Avenue Elementary. The District predicts that the growth will continue at a rate of over 4000 students, or 16%, over the next three years and has reinstated the Future's Task Force. This Task Force recommends modifications to enrollment boundaries, building of new classrooms, and instituting year-round education and it is in place and operating now to handle the large growth in the district, independent of this proposed transfer.
Substantial portion of this growth is happening in the La Crescenta area. There are a number of developments being planned in this northern region. One development alone, at the top of Lowell, will build 47 single-family homes. Many condo developments are being planned with one condo development under construction at Pennsylvania Avenue. The La Crescenta Town Council at their February 19, 1992 meeting expressed concerned about the level of condo and apartment development taking place in its community. This population growth translates directly into crowding in the local schools.

In the November 4, 1991 Glendale School Board meeting, the Superintendent's Office announced that, in August - one month before the school year began, they had underestimated that coming year's enrollment by more than 800 students. The uncertainty that Glendale Unified had this past summer in enrollment population is four times greater than the number of students in the proposed transfer.

Six of its elementary schools have instituted year-round education to be able to handle the existing crunch. Since projected enrollment in '92/'93 is expected to exceed capacity in fourteen of the elementary schools and all four of the junior high schools, the proposed loss of the La Canada students may slightly ease some of Glendale's planning problems.

The number of regular day students involved in the proposed change is approximately 244. This is less than 1% of Glendale's already crowded student population, and whatever minor impact a transfer might have on Glendale Unified, it would nevertheless represent a moderate increase (6.6%) and benefit for La Canada Unified. Glendale Unified is the sixth largest district in the County and its enrollment is skyrocketing. In contrast, La Canada Unified is the third smallest district and its enrollment next year is projected to decrease.

The City itself has no major developments ongoing and has no large areas for future growth.

1. Effect on Elementary Schools.

There are 134 students that reside in the area proposed for transfer that attend the Mountain Avenue Elementary School, the Glendale elementary school involved. A large portion of them are in the upper two grades and many parents will choose to keep their children in the school to complete their elementary years, if the grandfather clause is approved by the districts. Overcrowding at Monte Vista Elementary School, adjacent to the Mountain Avenue Elementary, forced the District to lease an additional portable classroom after the start of this school year. La Crescenta Elementary School, also adjacent to the
the school is on the edge of the of its attendance boundary. This situation is not unique and many other school districts have overcome this problem. In fact, the other elementary school involved in this transfer, La Canada's Palm Crest, is itself on the western boundary of its district (Attachment 8) and, yet, it is functioning well. Further, Glendale has stated that this transfer may require the redrawing of attendance boundaries between its schools and yet, they have reinstituted their Future's Task Force to do just that, even without the transfer taking place. Demographics are constantly changing and Glendale Unified is modifying its internal school boundaries to adjust.

To help Glendale Unified identify solutions to overcome the loss of our 134 students at Mountain Avenue Elementary, we have examined their attendance boundaries, the 1990 census data\(^1\) for Crescenta Valley, and the local elementary school populations. The Mountain Avenue southern attendance boundary (Attachment 9) extends into the Montrose area below Foothill Blvd. By moving this boundary just two blocks to the south (Attachment 9) to include the 642 residents of Rincon Ave, Del Mar Rd, Montrose Ave, a short stretch of Ocean View Blvd, Waltonia Ave, and Glenada Rd, Glendale Unified can transfer about 114 elementary school age students from the presently crowded Fremont Elementary to Mountain Avenue Elementary. Access across the freeway from this densely populated apartment area is via Briggs Avenue and Ocean View Blvd. This boundary would allow Fremont to reduce its number of portables from 6 to 2 and would make room for children from the new apartments and condos being developed in the Montrose area and the new houses in the Ayars Canyon and Esperanza area.

If the transfer takes place, La Canada Unified may redraw the boundaries between its elementary schools to balance the school populations.

2. Effect on Junior and Senior High School Facilities.

There are only 39 students, out of 1085 (<4\%), from the area proposed for transfer that attend Glendale's Rosemont Junior High. This number is not significant, especially in view of the Grandfather Clause, if it is approved. The number of our youth attending Glendale's Crescenta Valley High School is 68 out of 1777 (<4\%), again not significant given the Grandfather Clause and given that the District is already considering adjusting the school boundaries in order to ease overcrowding in the other schools.\(^5\) Also, Crescenta Valley Vice-Principal Sambar has been quoted saying "Increased enrollment has put a strain on school faculty and facilities" and that the biggest challenge facing the staff is to provide adequate space for all the [existing] students.\(^7\) Many school sporting events must be held at other schools, requiring travel over significant distances, because Crescenta Valley does not have adequate facilities.
The La Canada Unified High School would adequately house both the additional junior and senior high school students involved in the transfer. However, the impact of an 6.4% increase in the student body would have to be assessed.

G. The Proposed Reorganization Will Not Result In A Significant Increase In School Housing Costs.

The proposed transfer will not result in any change in school housing costs.

H. The Proposed Reorganization is Not Primarily Designed To Result In A Significant Increase In Property Values Causing Financial Advantage To Property Owners Because Territory Was Transferred From One School District To An Adjoining District.

The objective of the reorganization is not to raise property values but to unite a divided community and to provide a sense of community for our children. The petitioners all have young children and are interested in having them attend the local La Canada-Flintridge public schools. We are not attempting to join a community as in the Pasadena-San Marino petition. We are already living in our community and we want to join in its educational system and its small town environment. This reorganization is not designed to increase property values.

I. The Proposed Reorganization Will Not Negatively Affect The Fiscal Management Or Fiscal Status Of The Proposed District Or Any Existing District Affected By The Proposed Reorganization.

The 1991/92 Glendale Unified School District budget is $111 million and the loss of 244 students translates into a reduction in revenue of $782,266 or less than 1% of annual revenue. It is important to note that with the reduction in revenue also comes a reduction in the number of students to teach. On a local level, the revenue reduction in ADA is comparable to the expenses used to educate the children. For instance, the costs per year to Glendale Unified per ADA (based on figures from the LA County School Board 1989/90 Annual Financial Report) are as follows:

- Average Teacher's Salary in '89/90 $1,800
- Employee's Benefits in '89/90 $ 630
- Educational Supplies (Books, etc) in '89/90 $ 170
- Total Expense in '89/90 $2,670
- Expenses Inflated to '91/92 @5% for 2 years $2,860
- Revenue income in '91/92 $3,206
- Difference $ 346
Those expenses listed above do not other costs including portables rented, controlled services, other certificated salaries, the added cost of teaching the 18 handicap students that Glendale has included etc. With 244 students, the loss is $84,424 per year. On a district-wide level, the transfer will diminish slightly the rapid growth being experienced this year. Teachers will not be laid off and portables returned due to this transfer; the District will just have to hire fewer new teachers and rent fewer portables than they had planned. It should be remembered that the number of students and revenue involved in the transfer is less than the District's planning uncertainty the summer before the start of this school year. Also, the 467 students added to the district since the start of the school year represent an increase of $1,497,000 in increased revenues this year alone. The increase of over 4000 students to Glendale district over the next three years will result in an additional $12,000,000 per year and, over ten years, the increase will be a staggering $120,000,000!

The Glendale district must contend with a huge increase in enrollment next year regardless of whether or not this transfer takes place.

The La Canada Unified School District 1989/90 budget was $17 million and the addition of 244 students would increase its funding by $832,528 or 5%. Although the transfer will have a positive effect on the La Canada Unified fiscal status, it will have to hire more teachers and, again, expense will offset revenue.

VII. SUGGESTED VOTING DISTRICT AND TRANSITION ARRANGEMENTS

Should there be a favorable finding for the transfer, we believe that, consistent with the Fullerton decision, the voters should be limited to the La Canada territory to be transferred. These individuals truly have a greater than incidental interest in the education of their children and in the unification of their City. It is they that must decide in which district their children should be educated.

Residents of the City of Glendale will not be affected and do not have a greater than incidental interest. Bussing for achieving desegregation is not employed by Glendale Unified and there is no way in propagating racial/ethnic changes from the Foothill region to other portions of Glendale Unified. From a total student percentage point of view, the impact to the schools in the unincorporated foothill town of La Crescenta and in the City of La Canada-Flintridge will be the same: less than ten percent and not significant. This percentage drops even more dramatically when just the higher level schools are examined; the Rosemont Junior and Crescenta Valley High School in Glendale Unified are each impacted 4% or less and in the combined La Canada High School, the impact is less than 7%.
Each school system may redraw elementary school boundaries to either equalize enrollments or to account for future growth; for example, Glendale Unified may choose to modify the Fremont/Mountain Avenue schools' boundaries and La Canada may adjust the boundaries between all their elementary schools. However, the dramatic increases in the Glendale school population have required boundary modifications whether or not this transfer takes place and the District has already instituted a task force to examine their internal boundaries. The proposed Grandfather Clause will relax the timeframe in which these potential modifications must be accomplished. Special consideration is required if La Canada Unified plans to open either an elementary (on the opposite end of town) or intermediate school. Therefore, we request the following:

- Any election would be limited to the area proposed to be transferred.

- New residents and enrollees seeking public school education within the area would be required to attend the La Canada schools.

- If the transfer is approved by the voters, Glendale and La Canada Unifieds would enter into agreements to permit the families of those students who are now attending Glendale Schools to have the option of continuing such attendance or enrolling in La Canada schools through interdistrict transfers. Pre-school aged siblings of these students would also be granted this option.

VIII. CONCLUSION

As residents of the City of La Canada-Flintridge, we desire to have the school boundaries in our area realigned to coincide with the boundaries of the City. The requested transfer will finally unify a community that has been unjustly split for over a century. We feel it is our right and duty as citizens, parents, students, taxpayers and voters to participate in and to support the total activities of our incorporated and relatively small City. La Canada Unified is a small district with a decreasing enrollment and the transferred students will ameliorate this situation. We wish to have more local control over the influences on our families and our children's education. Yet we do not have a significant voice in the affairs and politics of Glendale, nor are we involved fully with La Canada because our children are not included in the school activities. We believe our involvement would make a difference in the community and in the future of the La Canada Unified School District.

The nine criteria defined by EC 35753 are adequately met by this transfer. There are no school properties involved (except an unimproved residential lot) and there is no bonded indebtedness. The ethnic/racial mix in the schools and areas involved in the transfer are
homogeneous and Glendale Unified does not have a program of bussing to achieve desegregation. There is no substantial increase in costs to the state nor is the motivation for the transfer to increase property values. The transfer will slow slightly Glendale's enormous growth in enrollment and funding and will stabilize La Canada's.

Under these circumstances, we trust that the Committee will obtain from each of the Districts sufficient information to make an objective determination as to the merits of our requested transfer. In doing so, we are confident that the Committee will make a favorable determination as to the transfer.

The Petitioners of the Sagebrush Committee:

Mrs. Rose McCoppin
5034 Castle Rd.
La Canada-Flintridge, CA
91011

Mrs. Maureen Burch
2202 Los Amigos St
La Canada-Flintridge, CA
91011

Mr. James Graf
2209 Los Amigos St.
La Canada-Flintridge, CA
91011
References

1.) 1990 Census, Bureau of Census Library, Sherman Way, CA

2.) Racial and ethnic mix obtained from "Report To Parents" and "School Reports" published by each school district, from Rian, Russell, Daily News, January 13, 1992, and from District Responses to County Questionnaires

3.) Glendale Unified School District, Comparison of First Month Enrollment for School Years 1990-91 and 1991-92

4.) Glendale News- Press, November 21, 1991


6) Glendale Unified School District, Action Plan To Address Student Growth - 1992-93

7.) Crescenta Valley High School, Falcon, September 27, 1991.
Beginning at the southeasterly corner of Tract No. 7116, as shown on map filed in Book 106, page 89 of Maps, in the office of the Recorder of the County of Los Angeles; thence northerly along the easterly boundary of said tract to the northerly terminus of that certain course having a length of 582.02 feet in said easterly boundary; thence northerly in a direct line to the intersection of the northeasterly line of said tract with the southerly prolongation of the easterly line of Parcel 2 of Lot 24 of Beach's Addition to Crescenta Canada, as shown on map recorded in Book 7, page 25 of Miscellaneous Records, in the office of said recorder; thence northerly in a direct line through the northeasterly corner of Parcel 20 of said lot to the northeasterly line of that certain 1.02 acre parcel of land, as shown on map of Tract No. 519 filed in Book 15, page 45 of said Maps; thence northerly along said northeasterly line to the west line of Fractional Section 26, Township 2 North, Range 13 West, S.B.M.; thence northerly along said west line to the northwest corner of said fractional section; thence northerly along the boundary of the City of La Canada-Flintridge, as same existed on October 10, 1991 and following the same in all its various courses and curves to the point of beginning.

Containing: 386.10 Acres  
0.603 Square Miles

Description Approved  
OCT 24 1991  
T. A. TIDEMANSON  
County Engineer

By: [Signature]  
Deputy

AE:ayc/MPM277/DESCRIPT

A-40  
F RECEIVED APR 1 1992
January 17, 1992

Mr. Jim Graf
2209 Los Amigos
La Canada Flintridge, CA 91011

Dear Mr. Graf:

We are writing you to express our support of your Committee's efforts to realign the La Canada/Glendale Unified School District boundaries. We have always felt that the current boundaries are awkward and inconvenient for some La Canada Flintridge residents but, more so, preclude them from participating fully in their community.

As you know, the local school system plays an important role in integrating residents with their community. This integration influences the development of civic pride, community involvement and service. In a city separated by two school systems, we are concerned that many of our youth and their families lack an association with the community in which they live simply because they attend schools of another community. They are deprived of opportunities and information which would otherwise be made part of the overall educational curricula, such as information about local events and activities, intellectual discussions on issues of concern to the community, and knowledge or access to civic leaders and other community individuals and organizations.

We feel educational programs are important in the development of community identification, particularly in programs stressing knowledge of civic responsibility, community values, available public services and local history. We are proud of what the La Canada Unified School District has accomplished in this regard and we would like to ensure that all of our residents are afforded the same opportunities.
If there is anything we can do to assist you in your efforts, please do not hesitate to contact us. We hope that we can play a part, or be influential in some respect, in helping you to achieve your goals.

Please feel free to contact either of us at any time. We would be happy to share our thoughts with you further.

Best wishes,

John W. Hastings
Mayor

Joan C. Feeshan
Mayor Pro Tem
RESOLUTION NO. 92- 10

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF LA CAÑADA FLINTRIDGE
SUPPORTING A BOUNDARY CHANGE BETWEEN
LA CAÑADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
AND GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

WHEREAS, several hundred children who are residents of La Cañada Flintridge attend
schools in the Glendale Unified School District; and

WHEREAS, overlapping boundaries create difficulties in the communication of
information to and between the school districts, the cities and the affected families; and

WHEREAS, overlapping boundaries make it difficult for affected children within the City
of La Cañada Flintridge to relate to, identify with, learn about and participate in their
community; and

WHEREAS, transfer of students will have little or no impact on La Cañada Flintridge
schools.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved that the City Council of the City of La Cañada
Flintridge supports a boundary change between the La Cañada Unified School District and the
Glendale Unified School District which would result in coterminous School District and City
boundaries.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 18th day of February, 1992.

Mayor

ATTEST:

City Clerk

RECEIVED APR 1 1992

Ayes: Edwards, Valente, Feehan, Hastings
Noes: None
Absent: Phelps
A-44
None
March 9, 1992

Mr. Jim Graf
2209 Los Amigos
La Canada Flintridge, Ca 91011

Dear Mr. Graf:

This letter is to inform you that the La Canada Flintridge Chamber of Commerce and Community Association has voted to support the Sagebrush Committee in its efforts to realign the La Canada/Glendale Unified School District boundaries. We feel that having everyone in La Canada Flintridge attend the same school system is important, especially in a smaller community like ours.

Currently families in western La Canada Flintridge are pulled in one direction by a school system and in another direction by recreational and community activities. Both for the children's sense of belonging to school and community and for a family's sense of belonging to La Canada Flintridge, we support western La Canada Flintridge becoming a part of the La Canada Unified School District.

If there is anything further we can do to help you in your efforts, please do not hesitate to call. Good luck to you!

Very truly yours,

B. R. Hull

Brian R. Hull
President

A-45

Keep Your Tax Dollars At Home. Shop In La Canada Flintridge!
WHEREAS, the public school system is an important and integral part of community life; and

WHEREAS, the area designated as the "Sagebrush" area is a part of the City of La Canada Flintridge but is served by the Glendale Unified School District; and

WHEREAS, the "Sagebrush" area is the only portion of the City of La Canada Flintridge not served by the La Canada Unified School District; and

WHEREAS, the residents of "Sagebrush" have presented a petition to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization requesting that the designated area be placed within the jurisdiction of the La Canada Unified School District; and

WHEREAS, the Governing Board of the La Canada Unified School District recognizes the communal benefits to the "Sagebrush" area of becoming a part of the La Canada Unified School District; and

WHEREAS, the Governing Board of the La Canada Unified School District finds no detrimental impact on its existing program of instruction by transferring the "Sagebrush" area into its District; and

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Governing Board of the La Canada Unified School District supports the transfer of the "Sagebrush" territory from the jurisdiction of the Glendale Unified School District to that of the La Canada Unified School District.

[Signatures]
President - Governing Board
Vice President - Governing Board
Clerk - Governing Board
Member - Governing Board
Member - Governing Board
Secretary - Governing Board
### Action Plan to Address Student Growth - 1991-92

#### Revised 5/7/91

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Actual 9/1/91</th>
<th>Revised 9/1/91</th>
<th>Note #1</th>
<th>Note #2</th>
<th>Note #3</th>
<th>Note #4</th>
<th>Note #5</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>No Construction</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/1/91 Implemented TRE-July 1, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerritos</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>618</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/1/91 No action at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>1165</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/1/91 Implemented TRE-July 1, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunsmore</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>648</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/1/91 No action at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>668</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/1/91 No action at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/1/91 No action at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/1/91 No action at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenoaks</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/1/91 No action at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/1/91 Implemented TRE-July 1, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keppel</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>1105</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/1/91 Implemented TRE-July 1, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Crescenta</td>
<td>645*</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/1/91 No action at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/1/91 No action at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mann</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>1542</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/1/91 Implemented TRE-July 1, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7/1/91 Implemented TRE-July 1, 1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Vista</td>
<td>750*</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/1/91 No action at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Ave</td>
<td>655*</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/1/91 No action at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muir</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/1/91 No action at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdugo Hills</td>
<td>669*</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/1/91 No action at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.O. White</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/1/91 No action at this time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS:** 13,953 - 14,332

### JUNIOR H.S. - Capacity based on 90% utilization per the Site Capacity Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>9/1/91</th>
<th>9/1/91</th>
<th>9/1/91</th>
<th>9/1/91</th>
<th>9/1/91</th>
<th>Note #1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>1075</td>
<td>1522</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Added 2 portables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemont</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>1077</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>No action at this time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telfer</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>1677</td>
<td>1705</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Phone/transport (new 8th gr. to Rosemont)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Added 2 portables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS:** 5,310 - 5,580

### SENIOR H.S. - Capacity based on 100% utilization due to the greater use of 9th and 7th period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>9/1/91</th>
<th>9/1/91</th>
<th>9/1/91</th>
<th>9/1/91</th>
<th>9/1/91</th>
<th>Note #1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crescents</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>2109</td>
<td>2520</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>No action at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Paloma</td>
<td>2235</td>
<td>2207</td>
<td>2229</td>
<td>2664</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Added 2 portables - Converted Driver Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoover</td>
<td>2430</td>
<td>2467</td>
<td>2460</td>
<td>2448</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>No action at this time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS:** 6,740 - 6,132

**Note:**
- **Note #1:** Assume no new construction, existing portables to remain, plus added portables when space available. Assumes relocation of CDP to reach RMC.
- **Note #2:** The schools based on September 6, 1991, actuals. Other schools based on actual enrollment as of September 16, 1991.
- **Note #3:** Assumes current use of classrooms continue, i.e., libraries, day-care, etc. 40-year-round capacity.
- **Note #4:** The schools are based on actual space; other schools are based on 1.2x of classroom capacity.
- **Note #5:** Spaces can vary ± 20 due to kindergarten and other grade configuration in grades 1-6, and ± 30 at secondary.
### Action Plan to Address Student Growth - 1992-93

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7/1/93 No action at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sereno</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7/1/93 Add portable, possible boundary change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linwood</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7/1/93 Increase capacity - possible boundary change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7/1/93 No action at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7/1/93 Possible boundary change/tentative TRES + 7/1/92 - remove portables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7/1/93 No action at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7/1/93 Add portable as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7/1/93 Add portable as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7/1/93 No action at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylmar</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1229</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/1/93 No action at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylmar</td>
<td>665*</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7/1/93 Add portable as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7/1/93 No action at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longfellow</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>1573</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7/1/93 Increase capacity - possible boundary change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentez Vista</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1091</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7/1/93 Increase capacity - possible boundary change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkside</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7/1/93 Add portable as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkside</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7/1/93 Possible boundary change/tentative TRES - 7/1/92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7/1/93 Add portable as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdugo Winds</td>
<td>600*</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7/1/93 Possible boundary change/tentative TRES - 7/1/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.O. White</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7/1/93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS:** 13,955 14,824 16,188 73 309

#### JUNIOR HS.

- Capacity based on 92% utilization per the Site Capacity Study
- Grade level reconfiguration - 9th grade to high school
- Note #1: Assumes no new construction, existing portables to remain, plus added portables when space available. *assumes relocation of GSEP to reach RNC.
- Note #2: Growth is based on 2% over 1991-92 Action Plan.
- Note #3: Assumes current uses of classrooms continue, i.e., libraries, day care, etc.
- Note #4: Portables are based on actual space, other schools are based on 1.2% of classroom capacity.
- Note #5: This capacity is based on projected enrollment, if enrollment is reached, spaces can still vary ±20 at elementary and ±30 at secondary.

#### SENIOR HS.

- Capacity based on 100% utilization due to the greater use of 9th and 7th period
- Grade level reconfiguration - 9th grade to high school
- Note #1: Assumes no new construction, existing portables to remain, plus added portables when space available. *assumes relocation of GSEP to reach RNC.
- Note #2: Growth is based on 2% over 1991-92 Action Plan.
- Note #3: Assumes current uses of classrooms continue, i.e., libraries, day care, etc.
- Note #4: Portables are based on actual space, other schools are based on 1.2% of classroom capacity.
- Note #5: This capacity is based on projected enrollment, if enrollment is reached, spaces can still vary ±20 at elementary and ±30 at secondary.
TRANSFER OF TERRITORY NO. 2-91
FROM GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
TO LA CANADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

LEGEND:
Boundary of Annexation
Existing District Boundary
Containing: 366.10 Acres, 0.603 Sq. Mi. Scale: 1"=1000'
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HEAVY WEIG
BLACK LINE
SHOW SIDEWALKS
Palm Crest Elementary School  
Parent Teacher Association  
Resolution  

The Palm Crest Elementary School PTA met on March 10, 1992, and voted as an association to adopt the La Canada Unified School Board Resolution #14-91-92 endorsing the transfer of the "Sagebrush" area to the La Canada Unified School District.

\[\text{Signature}\]  
Co-PTA President Marian Macho

\[\text{Signature}\]  
Co-PTA President Joanna Hurst
SAGE Boundaries for Unified Schools

SAGEBRUSH COMMITTEE

Mrs Rose McCoppin  Mrs Maureen Burch  Mr James Graf
AGENDA

- Objective
- Reasons for transfer
- Quintessential transfer
- Key Topics
  - Money Woes
  - Making Waves
  - Homogeneity/No Propagation
  - Clairvoyance
- Summary
OBJECTIVE

- TO TRANSFER THE WESTERN END OF LA CANADA FROM GLENDALE UNIFIED TO THE LA CANADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

- Both Glendale/GUSD and La Canada-Flintridge/LCUSD Would Then Have Coterminal Boundaries
DESCRIPTION OF AREA

- PICKENS CANYON (WEST) AND ARBITRARY 1880'S LINE (EAST)

- AREA JUST BELOW FOOTHILL BLVD (SOUTH) AND ANGELES NATIONAL FOREST (NORTH)

- 1/4 BY 1 1/2 MI (APPROX. 0.6 SQ MI)

- AREA CONTAIN ENTIRELY IN CITY OF LA CANADA-FLINTRIDGE
REASONS FOR TRANSFER

- PROVIDE A COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENT FOR OUR CHILDREN
  - Strengthen Family/Community Ties
  - Children To Participate In Local School Activities With Neighborhood Friends

- UNIFY THE SMALL, DIVIDED CITY OF LA CANADA-FLINTRIDGE AND PROVIDE COMMUNITY IDENTITY TO THE AREA TO BE TRANSFERRED
  - School Boundary Splits Neighborhoods
  - Area Has Limited Involvement In La Canada Activities

- TO IMPROVE LOCAL CONTROL OVER EDUCATIONAL MATTERS

- ALIGN SCHOOL AND CITY BOUNDARIES ALONG A NATURAL FEATURE
HISTORY

- SCHOOL BOUNDARIES DEFINED IN 1880'S AS START OF SAGEBRUSH

- CITY BOUNDARIES ALWAYS DEFINED AS PICKENS CANYON

- IN '77/'79, ATTEMPT WAS MADE TO MAKE BOUNDARIES COTERMINOUS AFTER CITY INCORPORATION
  - Committee On School District Organization Voted In Favor
  - No Election Held Since Vote Included All Of GUSD

- PROCESS HAS BEEN CHANGED
  - Fullerton Decision Requires Greater Than Incidental Interest To Vote
  - Committee Defines Voting District
IMPACT ON DISTRICTS

- **NUMBER OF STUDENTS INVOLVED IN TRANSFER: 262**
  - Mountain Ave Elementary = 133 out of 470 (28%)
  - Rosemont Jr High = 38 out of 1,090 (3%)
  - CV High = 73 out of 1,760 (4%)
  - Handicapped/Other = 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER</th>
<th>GLENDALE</th>
<th>LA CANADA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ENROLLMENT</td>
<td>27,545**</td>
<td>3713**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENROLLMENT IMPACT (%)</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on GUSD response to County Questionnaire
** Glendale and La Canada enrollments as of Feb 19, 1992 and Oct 16, 1991, respectively
ACTIONS REQUESTED

- TRANSFER THE WESTERN END OF THE CITY OF LA CANADA-FLINTRIDGE FROM GUSD TO THE LCUSD
  
  - New Residents and Enrollees Within the Area Would Be Required to Attend La Canada Unified Schools
  
  - Align The New Boundaries Along Pickens Canyon - The Existing City Boundary
  
- CHILDREN NOW ATTENDING GUSD WILL HAVE OPTION OF REMAINING IN GUSD
  
  - Siblings Also Have Option
QUINTESSENTIAL TRANSFER

- True lack of identity with any community yet part of a city
  - Effort first started in 1977 right after City incorporation
- Archaic reason for split
- Area residents, School Board, and City Council strongly behind transfer
  - 51% of voters signed the petition
  - Resolutions of support from key city organizations
- Satisfies all nine criteria of EC 35753 - transfer will provide community identity
  - Property involves only one unimproved lot
  - Homogeneous racial/ethnic mix in the schools involved
  - Fiscal impact to State is small
  - Slows slightly the fiscal/enrollment growth in Glendale while stabilizing La Canada's enrollment

Makes good sense; What the policy makers had in mind:

---- The Quintessential Transfer ----
MONEY WOES

- ADA dollars and enrollment tied together - Both Districts @ app $3000
- Glendale Unified present budget: $111M/yr with 27,545 students*
  - Enrollment has risen 42% in last six years
  - Projected enrollment increase in next three years is 4000 students
    or an increase of $12M/yr in new ADA or $120M over ten years
- This school year alone from Nov 19 to Feb 19 (3 months) enrollment
  increased by 467 students and ADA by $1.5M
  - Twice the number of students involved in the transfer
  - Roughly equivalent to enrollment at Mountain Ave school
- Planning estimates one month before start of this year under-
  estimated enrollment by 800 students - more than three times the
  students in the transfer; transfer impact below planning uncertainties!

*Enrollment as of Feb'92
WOES (Cont)

- Revenue loss due to transfer roughly offset by educational expenses
  - We believe $90K/yr*; Glendale states $400k/yr
  - Amount is less than 1/2 of 1% of annual budget
- Transfer will reduce slightly the rapid enrollment increases in Glendale district

No Money Woes - Problem Is Enrollment Growth

* From LA County 1989/90 Annual Financial Report
MAKING WAVES

- May close Mountain Ave school - On edge of attendance boundary
  - **Scare tactics used on children, parents, and handicapped students**
  - Glendale has not agreed to Grandfather clause
  - Three Glendale schools within 3 streets of boundaries
  - General growth in local Foothill area
  - Award winning school with excellent staff
  - Make waves in realigning the elementary school boundaries as far as possible to affect greater numbers
  - JHS and HS impact is small (<4%); March/April'92 PTA flyers do not discuss transfer
  - Glendale is **already realigning their boundaries** due to growth
    - Task force is in place now
WAVES (Cont)

- Homes, apartments, and condos being build throughout La Crescenta area
- Growth in foothill area especially in surrounding elementary schools
  - Monte Vista: Portable added after year started; up 13% in 18 months
  - La Crescenta: 6 portables; 6% growth since start of this year; already beyond '92/93 enrollment projections; up 14% in 18 months
  - Fremont: 6 portables; 6% growth since start of year; already beyond '92/93 enrollment projections; up 14% in 18 months
  - Mountain: up 9% in 18 months

Boundaries are being realigned - There is overcrowding in this area - There are better solutions other than closings and tidal waves
ENROLLMENT GROWTH IN SURROUNDING ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS (18 MONTHS PERIOD)

- MONTE VISTA (13%)
- LA CRESCENTA (14%)
- FREMONT (14%)
- MOUNTAIN (9%)

ENROLLMENT

700
650
600
550
500
450
400

SEPT'90  FEB'92
HOMOGENEITY/NO PROPAGATION
Racial/Ethnic Aspects

- Numerical impact district-wide is negligible \((262/27,545 = 0.9\%)\)
- There are no "nibbles and gulps"; City/school boundaries can be made coterminous only once
  - Western La Canada is already a part of the City of La Canada-Flintridge
- No way of propagating racial/ethnic changes to areas outside of directly affect schools
  - No forced bussing to achieve desegregation
  - Glendale has "long standing philosophy of children attending their neighborhood schools"
- La Canada and La Crescenta-based schools are homogeneous and a transfer will not affect racial/ethnic ratios
  - Mountain Ave and Palm Crest Elementaries are exactly the same: Caucasian: 73% and Minority: 27%
- No "white flight"

Racial/Ethnic ratios are not an issue
CLAIRVOYANCE
Increase in Property Values

- Only mentioned by Glendale not by petitioners - they say that they can see into our minds
- Process to change boundaries started 15 yrs ago after incorporation as City
- All committee members and majority of canvassers have school age children and plan to raise their children here
  - People move to La Canada for the community environment; Not sell for a quick profit if there is one
- Not looking to join with another town - we want to be apart of the one we are in!

Prime reason for this transfer is to provide a sense of community for the children
SUMMARY

- Transfer requested to heal a 110 yr division, to unify the City of La Canada-Flintridge, and to provide a sense of community for our children.
- Students, parents, and residents of western La Canada want to join their City.
- Logical boundary is the City boundary: Pickens Canyon.
- Nine criteria of EC35753 are easily met.
- Glendale Unified has problem with increasing enrollment both district-wide and in the Foothill region; La Canada has decreasing enrollment.
- Fiscal impact to Glendale is below their planning uncertainty.

This is the quintessential transfer.
WHEREAS, the public school system is an important and integral part of community life; and

WHEREAS, the area designated as the "Sagebrush" area is a part of the City of La Canada Flintridge but is served by the Glendale Unified School District; and

WHEREAS, the "Sagebrush" area is the only portion of the City of La Canada Flintridge not served by the La Canada Unified School District; and

WHEREAS, the residents of "Sagebrush" have presented a petition to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization requesting that the designated area be placed within the jurisdiction of the La Canada Unified School District; and

WHEREAS, the Governing Board of the La Canada Unified School District recognizes the communal benefits to the "Sagebrush" area of becoming a part of the La Canada Unified School District; and

WHEREAS, the Governing Board of the La Canada Unified School District finds no detrimental impact on its existing program of instruction by transferring the "Sagebrush" area into its District; and

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Governing Board of the La Canada Unified School District supports the transfer of the "Sagebrush" territory from the jurisdiction of the Glendale Unified School District to that of the La Canada Unified School District.

[Signatures of Board Members]

RECEIVED MAR 18 1992
RESOLUTION NO. 92-10

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF LA CAÑADA FLINTRIDGE
SUPPORTING A BOUNDARY CHANGE BETWEEN
LA CAÑADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
AND GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

WHEREAS, several hundred children who are residents of La Cañada Flintridge attend schools in the Glendale Unified School District; and

WHEREAS, overlapping boundaries create difficulties in the communication of information to and between the school districts, the cities and the affected families; and

WHEREAS, overlapping boundaries make it difficult for affected children within the City of La Cañada Flintridge to relate to, identify with, learn about and participate in their community; and

WHEREAS, transfer of students will have little or no impact on La Cañada Flintridge schools.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved that the City Council of the City of La Cañada Flintridge supports a boundary change between the La Cañada Unified School District and the Glendale Unified School District which would result in coterminous School District and City boundaries.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 18th day of February, 1992.

[Signature]
Mayor

ATTEST:

[Signature]
City Clerk

Ayes: Edwards, Valente, Feehan, Hastings
Noes: None
Absent: Phelps

RECEIVED MAR 18 1992 A-70
March 9, 1992

Mr. Jim Graf
2209 Los Amigos
La Canada Flintridge, CA 91011

Dear Mr. Graf:

This letter is to inform you that the La Canada Flintridge Chamber of Commerce and Community Association has voted to support the Sagebrush Committee in its efforts to realign the La Canada/Glendale Unified School District boundaries. We feel that having everyone in La Canada Flintridge attend the same school system is important, especially in a smaller community like ours.

Currently families in western La Canada Flintridge are pulled in one direction by a school system and in another direction by recreational and community activities. Both for the children's sense of belonging to school and community and for a family's sense of belonging to La Canada Flintridge, we support western La Canada Flintridge becoming a part of the La Canada Unified School District.

If there is anything further we can do to help you in your efforts, please do not hesitate to call. Good luck to you!

Very truly yours,

B. R. Hull
Brian R. Hull
President
November 21, 1991

Rose McCoppin
5034 Castle Road
La Canada, CA 91011

Dear Rose:

This letter is in response to your request for the La Canada Unified School District's position regarding the attendance of students in the area presently being considered for annexation to the La Canada School District.

Please be advised that the District's practice is to allow any student within the District to attend schools in the District of their choice. Specifically, if a student is currently attending school in the Glendale Unified School District and is under consideration for annexation to the La Canada School District but chooses to remain in the Glendale Unified School District, the La Canada Unified School District would support that decision and approve an Inter-District transfer request.

Please let me know if you have any further questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Andrew J. Meyer

AJM:cb
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modified RMC</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Classroom</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>THES</th>
<th>Student Spaces</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revised 5/7/91</td>
<td>No Construction</td>
<td>9/91 Enrollment</td>
<td>Note</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>Note #2</td>
<td>Note #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 9/16/91</td>
<td>Note #1</td>
<td>Note #2</td>
<td>Note #3</td>
<td>Note #4</td>
<td>Note #5</td>
<td>Note #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salton 665</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>(600)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/1/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrillo 616</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7/1/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus 605</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7/1/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunsmuir 605</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7/1/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison 675</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin 565</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont 500</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenoak 730</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7/1/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson 665</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>(670)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7/1/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keppel 1000</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>(1200)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7/1/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Crescenta 605</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln 470</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moor 390</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall 800</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>(880)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7/1/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Vista 750</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7/1/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Ave 655</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuir 1065</td>
<td>1064</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdugo Hills 660</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.D. White 745</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS** 13,935 | 14,532 | 16,108 | 164 | 108 |

**JUNIOR H.S.**
Capacity based on 92% utilization per the Site Capacity Study

| Roosevelt 1075 | 1322 | 1301 | 1543 | 21 | Added 2 portables |
| Reservoir 1235 | 1071 | 1060 | 1270 | 11 | Added 2 portables - Converted Driver Training (2) |
| Taft 1625 | 1507 | 1700 | 2420 | 31 | No action at this time |
| Wilson 1000 | 1510 | 1501 | 1801 | 9 | Added 2 portables |

**TOTALS** 5,510 | 5,580 | 5,570 | 4,604 | 31 |

**SENIOR H.S.**
Capacity based on 100% utilization due to the greater use of 0 and 7th period

| Crescenta Valley 2007 | 1758 | 2100 | 2520 | 342 | 47 | No action at this time |
| Glendale 2303 | 2267 | 2220 | 2664 | 47 | No action at this time |
| Hoover 2430 | 2087 | 2040 | 2448 | 47 | No action at this time |

**TOTALS** 6,240 | 6,112 | 6,350 | 7,432 | 94 |

Note #1: Assumes no new construction, existing portables to remain, plus added portables when space available, assumes relocation of CDP to reach RMC.

Note #2: THES schools based on September 6, 1991 actuals. Other schools based on actual enrollment as of September 16, 1991.

Note #3: Assumes current use of classrooms continues, i.e., Libraries, Day Care, etc., non-summer-term capacity.

Note #4: THES schools are based on actual space; other schools are based on 1.2% of classroom capacity.

Note #5: Spaces vary +/- of 20 due to kindergarten and other grade configuration in Grades 1-6, and +/- of 50 at secondary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Modified RNC</th>
<th>Projected 9/92 Enrollment</th>
<th>Classroom Capacity</th>
<th>PER 9/92</th>
<th>Capacity Available</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7/1/91 No action at this time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crittenden</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7/1/91 Add portable - possible boundary change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumbar</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7/1/91 Rear capacity - possible boundary change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7/1/91 No action at this time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skinner</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7/1/91 Possible boundary change/ Tentative PER 7/1/92 - Remove portables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enon</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7/1/91 No action at this time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etna</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7/1/91 Add portables as needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etna West</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7/1/91 No action at this time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larcomar</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7/1/91 No action at this time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pebble Springs</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1229</td>
<td>1238</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/1/91 No action at this time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidio</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7/1/91 No action at this time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7/1/91 No action at this time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7/1/91 No action at this time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallmark</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7/1/91 No action at this time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hite Vista</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7/1/91 No action at this time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hite Pk Ave</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7/1/91 No action at this time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lava</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>1069</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7/1/91 No action at this time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robins Winds</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7/1/91 Add portables as needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Yule</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7/1/91 Add portables as needed/ Tentative PER 7/1/92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS:** 13,955 16,824 16,183 73 309

**RICH N.E.S.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Capacity based on 92% utilization per the Site Capacity Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>1075 1368 1361 1620 47 Possible boundary change - Edison attendance area to Kill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>1235 1092 1060 1368 32 Possible boundary change - Kill students return to Kill or Hoover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dell</td>
<td>1675 1711 1708 1944 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>1575 1540 1591 1672 39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS:** 5,510 5,601 5,570 6,084 121

**RICH N.E.S.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Capacity based on 100% utilization due to the greater use of 0 and 7th period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>2000 1795 2190 2820 197 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lava</td>
<td>2303 2312 2220 2664 811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber</td>
<td>2430 2129 2040 3528 811</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS:** 6,740 6,234 7,260 8,712 1,118 92

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- No action at this time
- Add portables as needed
- Remove portables
- Receive 9th grade - construction completed
- Seating capacity at RICH N.E.S.

**NOTES:**

- Assumes new construction and existing portables to remain, unless added portables are available.
- Assumes relocation of CEP to reach RICH.
- Growth is based on 2% over 1991-92 action plan.
- Assumes current uses of classrooms continue, i.e., libraries, day care, etc.
- PER schools are based on actual space; other schools are based on 1.2x of classroom capacity.
- This capacity is based on projected enrollment. If enrollment is reached, spaces can still vary ± 20 at elementary and ± 50 at secondary.

**RECEIVED:** MARCH 18, 1992
GLENDALE

District may reconvene task force

Glendale school officials seek recommendations on how to handle student growth

By Laurence Darmiento
Daily News Staff Writer

GLENDALE — Faced with projections that its student population will increase by more than 4,000 within three years, the Glendale school board will consider reconvening a task force on how to handle the growth.

Superintendent Robert Sanchez is recommending that the Glendale Unified School District re-establish the Futures' Task Force, which presented a report in February 1990, but has since disbanded.

Nearly all of the task force's initial recommendations have been carried out, but projections that enrollment will grow nearly 16 percent by the 1994/1995 school year are requiring it to meet again, said Vic Pallos, the school district's spokesman.

School board member Sharon Beauchamp said that she favored reconvening the task force.

"We had projected we would have 27,000 students by the end of next year," Beauchamp said. "We are over that already. I think it's necessary."

The school board is scheduled to consider the recommendation during its regular meeting at 7:30 p.m. today at Columbus Elementary School, 425 W. Milford St.

The school district's enrollment is now at 27,078, according to Sanchez's memo. That is expected to rise to 28,646 next year and to 31,436 in three years.

The task force will have 24 members, including three administrators, three principals, six teachers and six parents. Pallos said he expects the task force will be composed of both new faces and members from the old group.

"While we implemented basically all of the original recommendations, the continuing enrollment increase shows that its time to look at some additional changes," said Pallos.

The task force recommendations included that the district should build new classrooms, modify enrollment boundaries and consider year-round education, according to a memo to the board by Sanchez.

The original task force concentrated on the district's elementary schools, but Pallos said the new one would be asked to study what can be done to alleviate overcrowding in secondary school classrooms.

Administrators have been discussing the possibility of changing the boundaries of the three district high schools, so that students can be diverted from Hoover and Glendale high schools — now just about at maximum capacity — to Crescenta Valley High School, which still has room to grow, Pallos said.

There also has been discussion of turning the now six-period day into nine periods and extending its hours. While each individual student would still attend school for six periods and for the same amount of time, not all students would be at school at once, Pallos said.

An extension of this idea would be to start offering night classes for students who would like that option. That would allow them to work part-time jobs during the day, he said.
Schools see more enrollment growth on horizon

By Ed Kamian
Glendale News-Press

The Glendale Unified School District, currently experiencing record growth, is rejecting a 16-percent student increase by officials, said.

Enrollment, now at 27,076 students, is expected to surpass 31,400 students in two years, Stephen Hodgson, assistant superintendent of business services, said.

The district has grown by more than 42 percent in the last six years, mostly in North Glendale.

North Glendale schools, including two that are closed, can accommodate 3,000 more students, and not 4,500 students as district officials had said Tuesday, after the board meeting.

Currently, seven of the 19 elementary schools have surpassed their recommended student capacities as have two of the four junior high schools and one of the three high schools, school records show.

Furthermore, construction funding for Glendale High School has been unavailable, postponing plans there for new space.

However, three more elementary schools are scheduled to convert to multi-track year-round education by 1993, freeing up 25 percent of their students at a time.

And the district benefits financially from growth — each new student translates into more than $3,000 in state revenue for the financially strapped district.

Superintendent Robert Sanchis recently told the Board of Education that the recent influx was improving the district's fiscal health.

"We're living off growth at the present time," Sanchis said. "It just so happens it was available. Lucky for us."

In addition to bodies and money, growth causes the district to consider spacing needs, negotiated student-teacher ratios and the balance between permanent construction and leased portable classrooms, Hodgson said.

The district has managed growth in recent years by converting six elementary schools to a year-round calendar, utilizing portable classrooms and, when funding permits, building classroom space, Hodgson said.

Burgeoning enrollments "will necessitate some pretty creative ideas as we move into the future," an official said.

"Because of the state of the economy we don't foresee much movement," Andrew Meyer, assistant superintendent for business services said.

LCUSD enrolls 3,702 students and can accommodate 5,000, Meyers said.

Board President Blanch Greenwood said the Glendale district's enrollment helps it provide a wide variety of needed services for its student body.

One GUSD administrator said that a 10-year-old wave of immigrants fleeing unrest has fueled the districts growth pattern.

"I call Glendale the United Nations district," Intercultural Director Alice Petrossian said.

"We're are seeing quite a few immigrant students who are fleeing political and economical conflict," she said.

With them come the need to learn and master English, adjust to a new educational system and stabilize their families' economical situation, she said.
You Are NOT an On-Looker

All parents who have children in the elementary school system in the Glendale Unified School District may be affected by the "Sagebrush Issue" going on right now. The passing of this issue can threaten the existence of Mountain Avenue Elementary School or change boundary lines for hundreds of children in the Northern Glendale Unified School District area.

Please come to the County Board of Education Public Hearing on Monday, March 5th at 7:30 pm at Mountain Avenue Elementary School and see what impact this issue can have on your children.

We in the Glendale Schools want a right to be heard on this issue. The County Board of Education decides who can vote. Let's let them know we also want the right to decide since our children could be affected by its passing.
CRESCENTA-CANADA COMMITTEE

We need your support in our effort to block the SAGEBRUSH PETITION!
If you are a parent with a child enrolled in the Glendale Unified School District
or if you own property in the area, this issue affects you!

Mountain Avenue School may be closed
Hundreds of students will be disrupted

The Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization is holding its

FINAL HEARING
MARCH 16, 1992
7:00 P.M.

PALMCREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
5025 Palm Drive, La Canada, CA.

Your attendance is necessary to demonstrate the community's concern over this issue.
Show your support by wearing a ROYAL BLUE RIBBON.
# SPEAKING ORDER

**SAGEBRUSH PETITION OPPONENTS**

**MARCH 16, 1991**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEAKER</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JULIE FARIAS</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL FERRIL</td>
<td>HISTORY OF MOUNTAIN AVENUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRY LANE</td>
<td>FISCAL IMPACT ON STUDENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRACE CHASE</td>
<td>IMPACT ON THE CHILDREN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RYAN SEROTE</td>
<td>IMPACT ON CRESCENTA VALLEY HIGH STUDENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRED MORROW</td>
<td>SAGEBRUSH PARENT TO DISCUSS COMMUNITY IDENTITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK EVANS</td>
<td>IMPACT ON CHILDREN AND THE RIPPLE EFFECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBBIE HALL</td>
<td>FISCAL IMPACT AND AN EQUITABLE DIVISION OF PROPERTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOE SCHRAMM</td>
<td>MONTE VISTA PARENT TO DISCUSS RIPPLE EFFECT ON AREA SCHOOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHERRY TAYLOR</td>
<td>LA CRESCENTA ELEMENTARY PARENT TO DISCUSS THE RIPPLE EFFECT ON AREA SCHOOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANK HALL</td>
<td>COMMUNITY IDENTITY AND THE UNDERLYING SOCIAL ISSUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROL BAKE</td>
<td>SAGEBRUSH PARENT OPPOSED TO PETITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDY HILTON</td>
<td>MOTIVATION OF PETITIONERS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THE REMAINDER OF TIME TO BE USED BY OTHER SPEAKERS.**

| BRUCE SALTZER | SUMMATION |
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Mr. Stark and committee members, my name is Julie Farias. I live at 2349 El Moreno Street in La Crescenta. I have a daughter who attends Mountain Avenue. I am a member of the Crescenta Canada Committee. We are a community coalition dedicated to ensuring that our children's lives and educations are not disrupted by the Sagebrush issue.

We began the "Save Mountain Avenue" movement because we believe that it is a living and dynamic community of children and faculty. We know that if one third of our population is lost, that community will be disrupted and other schools affected. Our campaign has given a voice to the landslide of community opposition to the Sagebrush petition. We are informed people and we know that there will be an impact on all children within the La Crescenta Schools. How can the Sagebrush Committee tell us that the Glendale School District will not have to shift children if their petition passes? Fiscal policy is not a matter of good guy, bad guy. It is a matter of economic survival.

I am dismayed by all the nonsensical attacks on our Glendale Board of Education by the Sagebrush Committee. Our children were sent home with the resolution stating their position on the Sagebrush issue. As a parent I appreciate the information that the school board sent home. I would consider it irresponsible if the board had not informed us of the possibility of 263 students leaving our district. I expect to hear both sides of an issue and I expect to be able to voice my opinion.

Many people on the Crescenta Canada Committee have attended the local schools as children and have returned to raise their children here. I am one of those people. I have many friends who lived in the Sagebrush area. There are people on our committee today who grew up in that area and will tell you that they never felt that they lacked a sense of community identity. We never considered ourselves to be separated by any boundary or barrier. Boundaries can be something in the mind as much as a fact of geography. Boundaries can even be a telephone prefix.

The bottom line is this. The Crescenta Canada Committee cares about all of the children in the Glendale School District regardless of which side of the canyon they live on. Yes many of us have told our children about this issue. We have organized, come up with a position and been able to present it intelligently at these hearings. We are all proud of this. We are proud of the support that we have received from our community. We are doing everything we can to oppose something which we do not believe to be for the good of all of our children. It is not only our right to do this, it is our duty as members of this Crescenta Canada Community. We believe that the wave of disruption that would be caused by 263 children leaving our district would affect not only Mountain Avenue, but Monte Vista, La Crescenta, and Freemont Elementary schools as well as Rosemont Junior High and Crescenta.
Valley High. We believe that the cost to our community is too
great a sacrifice.
I would like to again bring to the attention of the committee that Mountain Avenue School and the park, pick-up and delivery turn-around, and footbridge were built twenty-five years ago. This was accomplished at considerable expense and was built to accommodate the children and parents living on the Eastside of Pickens Canyon. The school facility is the finest in the area and one of the best K-6 schools in the State. The CRESCENTA - CANADA COMMUNITY is not about boundaries, but is about values, similarities and priorities. Our children have always shared Scouts, the "Y", churches, parks and many other programs sponsored by churches, service clubs, and charitable groups. Why is the "Grandfather Clause" emphasized by the Canada City Council, School Board, School Superintendent and the "Sagebrush" Committee? Is it a ploy to discredit the Glendale School Board's position? Is it because so few parents intend moving their children from Mountain Avenue and then send their children four miles further for grades seven (7) thru twelve (12)? Is it because Palm Crest School may close, as it was from 1979-1986? Or, is it a smoke-screen to achieve other goals separate from the best interest of the children?
I continue to hear the importance of the 790 phone prefix, the 91011 La Canada zip-code and the prestige of the La Canada name. This attitude does not benefit the children. Rather than constructing barriers, let us remove anything that would isolate us from one another. We are all friends and agree on ninety plus percent of the issues confronting our CRESCENTA-CANADA COMMUNITY. Whatever the outcome to this issue, I hope we will continue in friendly cooperation. Thankyou.

Bill Ferril 248-4080
2232 Phyllis St. La Crescenta 91214
Remarks by
Barry Lane
before the
Public Hearing of the
Los Angeles County Committee on
School District Organization
March 16, 1992

GOOD EVENING. MY NAME IS BARRY LANE. I LIVE AT 2311 JAYMA LANE IN LA CRESENTA, AND I AM THE PARENT OF TWO CHILDREN WHO ATTEND GLENDALE SCHOOLS.

TONIGHT I WISH TO ADDRESS THE FINANCIAL IMPACT OF TAKING AWAY THE "SAGEBRUSH" AREA FROM THE GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT.

AS THIS COMMUNITY WAS DEVELOPED, THE GLENDALE DISTRICT RESPONDED BY SPENDING 3 MILLION DOLLARS TO BUILD MOUNTAIN AVENUE SCHOOL TO ACCOMMODATE THE STUDENTS WHO LIVED IN PARADISE VALLEY AND ALONG OCEAN VIEW.

IN ADDITION, THE DISTRICT SPENT HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS TO ACQUIRE SEVERAL LOTS ON OCEAN VIEW, ACROSS PICKENS CANYON FROM THE NEW SCHOOL AND THEN BUILT A BRIDGE TO SPAN THE CANYON.

THESE COSTS WERE BORNE BY ALL OF THE RESIDENTS OF THE GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT TO BENEFIT THOSE MEMBERS OF OUR COMMUNITY WHO LIVED IN THE LA CANADA AREA.

NOW, WITH THIS SECESSION MOVEMENT, THE PETITIONERS WOULD HAVE US DISMISS THE MILLIONS OF DOLLARS WE SPENT FOR THEIR BENEFIT AND THE COSTS THAT THE SECESSION WILL IMPOSE.

THE GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT WOULD REALIZE A SIGNIFICANT LOSS IN THE FUNDS IT RECEIVES FROM THE STATE TO EDUCATE OUR CHILDREN -- A LOSS TOTALING MORE THAN 780 THOUSAND DOLLARS A YEAR.

PART OF THIS REVENUE LOSS WOULD BE OFFSET BY FIRING TEACHERS.

BUT IN THE END, THE GLENDALE DISTRICT WOULD HAVE A NET REVENUE LOSS OF MORE THAN $400,000 A YEAR -- A BIG BITE AT A TIME WHEN THE DISTRICT IS SCRAMBLING TO BALANCE ITS BUDGET.

THE CALIFORNIA TAXPAYERS WILL SHOULDER PART OF THE BURDEN, TOO.
THE REVENUE LIMIT FOR THE GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL
DISTRICT IS $3,008 PER STUDENT. BY CONTRAST, THE REVENUE LIMIT FOR
THE LA CANADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IS $3,412 -- $404 MORE PER
STUDENT.

THIS MEANS THAT FOR THE 262 STUDENTS IN THE "SAGEBRUSH"
AREA, THE TAXPAYERS WILL PAY NEARLY $106,000 A YEAR MORE TO HAVE
THOSE SAME STUDENTS ATTEND LA CANADA SCHOOLS.

THE $400,000 REVENUE LOSS FOR GLENDALE SCHOOLS AND THE
$100,000 HIGHER COST FOR LA CANADA SCHOOLS GIVES THIS PROPOSAL A
PRICE TAG OF MORE THAN $500,000 A YEAR.

THE SAGEBRUSH PETITIONERS ARGUE THAT THIS IS A SMALL PART
OF THE OVERALL EDUCATION BUDGET, BOTH FOR GLENDALE AND FOR
THE STATE, AND SHOULD NOT BE OF CONCERN. HOW INCONSEQUENTIAL
IS IT?

THAT $500,000 WOULD BUY MORE THAN 14,000 NEW TEXTBOOK FOR
OUR STUDENTS, EACH YEAR!

THAT $500,000 WOULD BUY MORE THAN 300 NEW COMPUTERS FOR
OUR STUDENTS, EACH YEAR!

THAT $500,000 WOULD HIRE NEARLY ENOUGH TEACHERS TO STAFF
AN AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, OR REDUCE CLASS SIZE BY TWO
STUDENTS IN GRADES 4 THROUGH 6 THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE
GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT.

DWINDLING REVENUE SOURCES ARE REQUIRING THE GLENDALE
SCHOOL DISTRICT TO CUT MORE THAN $6 MILLION.

RIPPING OUT ANOTHER ONE-HALF MILLION DOLLARS FROM THE
BUDGET WILL HAVE BROAD, SERIOUS AND ADVERSE CONSEQUENCES
THROUGHOUT THE CRESCENTA VALLEY AND THE GLENDALE SCHOOL
DISTRICT.

WE HAVE ALREADY SEEN SEVERE CUTS IN SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR
AT-RISK YOUTH AND STUDENTS REQUIRING REMEDIAL ASSISTANCE.
FURTHER CUTS WILL CHOP AWAY AT THE HEART OF AN
OUTSTANDING EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM THAT HAS BEEN BUILT AND
NURTURED FOR MORE THAN 100 YEARS.

THIS PETITION CARRIES A SIGNIFICANT COST BURDEN TO THE
GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT AND OUR COMMUNITY -- THE
PRICE TAG WILL RUN INTO THE MILLIONS OVER THE YEARS.

I ASK YOU TO CUT THIS PROCESS SHORT BEFORE WE ARE FORCED
TO EXPEND FURTHER PRECIOUS MONIES TO PROTECT OUR SCHOOLS.
IF YOU MAKE YOUR DECISION BASED ON WHAT'S BEST FOR THE
CHILDREN, YOU WILL SEE THAT THEY ARE BEST SERVED BY REMAINING A
PART OF THE CRESCENTA-CANADA COMMUNITY.
MY NAME IS GRACE CHASE, I AM PART OF THE CRESCENTA - CANADA COMMITTEE AND I HAVE THREE CHILDREN WHO ATTEND MOUNTAIN AVENUE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL.

I FEEL THAT THE PASSING OF THIS ANNEXATION THREATENS THE EXISTENCE OF MOUNTAIN AVENUE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL. TWENTY SEVEN YEARS AGO THE THINKING IN LA CANADA MUST HAVE BEEN DIFFERENT. AT THAT TIME THERE WAS A SCHOOL NEEDED TO SERVICE WHAT WE ARE NOW REFERRING TO AS THE "SAGEBRUSH" AREA. TWENTY SEVEN YEARS AGO THE GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT MADE A COMMITMENT TO THIS AREA AND BUILT MOUNTAIN AVENUE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, THE PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE AND THE PARK OFF OF OCEAN VIEW BLVD. AND HAVE MAINTAINED IT FOR ALL OF THESE YEARS.

THIS ISSUE THREATENS THE SURVIVAL OF THIS VERY SCHOOL AND POSSIBLE LOSS OF PROGRAMS AND TEACHERS AT A TIME WHEN JOBS ARE HARD TO COME BY AND WHEN EDUCATION IS SO VERY IMPORTANT. AND FOR WHAT?? COMMUNITY IDENTITY!! NOT AT THE EXPENSE OF MY SCHOOL!! THE PETITIONERS FOR THIS ANNEXATION FEEL THAT BEING A PART OF THE LA CANADA SCHOOL DISTRICT WILL GIVE THEM THAT SENSE OF COMMUNITY IDENTITY.

COMMUNITY IDENTITY DOES NOT ONLY COME FROM YOUR SCHOOL OR YOUR ADDRESS BUT BY ATTITUDE AND CONCERN FOR THOSE LIVING AROUND YOU. IT'S WHAT YOU MAKE OF IT AND NOT WHAT YOUR COMMUNITY MAKES OF YOU.

THERE WILL ALWAYS BE CHILDREN WHO WILL LIVE ON THE BOUNDARIES BETWEEN SCHOOL DISTRICTS BUT NOT MANY SCHOOLS CAN SURVIVE ON A BOUNDARY LINE. BEING THAT THIS SCHOOL WAS BUILT FOR THIS "SAGEBRUSH" AREA AND THAT THERE CAN BE NO GUARANTEE FOR ENROLLMENTS IN FUTURE YEARS THIS ANNEXATION DOES THREATEN THE EXISTENCE OF MOUNTAIN AVENUE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL THEREBY AFFECTING HUNDREDS OF CHILDREN IN THE GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT.

THE PETITIONERS SPOKE OF GIVING THIS AREA A CHOICE OF DISTRICTS WITHOUT GETTING THEIR FACTS. THESE PEOPLE CANNOT BE GUARANTEED A CHOICE. THE GRANDFATHER CLAUSE WAS A FARCE TO GET THE NEEDED SIGNATURES. A SCHOOL DISTRICT CANNOT RUN GIVING AN AREA A CHOICE OF SCHOOLS. GIVING THIS AREA A CHOICE THREATENS THE CHOICE OF SCHOOLS THAT I MADE ELEVEN YEARS AGO.

THE PETITIONERS CLAIM THAT THE GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IS USING A "SCARE TACTIC" ON US, I BELIEVE THAT IT IS A WARNING AND ONE WE SHOULD NOT TAKE LIGHTLY. THE ONLY GUARANTEE REGARDING MY SCHOOL I CAN TAKE SERIOUSLY IS THE ONE GIVEN TO ME BY MY DISTRICT AND I CANNOT GET A GUARANTEE IF THIS ANNEXATION PASSES. THIS ISSUE AFFECTS ALL THE CHILDREN LIVING IN THE CRESCENTA - CANADA VALLEY, NOT JUST THE ONES LIVING IN THE SAGEBRUSH AREA.
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WE HAVE TO PROTECT OUR SENSE OF IDENTITY WITH MOUNTAIN AVENUE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL. AND IN THE SAGEBRUSH PETITIONERS PURSUIT FOR COMMUNITY IDENTITY THROUGH THE SCHOOLS THEY MAY BE DESTROYING A WONDERFUL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL THAT ALREADY COMPLIMENTS THE COMMUNITY. WE CANNOT SACRAFICE A SCHOOL FOR COMMUNITY IDENTITY.
My name is Ryan Serote. As the elected Associated Student Body President of Crescenta Valley High School, a high school well under its capacity, I would like to express my feelings on the issue at hand. At the public hearing last Monday night, I was appalled to hear many people putting selfish, materialistic desires before the educational standards of our society.

The focus of these public hearings has drifted too far from its objective. The most pertinent issue of this proposal must be to ensure an excellent education for these students. Never having been enrolled in the La Canada Unified School District, I cannot belittle their educational system, yet having progressed through Glendale schools, specifically Mountain Avenue, Rosemont, and Crescenta Valley, I know that these educational standards are difficult to surpass, and are certainly not surpassed by La Canada schools. A simple example of this is a recently published list of SAT averages of public high schools, in which Crescenta Valley High School was ranked as one of the top ten across Southern California. This information is available through the College Board.

La Canada High school has been cutting classes from its curriculum, including much of its Advanced Placement program. The Glendale schools have been adding AP courses every year, as well as offering a large variety of courses in its curriculum.

Knowing the differences between these schools, it would seem that the parents of children in the sagebrush area would prefer their kids to attend Glendale schools. It boggled my mind Monday night, to hear sagebrush parent after sagebrush parent after sagebrush parent voice absolute approval of the education received at Mountain Avenue Elementary school. As one man stated that evening, "If it's not broken, why fix it?"
Another issue I would like to address is the idea of community identity in La Canada. Community boundaries do not end where city borders exist. Growing up in La Crescenta, I regularly attended a La Canada Church. Although I was one of only three kids from La Crescenta schools, I had no problem in making friends, as the other children were readily accepting to people they did not go to school with.

The high school students in the Crescenta-Canada area also share support groups, such as DARE, Saferides, the Peer Assistance Hotline, and many others.

As for sports, scouting, and other social events for children, again, we share teams, troops, and facilities. Getting involved in any community is simple, but the choice to get involved in these activities is up to each individual.

Lack of community identity cannot be the issue here tonight. I would like to believe that we are all here to determine what is in the best interests of the children. As Carole Siegler, the vice-president of the governing board of La Canada Unified School District stated, "What is best for the students should be the bottom line." It is sad to see that some parents do not see this dispute in the same respect.
Good evening, my name is Mark Evans and I live on Terrace Dr. in La Crescenta. I have one child currently in Mountain Ave. and another child who attended Mountain and is currently at Rosemont.

Each parent has been faced with the task of explaining to the children, our children what is happening to our school community.

After what I believe to be a most accurate description--my child responded--but the bridge.

The bridge that spans the wash joining the Ocean View community with the Briggs community is perhaps the most poignant symbol of our present dilemma. A bridge joins--it combines--it links.

This school community has been in place since the 1880's. When residents of our school community purchased their homes--there was no secret--the school community was Mountain Ave., Rosemont, and Crescenta Valley. Theses are the neighborhood schools for the Sagebrush students. NO CHANGES HAVE BEEN MADE--THERE SHOULD BE NO SURPRISES FOR ANYONE.

If there is confusion, perhaps it is caused by the La Canada School District who apparently has a policy of accepting students illegally into the district. This issue was discussed in last Saturday's Foothill Leader and last Thursday's Glendale section of the Los Angeles Times.

As the Sagebrush Committee works to change their school community--they neglect to take into account the repercussions, the ramifications on all the other children in the school community.

It is obvious that when an elementary school loses 30% of its population its viability is in jeopardy. The school district will have to make choices in near impossible financial times.

There seems to be two major alternatives. Mountain Ave. could be closed and perhaps leased to a private entity. Our children would be redistributed to other elementary schools. Our children could not simply be absorbed into the nearest school. There would have to be adjustments made to the boundaries of the other five elementary schools--La Crescenta, Fremont, Monte Vista, Lincoln and Dunsmore.

The remaining option is to keep Mountain open. However, it is not economically feasible to remain open serving 133 fewer students. Again, boundary lines would have to be redrawn causing the same disruption cascading throughout the valley.
And so by demanding a change in school district boundary lines, the Sagebrush Committee is unthinkingly, perhaps unintentionally disrupting the lives of many children, many families, and at least 6 successful schools. It is up to this Board to weigh the consequences for ALL the children of the present school community.

It must be remembered, that by purchasing homes within the area—all residents agreed to join THIS school community. A community that has worked together to successfully educate children. A community joined by history, academic success, and the friendships of children and families that span that bridge.
Our neighbors from the Sagebrush area have told us that it is not their intent to close Mountain Avenue School, and we believe them. The problem is that while that is not their intent, it is very likely that it will ultimately be the effect of the reorganization they have proposed. If we did not believe that - if we did not believe that a great number of children from our community, and our community itself, would be adversely affected, we would not be here opposing this proposal.

It does not take a degree in economics to understand that Mountain Avenue cannot continue to exist if its student body is reduced by one-third. Sure, you can cut the number of classes, the number of teachers. But you cannot cut a third of a principal, a third of the school secretary, a third of a custodian, a third of the on-going facilities costs. In this time of decreasing educational funds and budget deficits, a higher per student overhead at Mountain Avenue, particularly when the needs of its students in the less fortunate southern areas of the district are so great, could not be justified, no matter how wonderful the school. And while the petitioners would have you think otherwise, the increase in students this year at Mountain Avenue has been 9, not 9% - and there is no substantial area left in its boundaries where development can occur.

So the students would have to come from somewhere, or the school would have to close. If Mountain Avenue were to close, the education and the community of the remaining 237 students would be disrupted. And if the students were to come from neighboring schools, those students education and communities would be disrupted. And the parents in those neighboring schools have told us that they are vitally concerned about that. We are dealing here with the welfare of many more students than the 263 in the Sagebrush area.

The Sagebrush parents suggest that if Mountain Avenue needs students, then it should gladly give the students in that area the right to choose to attend Glendale Schools. It sounds good - but does it really work? What kind of year to year stability will there be for Mountain Avenue, the remaining Mountain Avenue community and the rest of the students in the Glendale District if each year it there is the uncertainty of whether enough students will choose to come to Mountain Avenue to keep it open?

Additionally, by virtue of the Education Code the Sagebrush area students would take with them to the La Canada District a valuable piece of property. Assuming a value of approximately $880,000, that's approximately $3340 per departing student - from land that was purchased with the funds for all the Glendale District students. Since there would be no further need for this piece of property for educational purposes, it could revert back to residential use - a windfall for the La Canada
District. Does this result in an equitable division of property between the Districts? Clearly not.

We agree with the La Canada School District that what is best for the students should be the bottom line - the Glendale students as well as the Sagebrush area students. The bottom line is that transferring these students out of the Glendale District will be highly disruptive to another significant community, impact the educational programs of many Glendale students, and result in unjust enrichment to the La Canada District at the expense of the Glendale District.
My name is Sherry Carlson Taylor and I reside at 2822 Piedmont Ave, La Crescenta. I am a teacher at Crescenta Valley High School and a parent of two elementary school aged daughters. I live several miles away from the Sagebrush area and yet I am here this evening because I am worried about the ramifications of this decision. We have heard about the ripple effect. I contend this will not be a ripple but a tidal wave. If this transfer of students is permitted thousands of children in the Crescenta Valley elementary schools will have their education disrupted. This is not scare tactics. This is reality. If the Glendale school board members possessed the wisdom of King Solomon this transfer could not take place without major upheavals. Every elementary school in La Crescenta will experience the fallout from this decision. Students will face reassignment and teachers will be transferred. Because of our contractual rights massive bumping could occur. The faculty that currently staffs these elementary schools will not remain in tact. This is a powerful issue and cannot be contained within the radius of the Sagebrush.

I am frustrated because my husband and I purchased our home in 1985. Although our children were not yet in school we made it very clear to our real estate agent that we wanted to look at
homes in two specific elementary school attendance areas. We made a cognitive decision to purchase our home in the La Crescenta Elementary school attendance area. Now our children might be removed from their present school because of demands from parents in the Sagebrush area who did not exercise the same prerogative that we did. Being a teacher I tend to be rule oriented. I feel like I am in the 3rd quarter of a game and my teammates decide to change the rules. This simply is not fair. Please remember the youngsters who attend Monte Vista, Dunsmore, Lincoln, La Crescenta and Fremont because they are all vulnerable in this process.

Finally, I strongly urge you to avoid massive disruption in the educational process by denying this request. But if this Board feels the political pressure to put this issue to a vote do not disenfranchise any affected family. Our children count, too. It's tough to be a public school teacher today. It's tough to be a good parent. Don't compound an arduous task by allowing this to continue.

PLEASE DON'T SATISFY A FEW TO SACRIFICE THE MANY. Thank you.
HANK HALL

OPENING

This proposal has not been advanced to better the quality of education. The "Sagebrush" Committee cannot and does not question the quality of the education which the Glendale Schools have provided to the children it purports to represent.

Throughout these hearings, I have waited to hear why hundreds of children across this valley should have their educations disrupted by having to change schools. If the proposed annexation is effected, either Mountain Avenue will close or every other Glendale School in the foothill area will have to realign its attendance area so that Mountain Avenue will have enough students to justify its operation. These are not scare tactics; they are possibilities dictated by reality. Because Mountain Avenue was built to accommodate the "Sagebrush" area, it is less than one-half mile, as the crow flies, from Monte Vista Elementary School. Maintaining Mountain Avenue could mean that some current Monte Vista students will have to travel past their old school to get to Mountain Avenue. This disruption will continue down the foothills as all Glendale School boundaries shift to the East. Those students are also parts of established communities which would be impacted by this proposal.

The question I still have is "why?"

The petitioners assert that property values are not in issue, but I have to wonder - particularly in the case of the overwhelming majority of petitioners who do not have affected children. There can be no question but that property values are directly tied to La Canada Unified School District membership. In the edition of the "Valley Sun" which immediately preceded last November's school assessment election, virtually every proponent of that assessment, including local realtors, writers of letters to the editor, and school board candidates, noted that schools were the key to property values. Coincidentally, the "Sagebrush" movement
appears to have begun within days of the publication of this edition of the "Valley Sun."

Further evidence of this can be found in an examination of the linchpin of this proposal, the so-called "grandfather clause." While the adults of the "Sagebrush" area seek to secede from the Glendale Unified School District in the name of "community identity," they also demand that their children be given the right to attend the same Glendale schools which are supposedly causing the problem. If that is the case, what will the annexation accomplish? What many of the petitioners appear to really want are their houses, not their kids, in the La Canada Unified School District.

Despite the fact that people throughout the Crescenta-Canada area work together, play together, worship together and share basic community services, the "Sagebrush" adults do not feel a part of the community. After listening to them, I believe that they have established, overwhelmingly, that there is a serious social problem which must be addressed.

There is a serious social problem when people are ostracized because of the street on which they live. There is a serious social problem when children are taught to judge other children on the basis of the school they attend or neighborhood they live in.

This serious social problem will not be solved by realigning school districts. If it approves this proposal for the reasons which have been advanced in its support, this Committee will be teaching our kids that these attitudes are both acceptable and of such value that they justify the disruption of hundreds of other people's lives. I ask you, is that a lesson which you wish to teach our kids?

In closing, I would like to remind the proponents that in 1979 the La Canada Unified School District adopted a resolution condemning the breaching of school boundaries to address social rather than educational problems. The real social problem at issue here will not be solved
by changing school boundaries because it is a problem of the heart not the mind.
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JOSEPH H. SCHRAMM, JR.
2750 Willowhaven Drive, La Crescenta

Parent of Monte Vista Student

My name is Joe Schramm. My family resides at 2750 Willowhaven Drive in La Crescenta at the top of La Crescenta Avenue and Rosemont Avenue. Our oldest of three children, soon to be four children, attends Monte Vista Elementary. The next in age attends Parents and Children's pre-school in La Canada, as did his older sister.

The comments that I make tonight represent the feelings of one Monte Vista family, that I am sure are shared by many other Monte Vista families—and La Crescenta elementary families—and Fremont Elementary families—and Dunsmore Elementary families—and Lincoln Elementary families—and, of course, Mountain Avenue families. All of whom are bound to have their schools, classrooms, and friendships DISRUPTED by this Sagebrush proposal.

You see—I too have a feeling a feeling of community that I want to preserve. I grew up in La Canada with a "790" prefix and attended Paradise Canyon Elementary, Foothill Intermediate School, and La Canada High School. The woman I married happened to grow up in La Crescenta and attended Monte Vista elementary, Rosemont Junior High, and Crescenta Valley High School. Truly a "mixed marriage"—but we don't buy into this "community identity" crisis that a small segment of La Canada claims to be having about where their children go to school.

In fact, not only do we not buy into this "community identity" crisis, what we DID buy in December 1987 was a home in a location where we KNEW our children would attend Monte Vista Elementary. When we looked for a home in late 1987, WE ASKED our real estate agent what schools our children would be attending. I can find no empathy for the Sagebrush homeowners who stood up here and claimed that they assumed they were in the La Canada school district when they purchased their homes. All they had to do was ASK!

THERE IS NO GRANDFATHER CLAUSE and never has been. The loss of 30% of the elementary student population at Mountain Avenue is certain to have ripple effects throughout the La Crescenta school community. Assuming that Mountain Avenue remains open, it is inconceivable that the attendance areas for the other elementary schools—Monte Vista, La Crescenta, Fremont, Dunsmore & Lincoln, would not be SHIFTED to correct for this newly created student imbalance. To my family, and many other Monte Vista families—the uprooting of students, severing of friendships, realignment of teachers and classrooms—NONE of this is worth the aspirations of the Sagebrush proponents of "becoming ONE with the city of La Canada"—we want to preserve our "community identity".

I urge the Committee to weigh the disruption to our schools against the transparent community interests of a few....And if it should have to come to a vote, the Monte Vista, La Crescenta, Fremont, Dunsmore, and Mountain Avenue families, who are ALL affected by this proposal, demand the right to voice our opinion on the preservation of our classrooms and "our community identity" at the ballot box. But, end this now, so that we can get on with our PTA meetings, and fundraisers and hot dog sales and Indian Princess meetings without worrying about which school our children and their friends will be attending next year. Thank you.
As a resident of the Sagebrush area of La Canada, I am offended that the Sagebrush committee knows what is best for my children and the community. Families such as ours, who are adament about our children attending Glendale schools were pacified with the false information that our children would be unaffected by the change, while their kids could attend the La Canada school district. Now that we learn that this may not be the case, I am not willing to gamble with the education of my children by supporting this change.

Some parents in this area are under the impression that they will have the choice of either district, or even of sending one child to each district, if they desire. We bought our home in La Canada 18 years ago only after we learned that our children would indeed attend the Glendale school district. Naturally we assumed that this would always be so.

We feel that the GUSD offers a better variety of classes, and is set up to deal with the needs of children with a wide ability level. Our girls have benefitted from the excellent Advanced Placement classes at C.V., where they have had top-notch teachers and enjoyed the special curriculum. La Canada has had to forfeit their A.P. program except when provisions are made with the teachers after school and on weekends.

We also believe that the Rosemont middle school cannot be matched for excellence, and strongly feel that this age student is much better served in a middle school than a 7-12 high school.

Mountain Avenue elementary is a superior school and a true bright spot in the community. Those of us who have enjoyed our experiences in the Glendale school district and have worked hard through the PTA and school involvement have a strong sense of loyalty to the district.

Most of my neighbors are retired, or have no children in school. They are part of the "over 50%" who support this change. Many of them signed the petition and later regretted it because they feel they were given false information. Those I spoke to who supported the change, but have no children in the schools do not hesitate to state that increased property value motivated their decision. Other families who have children at Rosemont and C.V. are not willing to get involved, because they feel that they can petition to keep their children in the Glendale schools and benefit from the increased property value as well.

I strongly feel that the proponents of this change are using children for financial gain. The La Canada school district wants this change simply for the money it will generate for their financially strapped schools. Property value and La Canada School district's financial need should have no bearing on these important educational decisions. This should be an issue of what's best for the child, and not a matter of dollars and cents.

Carol Bake
2109 Countryman Lane
La Canada, 91011
presented 3-09-92
My family and I are residents of the "no-man's land" now known as the "Sagebrush" area. If only I had known how clever my husband and I were in our approach to buying a home 18 years ago, I would have published a handy guide on important questions to ask before you purchase a home. This could have been immensely helpful to all of those parents who spoke last Monday on how they were unaware that there homes were in the GUSD.

We spent almost a year finding the home we wanted to buy...after all it was the single most important purchase we would ever make. We had only one infant daughter at the time, but we were aware that eventually she would go to school, so the first question we asked was about the school district. We wanted to be in the Glendale district, and only bought a home in La Canada because we knew that she would attend Mountain Ave., Rosemont and C.V.

My husband and I shared the goal to give our children a stable upbringing in one home. We planned ahead, and have always felt secure that we made the best choices for our family. Now with one daughter in college, one at C.V., and one at Rosemont, our goals are threatened by other families who didn't make correct decisions for their families and therefore are having an identity crisis over living in the Sagebrush area.

Our daughters are very involved in the Crescenta-Canada community and in their schools. They have benefitted from the excellent GATE classes at Rosemont, in the after school athletics program, extra-curricular activities, and have served as ASB officers. Their educational experiences would be greatly disrupted by having to attend La Canada High, which doesn't offer the wide variety of classes that C.V. does, the same A.P. classes, advanced dance or gymnastics. I feel that they would be torn from the community they are active in, and thrown into a school where they will be forever labeled as "those Sagebrush kids."

As a concerned and involved parent, if I thought for one minute that my daughters would receive a better education, would be safer, or in any way better off in the La Canada schools, I would be the first to see that we sell our home and move. However, I would never force my opinion on others, who were happy with the choices they made for their families.

I wonder if fear of the unknown motivates some of these Sagebrush families. They KNOW Mt. Avenue is excellent, but they worry about what Rosemont and C.V. might be like. As a parent who has had three daughters in Rosemont, I challenge anyone to show how 7th & 8th grade students are better off in a 7-12 high school.

I worried when C.V. added the 9th grade nine years ago, but after sending my two oldest daughters to C.V. as ninth graders, I realize that my fears were unfounded.

The La Canada school district claims that our children would be welcomed with "open arms." I maintain they are welcome only for the dollar signs they represent. The Sagebrush Committee is quick to try and make the Glendale School district out as the heavy, but my children are NOT being used as pawns by the Glendale Schools at all...they are being used as pawns by the La Canada School district, who needs the money and by the Sagebrush Committee who is hoping to clear up their identity crisis and will benefit by higher property values as well.

Presented by Carol Bake on 3-16-92

A-100
At worst, Mt. Ave. will close. At best, it will remain open but reconfiguration and transfers of students from up to 4 or more schools will occur. Is there a compelling reason for this disruption? Even the sagebrush parents don’t agree.

Mr. Chairman and Board Members, please deny this request. Even the Sagebrush parents are not in consensus over this proposal. It will only serve to disrupt a proven educational system and it will not achieve a better sense of community for anyone. The fact that the grandfather clause has become such a major issue should serve as a clear indication that this petition is being driven by a minority viewpoint. Let’s stop this action before it causes any further disruption to our fine community.

THIS IS NOT A "QUINTESSENTIAL TRANSFER" - IT IS CLEARLY A NON-ESSENTIAL TRANSFER!

Thank you for listening.
Mr. Stark and committee members, my name is Julie Farias. I live at 2349 El Moreno Street in La Crescenta. I have a daughter who attends Mountain Avenue. I am a member of the Crescenta Canada Committee. We are a community coalition dedicated to ensuring that our children's lives and educations are not disrupted by the Sagebrush issue.

We began the "Save Mountain Avenue" movement because we believe that it is a living and dynamic community of children and faculty. We know that if one third of our population is lost, that community will be disrupted and other schools affected. Our campaign has given a voice to the landslide of community opposition to the Sagebrush petition. We are informed people and we know that there will be an impact on all children within the La Crescenta Schools. How can the Sagebrush Committee tell us that the Glendale School District will not have to shift children if their petition passes? Fiscal policy is not a matter of good guy, bad buy. It is a matter of economic survival.

I am dismayed by all the nonsensical attacks on our Glendale Board of Education by the Sagebrush Committee. Our children were sent home with the resolution stating their position on the Sagebrush issue. As a parent I appreciate the information that the school board sent home. I would consider it irresponsible if the board had not informed us of the possibility of 263 students leaving our district. I expect to hear both sides of an issue and I expect to be able to voice my opinion.

Many people on the Crescenta Canada Committee have attended the local schools as children and have returned to raise their children here. I am one of those people. I have many friends who lived in the Sagebrush area. There are people on our committee today who grew up in that area and will tell you that they never felt that they lacked a sense of community identity. We never considered ourselves to be separated by any boundary or barrier. Boundaries can be something in the mind as much as a fact of geography. Boundaries can even be a telephone prefix.

The bottom line is this. The Crescenta Canada Committee cares about all of the children in the Glendale School District regardless of which side of the canyon they live on. Yes many of us have told our children about this issue. We have organized, come up with a position and been able to present it intelligently at these hearings. We are all proud of this. We are proud of the support that we have received from our community. We are doing everything we can to oppose something which we do not believe to be for the good of all of our children. It is not only our right to do this, it is our duty as members of this Crescenta Canada Community. We believe that the wave of disruption that would be caused by 263 children leaving our district would affect not only Mountain Avenue, but Monte Vista, La Crescenta, and Freemont Elementary schools as well as Rosemont Junior High and Crescenta.
Valley High. We believe that the cost to our community is too great a sacrifice.
BRUCE SALTZER

Summation for Opponents of the Sagebrush Petition  3/16/92

(1) I am the parent of 2 girls, one who currently attends Mt. Ave. and one who I hope will one day be able to attend Mt. Ave.

(2) (a) While testimony before the County Committee has called into serious question petitioner's ability to meet several of the Education Code criteria required for them to succeed, there can be no question but that they have been unable to meet criteria number 6, which requires that they prove that the proposed reorganization would not significantly disrupt the educational programs in the proposed districts.

(b) There has been a substantial amount of testimony presented before this Committee over two separate evenings on the issue of disruption and the dramatic impact it would have on hundreds and potentially thousands of students were the petition to succeed. While petitioners have attempted to downplay this issue with a clever new concept called the "grandfather clause," a clear analysis of the testimony and the facts presented provides a different picture.

(1) First, no one disputes the fact that there are 133 students currently at Mt. Ave. School within the Sagebrush area or that this comprises approximately 30 percent of the 470 students enrolled there.

(2) The facts also show that this loss of students would be significant and could not be made up elsewhere. The Glendale district projects that over the next 3 years the enrollment at Mt. Ave. will increase by only 9 students, or less than 2 percent.

In addition, each of the neighborhood schools surrounding Mt. Ave. School is currently enrolled at below capacity and the Glendale district currently has both an elementary and a junior high school in the area which were closed previously and are not being utilized due to an inadequate level of students.

(3) Given this information, there can be no dispute that if all or a large portion of the Sagebrush students were to leave Mt. Ave. School substantial disruption in educational programming would occur, either due to the required closure of Mt. Ave. School or the required redistricting of the boundaries of a large number of surrounding schools in the La Crescenta Valley area.

(3) Not only have petitioners not been able to meet their burden of proof set out in the Education Code, but they have also not been able to show a compelling interest or that the passage of the petition would be in the best overall interest for all those affected, two additional bases upon which the County Committee may reject the petition. Let's briefly look at how the equities of both sides balance in this case.

A-106
(a) On the one side, petitioners have spent a tremendous amount of time really talking about only one issue -- the importance of their "community identity." What have they said?

(1) We have heard that the petition should be granted to provide a community environment for their children, to strengthen community ties, and to allow their children to participate in community activities. At the same time, more than one Sagebrush parent not included among the petitioners has testified that community identity is what you make of it. With a little initiative, like all of us must take to become active participants in our communities, these Sagebrush parents have become involved in La Canada activities and events just like members of the Crescента-Canada area have become involved in their community.

(2) There appears to be a clear divergence of interests and a confusion among the residents of the Sagebrush area themselves, which calls into question petitioners entire community identity argument. In fact, upon close inspection it becomes apparent that the core of the petition itself is internally inconsistent. While on the one hand arguing in favor of the need for their children to attend La Canada schools to establish their La Canada community identity, petitioners have on the other hand asked that the Sagebrush parents be allowed to continue to send their children to the Glendale district schools that have served their children so well.

(b) Finally, one must ask whether this subjective and confusing concept of community identity, as applied in this particular situation, outweighs the hard, objective realities that Mtn. Ave. children and their families must face if the petition is allowed to succeed? The answer is a resounding "no."

(1) In addition to hearing about educational disruption, we have been told first and foremost why I hope are all here tonight -- the quality of our children's education. Throughout these proceedings, speaker after speaker on both sides has touted the exceptional quality of the education their son or daughter has received within the Glendale district. Any disruption to this quality education must clearly face a heavy burden, which petitioners cannot meet.

(2) We have also been told about the uncertainties inherent in the proposed "grandfather clause." Were the "grandfather clause" to be approved, the Mtn. Ave. School built specifically to serve the Sagebrush area would face continuing uncertainty over its future, forcing the families of Mtn. Ave. children to play a game of chance with their childrens' education each year. The first year Glendale could receive 130 requests while the second year Glendale might receive only 3 requests. Ultimately, however, the
affected grandfathered students would be gone, at which point the closure of the school would again be threatened. Is this a real threat? Who can speculate about what the financial situation of the Glendale district will be several years down the road and how they would consider a school with a reduced population base of 30 percent? Even more ominously, however, we have learned that schools in the area have in fact been closed by the district in the past due to inadequate enrollment.

(4) In closing, petitioners have argued more than once that this is exactly the situation envisioned by the policy makers when they wrote the relevant Education Code Section. The facts here do not bear them out. It is clear that the policy makers could not have envisioned or supported a situation where numerous persons who signed the petition claimed to be misled, regardless of whether or not it was unintentional; where the petitioners and their neighbors in the disputed petition area did not have a common vision of community identity; where substantial disruptions in educational programming would occur; or where ongoing uncertainties would be faced by hundreds if not thousands of children and their families as a result of a "grandfather clause."

For these and the other reasons set out above, we respectfully request that the Sagebrush petition be denied.

Thank you.
PLEASE
SIGN OUR PETITION
to transfer to
La Canada Unified School District

• What is the Petition for?
The Petition is a request to have the County investigate the issues involved in transferring our western edge of La Canada (about 0.6 square miles) from the Glendale Unified School District to the La Canada Unified School District. A public hearing will be held later.

• Why should we change school districts?
1. To unify all of La Canada into one school district.
2. To strengthen our community identity.
3. To enable our children to fully participate in local La Canada school-promoted sports activities as well as other functions.
4. To improve local control over educational matters.
5. To align the school and City boundaries along Pickens Canyon, a natural feature, rather than the arbitrary line drawn in the 1880's.

• Will my child be allowed to continue at Glendale schools?
Yes. Our request includes a Grandfather Clause where children now attending Glendale schools will have the option of remaining in Glendale schools. Pre-school aged siblings will also have this option. La Canada Unified School District supports this clause (see reverse).

• What is the Sagebrush Committee?
Our committee is composed of 60 parents residing in this area who actively support this change in school district boundaries. The current boundary at Rosebank Drive was drawn in the 1880's and marked the beginning of the sagebrush. Hence, our name.

If you wish to join our committee, please call Rose at (818) 248-2517.

• When will the Petition be circulated?
A neighbor will be contacting you this month to obtain your signature and, if necessary, register you to vote.

A-109
November 21, 1991

Dear Mr. McCoppin,

This letter is in response to your request for the La Canada Unified School District's position regarding the acceptance of students in the area presently being considered for annexation to the La Canada School District.

Please be advised that the District's practice is to allow any student within the District to attend schools in the District of their choice. Specifically, if a student is currently attending school in the Glendale Unified School District and is under consideration for annexation to the La Canada School District but chooses to remain in the Glendale Unified School District, the La Canada Unified School District would support such a decision and approve an Inter-District transfer request.

Please let me know if you have any further questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Andrew J. Meyer

Andrew J. Meyer
Showdown nears over La Canada students

By: Gaynor Komarny
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From A1

"The council's support is not legally necessary for the change to be implemented," said Burch. "But their support shows they think it's important for La Canada children to participate in and learn about their community."

The boundary change is expected to be implemented in July. A resolution to annex the Sagebrush area into its jurisdiction. The resolution "finds no detrimental impact on its existing program of instruction by transferring the 'sagebrush' area into its district."

The Glendale district is expected to fight the proposed transfer, citing organizational and financial problems.

Sagebrush committee member Jim Graf said, "the western end of La Canada has no sense of identity" because it is the only portion of the city not served by the La Canada district. "Mountain Avenue Elementary School or PTA President Carol Mollett said, "I believe it would be wonderful if school district lines would follow the city lines to unite the community."

Others expressed some doubts about the negative impact of "140 or more students coming in" to the La Canada district, but La Canada High School PTA president Maureen Progar countered, "even though it might be an impact on certain schools, it's our responsibility to do whatever we can to welcome them into the community."

The Los Angeles County Committee on School Organization will conduct public hearings in both districts in March to decide on whether to put the matter to a general vote. It is not yet known who will participate in the election.

Chris Valente
La Canada City Council

1993, she said.
At a public hearing held by the La Canada Unified School District Tuesday, sympathetic homeowners and parents sided overwhelmingly with the Sagebrush Committee.

The district is expected to pass a
Showdown nears in Sagebrush case

By Gabor Kamaromy and Margie Nelson

The Sagebrush Committee and its efforts to change school district boundaries has received support of the La Canada Flintridge City Council and the La Canada Unified School District.

But a showdown awaits with the Glendale Unified School District which has expressed opposition to enrolling 241 students in the move.

Members of the Sagebrush Committee met with the City Council school board Tuesday in an attempt to drum up local support for the annexation.

"We are a small city and it's important that we stay together and identify with our community," said Councilwoman Joan Feahan after hearing a report Tuesday by Sagebrush representative Maureen Burch.

"It's a long process, but it's moving," said Burch as she outlined the committee's efforts to make it possible for the La Canada children to attend Glendale schools.

Sagebrush / A-10

How the school districts compare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>La Canada</th>
<th>Glendale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of teachers</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-teacher ratio</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure per student</td>
<td>$4,899</td>
<td>$3,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of campuses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sagebrush

Continued from page A-1

who are now attending schools in the Glendale Unified School District to transfer to schools within La Canada Flintridge city limits, if they choose to do so.

"We shouldn't even question these efforts," said Councilman Chris Valeate. "These people live in La Canada, they pay taxes in La Canada and their children should be able to go to school in La Canada."

The council approved a resolution to support the boundary change 4-0, with Councilman Ed Phelps absent from the meeting.

"The council's support is not legally necessary for the change to be implemented," said Burch, "but their support shows they think it's important for La Canada children to participate in and learn about their community."

The boundary change is expected to be implemented in July 1993, she said.

At a public hearing held by the La Canada Unified School District Tuesday, sympathetic homeowners and parents sided overwhelmingly with the Sagebrush Committee.

The district is expected to pass a resolution to annex the Sagebrush area into its jurisdiction. The resolution "finds no detrimental impact on its existing program of instruction by transferring the 'sagebrush' area into its district."

The Glendale district is expected to fight the proposed transfer, citing organizational and financial problems.

The Los Angeles County Committee on School Organization will conduct public hearings in both districts in March to decide whether to put the matter to a general vote.

It is not yet known who will participate in an election, should one be held.
Sagebrush case

To the Editor:

I have just finished reading the article by Gabor and Margie (The Foothill Leader, Feb. 22, "Showdown nears in Sagebrush Case") and I wanted to express resentment of the fact that they quoted our PTA president talking about how wonderfully the school district lines would follow the city lines.

My children attend Mountain Avenue School. The article made it sound like Mountain Ave. PTA supports the Sagebrush Committee. Just because this woman is our president of the PTA, it doesn't necessarily follow the feeling of the school and I don't think it's appropriate to show the whole PTA is talking that way because our leader is talking that way.

I'm also on the PTA board and am a very active member and I don't agree with the Sagebrush Committee. I think if you are going to print something that our PTA president says, quote it as her opinion and not the opinion of the schools. Your article makes a biased reading.

— Grace Chase.
Montrose
LETTTERS

PTA president’s opinions her own

To the Editor:

I read, with interest, the letter from Grace Chase of Monrovia (The Foothill Leader, Feb. 26, "Sagebrush ‘case’"), voicing an opinion and support of the Sagebrush Committee at a recent public meeting.

I attended the meeting, as a resident directly affected by the issue. At no time did it occur to me that the (Mountain Ave. PTA president) was expressing anything other than her own opinion. She drew praise from other "Sagebrushers" and we welcome the support. The Mountain Ave. PTA is fortunate to have such a caring and considerate person for president.

Grace Chase’s comment, "I don’t agree with the Sagebrush Committee," incensed me. I wonder if it is the committee itself she disagrees with or the issue for which it stands.

I have no problem with anyone disagreeing with the committee, whether they understand the issue or not. However, her comments seem inappropriate, if directed toward the issue, when she lives outside the affected area.

Maybe she might have a different opinion if she lived within the Sagebrush corridor, instead of being merely an onlooker.

We will continue to welcome support from those who use common sense in recognizing the issue, whether directly affected or not.

Our children must be educated where we, as parents and guardians of their future, think it best for them. This is 1992, not 1892, and the reason for the previously imposed and arbitrary school boundary no longer exists. Let’s change it for their sake.

— Ian Page
La Canada

A-115
LETTERS

Clarifying stand on 'Sagebrush'

To the Editor:

I would like to respond to Ian Page's letter (The Foothill Leader, Feb. 29).

Mr. Page was misinformed or misread my letter to the editor on what I was disputing. I was not disputing my PTA president's personal stand on the Sagebrush issue, or any statement that she may have made at a Town Council meeting.

I disputed the way her statement was printed in the Feb. 29th article titled: "Showdown nears over 'La Canada' students."

I felt that the newspaper should have quoted her as a parent who lives in the "Sagebrush Corridor" and not as our PTA president, a title that represents Mountain Avenue Elementary School. I also agree with Ian Page that this person is "conservative and caring" and never stated otherwise.

It is my understanding that the Sagebrush Committee and the Sagebrush issue are one in the same and, yes, I have to say that I disagree with both.

I resent the implication that because I do not live in the "Sagebrush Corridor", that I should not have a right to voice an opinion. My common sense tells me that I am more than an "onlooker."

Because I do not live in the affected area of La Canada does not mean my children will be unaffected. The passing of this issue can threaten the existence of Mountain Avenue Elementary School or change boundary lines for hundreds of Glendale Unified School District children.

I urge all of us "onlookers" who have children in the elementary school system in the Glendale District to come and voice their opinion at the public hearing scheduled for March 9 at the Mountain Avenue Elementary School at 7:30 p.m. on this issue. The issue can impact all of our children, not just the children living in the "Sagebrush" area.

Grace J. Chase
Montrose
Glendale issues 'Sagebrush' stand

Glenda Jensen
Leader

Through it's no secret that the school board has been considering the transferring of nearly 250 students from the La Canada Unified School district to Glendale. The board officially announced its opposition to the move four months ago, but the parents of the students in the Sagebrush area of La Canada had already made the plans to transfer their children to Glendale.

Sagebrush committee spokes-
man James Graf was unavailable for comment on the letter."

Recently, the group submitted a petition to the county office of education that received support of 51 percent of the parents in the Sagebrush area.

In order for the office to consider such a change, the proposal needs the support of at least 25 percent of the community, according to Jim Marlett, a member of the county committee on school district organization.

But in the Feb. 28 letter to the county committee, Sanchis said the student population was over 51 percent of the parents in the Sagebrush area."

Sagebrush parents have also made the claim that the La Canada school board might be more responsive to the Sagebrush community, since it is in the school district."

But in the letter, Sanchis said the claim "has no basis in fact," noting that two of the members of the school board live in La Cienega. School board Sharon Benschamp, Mountain Avenue Elementary School, an area which the parents have requested to be included in the Sagebrush area.

Another reason that Sagebrush parents want to transfer their students is the overcrowding in the La Canada school district."

Sanchis, a member of the board, said that the district has been forced to make changes due to the shortage of space.

Besides responding to the parents' claims, Sanchis stressed that the loss of students could force the district to face a $4 million shortfall in state funds over a 10-year period.

"It's not just a drop in the bucket we're talking about," schools' spokesman Vic Pallos said Friday."

Pallos said that the board waited to take an official stance until the results from the petition were confirmed by the county committee.

"There was no reason for the board to make a big to do about their position until we got the results," Pallos said, "but I think individually, all the board members have already voiced their opinion."

The county committee will hold two public hearings on the issue this month."

The first will be held at Mountain Avenue Elementary School at 7:30 p.m. March 9. A second hearing will be 7:30 p.m. March 16 at Palm Crest Elementary.

Both hearings are open to the public.

Sagebrush/A-4
School district formally opposes Sagebrush plan

By Melinda Lemmon
Glendale News-Press

Although the Los Angeles County Board of Education formally adopted the lauded Sagebrush plan Friday morning, the Glendale Unified School District's Board of Education Opposed the plan on March 1. Although the differences between the Glendale Board of Education and the County Board of Education were relatively minor, the Glendale Board of Education formally adopted the plan at their February 29 meeting, which was held at 5 p.m. at the Glendale Unified School District Administration Building. The Glendale Board of Education met for the first time since the adoption of the plan. The Glendale Board of Education met for the first time since the adoption of the plan.

SAGEBRUSH

The area in reality has little to do with differences in city-school district boundaries, said Sanchis in the letter, adding that the Glendale schools' contribution to the Sagebrush community has helped it become one of the most desirable (communities) of any area in the school district.

Sagebrush parents have also made the claim that the La Canada school board might be more responsive to the Sagebrush community, since it is in La Canada. But in the letter, Sanchis said the claim has no basis in fact, noting that two of the members of Glendale's school board live in La Crescenta. School board member Sharon Beauchamp lives in the Mountain Avenue Elementary School area that would be affected by the changes.

Another reason Sagebrush parents give to support their case is that the changes would reduce overcrowding in the school district. Sanchis attacked the "claiming" that most of the schools in the Foothills are overcrowded. The changes would be "predictable" Pallos said.

Pallos added that the board waited to take an official stance until the results from the petition were confirmed by the county committees.

"There was no reason for the board to make a big to-do about their position until we got the results," Pallos said, "but I think, individually, all the board members have already voiced their opinion.

All of the county committees will hold their public hearings on the issue of the Sagebrush plan. The first will be held at Mountain Avenue Elementary School at 7:30 p.m. March 9. A second hearing will be at 7:30 p.m. March 16 at Palm Crest Elementary.

Both hearings are open to the public.

It's not just a drop in the bucket we're talking about," schools' spokesman Vic Pallos said Friday. Pallos said the "real danger" of the change would be that the board would not be able to adequately plan for the number of Sagebrush students who would seek to attend the Glendale district if given the chance.

Under the proposal, current Sagebrush-area students would be able to continue to attend Glendale schools if they chose to. "I think the board looks at the whole situation as unstable and unpredictable," Pallos said.

Pallos added that the board waited to take an official stance until the results from the petition were confirmed by the county committees.

"There was no reason for the board to make a big to-do about their position until we got the results," Pallos said, "but I think, individually, all the board members have already voiced their opinion.

The county committees will hold two public hearings on the issue.

The first will be held at Mountain Avenue Elementary School at 7:30 p.m. March 9. A second hearing will be at 7:30 p.m. March 16 at Palm Crest Elementary.

Both hearings are open to the public.

It's not just a drop in the bucket we're talking about," schools' spokesman Vic Pallos said Friday. Pallos said the "real danger" of the change would be that the board would not be able to adequately plan for the number of Sagebrush students who would seek to attend the Glendale district if given the chance.

Under the proposal, current Sagebrush-area students would be able to continue to attend Glendale schools if they chose to. "I think the board looks at the whole situation as unstable and unpredictable," Pallos said.

Pallos added that the board waited to take an official stance until the results from the petition were confirmed by the county committees.

"There was no reason for the board to make a big to-do about their position until we got the results," Pallos said, "but I think, individually, all the board members have already voiced their opinion.

The county committees will hold two public hearings on the issue.

The first will be held at Mountain Avenue Elementary School at 7:30 p.m. March 9. A second hearing will be at 7:30 p.m. March 16 at Palm Crest Elementary.

Both hearings are open to the public.
Glendale plays hardball over

By Melinda Jensen
Daily News, Glendale

After four months of quiet opposition to a controversial plan to create three new schools in the Glendale Unified School District, the Glendale school board appears ready to play hardball.

The five-member board sent a communication to the people at La Cañada School District, plus the five remaining members of the La Cañada school board, telling them it was against the proposal.

Supporting the proposal, the issue was brought to the board by committee chairperson at a meeting in February. According to the school board, the issue was referred to the committee and a new proposal was presented.

The board has a Tuesday meeting at 7 p.m. to discuss the proposal and a new report on the proposed changes. The meeting will be held at the school board meeting.

Supporting the proposal, the issue was brought to the board by committee chairperson at a meeting in February. According to the school board, the issue was referred to the committee and a new proposal was presented.


They feel like they've been taken for granted. The teachers say they're not getting the support they need. They're feeling frustrated.

"We're not getting the support we need," one teacher said. "They're not listening to us. They're not taking our concerns seriously."

Another teacher added: "They won't even listen to our suggestions."

The situation is getting worse, they say, and they're starting to lose hope.

In Cummings School, the atmosphere is tense. Teachers are feeling overwhelmed and frustrated.

"It's a difficult situation," one teacher said. "We feel like we're not being listened to."
La Canada for annexation

By Jake Doherty
Foothill Leader

As expected, the La Canada Unified School District passed a resolution Tuesday supporting the campaign to transfer about 250 students from the Glendale Unified School District.

The resolution is the latest public show of support for the Sagebrush Committee's campaign to change school district boundaries and unite all of La Canada Flintridge in one school district.

Two weeks ago, the La Canada Flintridge City Council passed a similar resolution supporting the proposal to allow children who live in La Canada Flintridge, but attend Glendale schools, to transfer to schools in their city.

In its resolution, the La Canada school district's governing board noted "the communal benefits" of the annexation and said it would
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create "no detrimental impact on its existing program of instruction."

The boundaries that define the two school districts are "out of date," said Irene Mondon, president of the governing board. The issue affects not just the schools, but is a "community issue," she said.

Carole Siegler, vice president of the board, said that people living in the Sagebrush area "don't feel as much a part of La Canada as they should."

The boundary change, she said, would "correct a quirk of geography."

According to figures provided by the Sagebrush Committee, 241 students who live in La Canada Flintridge attend three Glendale schools: 134 attend Mountain Avenue Elementary, 39 attend Rosemont Junior High and 68 attend Crescenta Valley High School.

The Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization will hold hearings in both districts after which it will determine whether to call an election to resolve the issue.

The hearings will be held at 7:30 p.m. on Monday at Mountain Avenue Elementary School, 2307 Mountain Ave. in La Crescenta, and on March 16 at 7:30 p.m. at Palm Crest Elementary School, 5025 Palm Drive in La Canada Flintridge.

The county committee must decide whether to hold an election or make a ruling itself within 120 days of Monday's hearing.
Parents clash over Sagebrush

By Melinda Jensen
Glendale News-Press

La Canada and La Crescenta residents shop in the same grocery stores, use the same hospital, and drink from the same water supply, but dozens of La Canada parents at a public hearing Monday night said they no longer want their children to attend La Crescenta schools.

"As parents, we want a strong sense of belonging larger than a family," said Jim Graf, a spokesman for a group of parents in the Sagebrush area of La Canada who want their children transferred from the Glendale school district to the La Canada school district.

"It seems that our children belong to another town," he said.

Graf was one of several parents who spoke at the hearing at Mountain Avenue Elementary School that will help the County Committee for School District Organization decide whether to grant the transfer, which would affect about 230 students.

The committee held the hearing in response to a community-driven petition signed by Sagebrush cross parents who felt their children would be better served in their hometown schools.

Following a second hearing March 16, the committee will decide whether to hold a community vote on the issue and, more importantly, which communities would be involved in the voting.

According to Graf and other parents who support the proposal, the boundary line in the Sagebrush area that separates the two school districts has alienated neighbors from one another and has cut Sagebrush students and their parents off from being involved in the La Canada district.

See Sagebrush / A7
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community.

But Sagebrush parents who oppose the proposal said at the hearing that their children had close ties to the La Canada community.

"When something has worked well for so long, why fix it?" said Bill Ferrill, adding that, for years, La Crescenta and La Canada residents have worked together to form a "true community."

Community involvement was not the only issue that sharply divided the more than 200 people attending the hearing.

A major issue was how much the proposed change would affect the Glendale school district and its other students.

Glendale Board of Education President Blanch Greenwood said the proposed change would cause a "great deal of disruption" for students and families.

Besides causing a possible 30 percent drop in enrollment at Mountain Avenue Elementary School — where the Sagebrush elementary students now attend — the change would cost the Glendale district about $400,000 in lost state funds per year, according to Greenwood.

If the proposal was passed, Greenwood said the Glendale school board would have to consider either closing Mountain Avenue or transferring students from up to three other elementary schools to fill the classrooms.

"We ask ourselves if the (Sagebrush) committee's rationale for the transfer is compelling enough to justify possibly uprooting hundreds of our students," Greenwood said.

"The board says no! It is not compelling enough," she added.

But Graf and other parents downplayed the possible effects of the proposal, noting that students involved in the potential transfer would only be a small percentage of the over 27,000 students in the Glendale district.

Graf also accused the Glendale Board of Education of using "scare tactics" to encourage opposition to the petition.

"Half the people in this audience wouldn't be here if the board hadn't posed the threat that (Mountain Avenue School) might be closed," Graf said.

Also speaking at the hearing were two officials from the La Canada school district, who said the district "had plenty of room" for the students and would welcome them with open arms.

The March 16 hearing will begin at 7:30 p.m. at Palm Crest Elementary School, 8025 Palm Drive, La Canada Flintridge.
Battle for children turns into a battle of petitions

By Melinda Jensen
Foothill Leader

The issue of whether the Glendale Board of Education should be forced to authorize the transfer of about 250 students to the La Canada School District has turned into a battle of the petitions.

The first one came in January, when a group of La Canada parents calling themselves the "Sagebrush Committee" submitted a 744-signature petition to the county requesting that students in the Sagebrush area of La Canada be permitted to attend schools in their hometown.

The second one surfaced at a county-sponsored public hearing Monday night, when Sagebrush parents opposing the proposal presented to the County Committee for School District Organization with a list of 1,020 names of area parents who were against the plan.

And a third petition is currently circulating among a group of parents who feel they were "duped" when they signed the first petition.

That petition, whose originators wish to remain nameless for now, will be submitted at a second public hearing Monday.

"I was misled," said parent Sandy Carper, who said she signed the original petition because she promised Sagebrush parents.
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Sense of community a factor in Sagebrush issue

By Melinda Jensen
Foothill Leader

La Canada Flintridge and La Crescenta residents shop in the same grocery stores, use the same hospital, and drink from the same water supply, but dozens of La Canada parents at a public hearing Monday night said they no longer want their children to attend La Crescenta schools.

"As parents, we want a strong sense of being something larger than a family," said Jim Graf, a spokesman for a group of parents in the Sagebrush area of La Canada who want their children transferred from the Glendale school district to the La Canada school district.

"It seems that our children belong to another town," he said.

Graf was one of several parents
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Parents claim they were duped on Sagebrush

By Melinda Jensen
Glendale News-Press

The issue of whether the Glendale Board of Education should be forced to authorize the transfer of about 250 students to the La Canada School District has turned into a battle of the petitions.

The first one came in January, when a group of La Canada parents calling themselves the "Sagebrush Committee" submitted to the county a 744-signature petition requesting that students in the Sagebrush area of La Canada be permitted to attend schools in their hometown.

The second one surfaced at a county-sponsored "public hearing" Monday night, when Sagebrush parents opposing the proposal presented the County Committee for School District Organization with a list of 1,020 names of area parents who were against the plan.

And a third petition is currently circulating among a group of parents who feel they were "duped" when they signed the first petition.

This third petition, whose originators wish to remain nameless for now, will be submitted at a second public hearing Monday.

"I was misled," said parent Sandy Carper, who said she signed the original petition because it promised Sagebrush parents a grandfather clause that would allow their children to stay in Glendale schools if they chose to.

However, the Glendale Board of Education recently passed a resolution that offered no guarantee that it would honor such a clause.

"How can (the petitioners) go around telling us where we could send our children to school when there was never any agreement with the Glendale district?" Carper said, adding that she has requested that her name be removed from the petition.

But Sagebrush Committee spokesman Jim Graf said the committee did not "knowingly mislead anyone," and blamed the Glendale Board of Education for not making a commitment to the clause.

"It seems incredible that the board can stand up and say they don't know if they want these children," Graf said.

See Sagebrush / A16
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who spoke at the hearing at Mountain Avenue Elementary School that will help the County Committee for School District Organization decide whether to grant the transfer, which would affect about 250 students.

The committee held the hearing in response to a community-driven petition signed by Sagebrush-area parents who felt their children would be better served in their hometown schools.

Following a second hearing on March 16, the committee will decide whether to hold a community vote on the issue and, more importantly, which communities would be involved in the voting.

According to Graf and other parents who support the proposal, the boundary line in the Sagebrush area that separates the two school districts has alienated neighbors from one another and has cut Sagebrush students and their parents off from being involved in the La Canada community.

But Sagebrush parents who oppose the proposal said at the hearing that their children had close ties to the La Canada community.

"When something has worked well for so long, why fix it?" said Bill Ferril, adding that, for years, La Crescenta and La Canada residents have worked together to form a "true community."

Community involvement was not the only issue that sharply divided the more than 200 people attending the hearing.

Also at issue was how much the proposed change would affect the Glendale school district and its other students.

Glendale Board of Education President Blanch Greenwood said the proposed change would cause "a great deal of disruption" for students and families.

Besides causing a possible 30 percent drop in enrollment at Mountain Avenue Elementary School, where the Sagebrush elementary students now attend, the change would cost the Glendale district about $400,000 in lost state funds per year, Greenwood said.

If the proposal was passed, Greenwood said the Glendale school board would have to consider either closing Mountain Avenue or transferring students from up to three other elementary schools to fill the classrooms.

"We ask ourselves if the (Sagebrush) committee's rationale for the transfer is compelling enough to justify possibly uprooting hundreds of students," Greenwood said.

"The board says no! It is not compelling enough," she added.

But Graf and other parents downplayed the possible effects of the proposal, noting that students involved in the potential transfer would only be a small percentage of the more than 2,000 students in the Glendale district.

Graf also accused the Glendale Board of Education of using "scare tactics" to encourage opposition to the petition.

"Half the people in this audience wouldn't be here if the board hadn't posed the threat that (Mountain Avenue School) might be closed," Graf said.

Also speaking at the hearing were two officials from the La Canada school district, who said the district "had plenty of room" for the students and would welcome them with "open arms."

The March 16 hearing will begin at 7:30 p.m. at Palm Crest Elementary School, 5025 Palm Drive, La Canada Flintridge.
La Canada District to Pay for Illegal Students

SCHOOLS: A one-time deal will allow up to 20 students to remain in La Canada schools.
Glendale Unified could receive up to $50,000.

DENISE HAMILTON
TIMES STAFF WRITER

In a controversial cash-for-student swap, La Canada Unified School District says it has agreed to pay Glendale Unified about $3,000 per pupil for up to 20 students who are attending La Canada schools in violation of state law.

Glendale Supt. Robert A. Sanchis verified through a spokesman that the deal took place but refused to comment further.

But La Canada officials defended their actions, saying they struck the one-time deal so that the students—many of which are at La Canada High School—would not be uprooted at midyear. The deal could cost the district up to $60,000 at a time when La Canada, like many other school districts, already faces budget constraints.

Phil Kauble, an official with the Los Angeles County Department of Education who sat in on a Jan. 6 meeting between the two districts to resolve the issue, says the transfer of money is not illegal. Kauble said he knows of three similar deals between other districts in the last 15 years.

The payments reflect the amount of state money that Glendale would receive annually for the missing students, said La Canada Assistant Supt. Andrew Meyer. He added that the students will not be allowed back into La Canada Unified schools next year unless Glendale Unified approves transfers.

La Canada Unified serves 3,364 students who live in La Canada Flintridge, a tony bedroom community of 20,800 where the average home price is between $500,000 and $850,000. La Canada students regularly score in the top 4% on standardized tests.

Glendale Unified's 23,900 students, meanwhile, come from all economic strata in the city of 195,000. The district has significantly lower test scores.

News of the swap has angered parents of some La Canada students, who say it is unfair for La Canada Unified to let a select group of students flout the law so they can attend one of the top districts in Los Angeles County. Some parents also claim that the Glendale students have edged La Canada children off athletic teams.

"It's unfortunate that [some] kids in our district don't get the opportunity to play sports they'd like because kids from outside the district are on these teams," said Anne Browne of La Canada Flintridge, who has six children in La Canada schools.

"People have sacrificed to move here so their kids could go to La Canada schools, and I feel not everyone is getting a fair shake," said Browne, who last fall sat on a schools committee that evaluated out-of-district enrollment.

Please see STUDENTS, 7.
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"We're losing money on this."

The controversy surfaced last fall when an unidentified group of parents apparently tipped off Glendale officials that an increasing number of students were attending La Canada schools illegally.

Although La Canada officials deny it, some local parents say the district has for years looked the other way in order to collect state funds doled out based on the number of students enrolled.

Now, however, "it's gotten so blatant that it's a joke; they're using friends' addresses and everybody knows it," said one La Canada mother, who didn't want to be quoted by name because she fears retaliation against her children.

Some parents claim that up to 200 students from outside the district attend La Canada Unified schools. But school officials say that perhaps only nine to 20 students are enrolled illegally. District officials said they won't have a "complete list until late March."

State law requires that enrolled students live with their immediate families within district boundaries.

Exceptions are made for foster children and those placed in local homes by the courts, said Kauble, who is a county consultant for attendance and administrative services.

Additionally, Kauble said, students can attend elementary school in a district if their parents work within the school district boundaries, a practice utilized, for instance, by some employees of NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory on the La Canada Flintridge-Pasadena boundary.

All such exceptions require authorization from the district in which the child resides.

Kaufle said La Canada officials apparently misunderstood the state law and allowed Glendale students who said they lived in La Canada Flintridge with family friends. La Canada officials also allowed in students who live outside the area but previously attended private schools in La Canada Flintridge.

La Canada officials now concede that they misinterpreted the law but say it is almost impossible for them to prove residency. "It's really difficult to verify where a child lives," Meyer said. "There are only two of us in the office, and we don't make home calls."
Panel Airs Dispute About Switch of School Systems

THE REGION

By VIKEN BERBERIAN
SPECIAL TO THE TIMES

Strong opposition surfaced this week to a proposal by a group of La Canada Flintridge residents to transfer their neighborhood of about 1,000 houses from Glendale to La Canada schools.

More than half of about 325 people who attended a hearing Monday on the proposal appeared to oppose it.

During the hearing before the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization, a Glendale group presented 950 signatures on a petition opposing the transfer, which could involve up to 240 students.

Speakers accused proponents of wanting to improve their property values and said the transfer would threaten to close Glendale’s Mountain Avenue Elementary School, which has won recognition for academic excellence.

Amid claps of support and mild jeering from both sides, supporters of the transfer contended that the existing city and school boundaries separate cul-de-sacs in the affected area, causing children who live at the opposite ends of the same street to attend schools in different districts.

“The residents of La Canada are torn between city and school,” said Carole Siegler, vice president of the governing board of LCUSD. “This is truly a community issue. What is best for the students should be the bottom line.”

One La Canada resident blasted the Glendale school board, which has opposed the annexation, for circulating thousands of flyers warning parents that students could be forced to change districts.

“I’m pleased to hear that the Glendale district is having budget problems when they’re spending money to print 10,000 flyers opposing the transfer,” said Bob Tanabe, a resident of the disputed area.

Glendale school officials said that the flyers were meant only to notify parents of the two public hearings.

The 888-acre residential area being considered for annexation is bounded by Foothill Boulevard on the south, Ocean View Drive and Pickens Canyon on the west, Highview Road on the north and Rosebank Drive on the east. The disputed area was incorporated in the city of La Canada in 1976 but has been a part of GUSD since 1886.

The group supporting the annexation calls itself the Sagebrush Committee, referring to a stand of sagebrush that once separated the neighborhood from La Canada. Sagebrush members petitioned the county committee last November. They gathered the signatures of 51% of the roughly 1,450 registered voters in the affected area favoring annexation, 26% more than committee’s requirement.

After the two hearings, the committee will vote on whether to call an election on the issue and, if so, what area to include in the voting.

The second hearing is to take place Monday at 7:30 p.m. at Palm Crest Elementary School, 5023 Palm Drive, La Canada Flintridge.
La Canada, Calif.

By Marilyn Sjosted

The La Canada Unified School District was ordered to return to class today by a judge of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. The judge ordered the district to return to class because of a lack of an agreement on a contract between the district and the teachers union.

In a 24-hour cease-fire, teachers have been allowed to return to their classrooms. The district is expected to begin negotiations on a new contract.

endale strike $60,000 deal

The Glendale Unified School District has agreed to a $60,000 settlement with the teachers union over the use of a new teaching method.

The Glendale Union High School District has agreed to pay the teachers union $60,000 to settle a contract dispute over the use of the new teaching method.

The Glendale Union High School District is expected to begin negotiations on a new contract.

FOOTBALL
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right now, but we don't know any
actual numbers at this time," 
Kauble said.

La Canada Assistant Super-
intendent Andrew Meyer said the
district was projecting a decline in
enrollment of 200 students next 
fall because the district was "ad-
justing" the way it handles inter-
district transfers.

Normally, transfers would be
approved a month before the
school year begins, Meyer said.
But the district this year has de-
cided to accept no transfer ap-
plications past March of the year
before the transfer, he added.

"We need more time to plan
for the school year," Meyer said.

The La Canada District cur-
cently has about 400 students 
enrolled who do not live in the
district, he said.

The La Canada District’s plan
has led some Glendale parents
who oppose a proposal to transfer
about 250 city students to La Can-
da and accuse the district of only
wanting Glendale students for
monetary reasons.

A group of parents in the
Sagebrush area of La Canada re-
cently requested in a petition that
students in that area be allowed to
attend their hometown schools.

At a March 9 hearing on the
subject, La Canada officials
praised the plan and presented to
the county a resolution support-
ing the transfer.

"We think the possibility of La
Canada losing all of those stu-
dents is a motivating factor in
their support of the Sagebrush
petition," said Roy Simmons,
who is active on a committee that
opposes the proposal.

At the hearing, some parents
referred to the La Canada school
district as "greedy."

But La Canada officials say
they support the proposal because
they feel it’s best for the students.

"There’s no denying that addi-
tional students are not going to
hurt us financially," said Carol
Siegel, vice president of the gov-
erning board of the La Canada
district, “but we’re supporting it
on that ‘sense of community’ idea
that we feel is important for the
children."

Siegel said the boundary line
in La Canada that separates the
La Canada and Glendale school
districts is "divisive."

"It seems a little strange that
kids who live in the same city
can’t go to school together,” she
said.
Students' Residency Scrutinized

**Education:** More than 100 students who may be illegally attending schools in the La Canada district are under investigation.

**PASADENA**

By DENISE HAMILTON
TIMES STAFF WRITER

Pasadena school officials say they are investigating up to 110 students who live in Pasadena but who are attending school in the La Canada Unified School District in possible violation of state law.

The news comes on the heels of a controversial cash-for-student swap in which La Canada agreed to pay Glendale Unified about $3,000 per pupil for up to 20 Glendale students who illegally attend La Canada schools.

Pasadena officials say they are meeting with the students' families to see whether any of the children would qualify for exceptions to the state law that requires that students attend school where they reside.

Philip Linsecomb, superintendent of Pasadena Unified, said he didn't know whether the district would press La Canada for $3,000 for each student found to be illegally enrolled or just insist that the students return to Pasadena next year.

"We're still looking at it," Linsecomb said Thursday.

A La Canada official confirmed Thursday that the district has met with Pasadena and is conducting its own investigation, but the official would not comment further.

Earlier this week, however, La Canada Assistant Supt. Andrew Meyer said the district agreed to the one-time Glendale deal so students would not be uprooted in the middle of the year. The $3,000 reflects state funds that districts would receive annually for each missing student.

Phil Kauble, an official with the Los Angeles County Department of Education, said cash-for-student swaps are not illegal. Kauble said he knows of three similar deals in the past 15 years.

News that so many out-of-district students are attending La Canada schools has angered some La Canada parents, who maintain that the students have edged La Canada children off athletic teams.

"People have sacrificed to move here so their kids could go to La Canada schools," said Anne Browne of La Canada Flintridge, who has six children in La Canada schools. "It's unfortunate that [some] kids in our district don't get the opportunity to play sports they'd like because kids from outside the district are on these teams."

La Canada Unified serves 3,364 students who live in La Canada Flintridge, a lower bedroom community of 20,800 where the average home price is between $500,000 and $650,000. La Canada students regularly score in the top 4% on standardized tests.

Pasadena Unified's 22,080 students, meanwhile, come from all economic strata in the city of 132,000. The district has significantly lower test scores.
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The controversy surfaced last fall when a Pasadena parent tipped off officials that students were attending La Canada schools illegally. Mark Facer, a consultant for Pasadena, said officials believe that some Pasadena parents falsified addresses.

State law requires that enrolled students live with their immediate families within district boundaries. Exceptions are made for foster children and those placed in local homes by the courts, said Kauble, a consultant for attendance and administrative services with the county education department.

Additionally, Kauble said, students can attend elementary school in a district if their parents work within the school district's boundaries, a practice utilized, for instance, by some employees of NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory on the La Canada Flintridge-Pasadena border.

All such exceptions require authorization from the district in which the child resides.

Although La Canada officials deny it, some parents say the district has for years looked the other way in order to collect state money based on the number of students enrolled.

Now, however, "It's gotten so blatant that it's a joke. They're using friends' addresses, and everybody knows it," said one La Canada mother, who didn't want to be identified because she fears retaliation against her children.

Some parents maintain that there are up to 200 students from outside the district attending the city's schools, many at La Canada High School. La Canada officials, who say the figure is much lower, expect to have a complete list by late March.

Kaufle said La Canada officials apparently misunderstood the state law and enrolled students who said they lived in La Canada Flintridge with family friends. La Canada officials also allowed the attendance of students who live outside the area but previously attended private schools in La Canada Flintridge.

La Canada officials now concede that they misinterpreted the law but say it is almost impossible for them to prove residency. "It's really difficult to verify where a child lives," Meyer said. "There are only two of us in the office, and we don't make home calls."
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Enrollment Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balboa</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerritos</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>1,338</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>1,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunsmore</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keppel</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Crescenta</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mira</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>1,917</td>
<td>2,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>1,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Vista</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Ave</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muir</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>1,491</td>
<td>1,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdant Wdlands</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.D. White</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>1,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14,719</td>
<td>15,744</td>
<td>16,788</td>
<td>17,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>1,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemont</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>1,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toll</td>
<td>1,646</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>1,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>1,529</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>1,757</td>
<td>1,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,544</td>
<td>5,196</td>
<td>5,495</td>
<td>5,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescenta Valley</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>1,917</td>
<td>2,114</td>
<td>2,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>2,305</td>
<td>2,451</td>
<td>2,698</td>
<td>2,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoover</td>
<td>2,063</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,113</td>
<td>6,898</td>
<td>7,213</td>
<td>7,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total K-12</td>
<td>26,700</td>
<td>28,161</td>
<td>29,820</td>
<td>30,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College View</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ed.</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>27,078</td>
<td>28,539</td>
<td>30,198</td>
<td>31,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Increase</td>
<td>5.72%</td>
<td>5.40%</td>
<td>5.81%</td>
<td>3.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT ENROLLMENT HISTORICAL INFORMATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRST MONTH ENROLLMENT FIGURE COMPARISON AND ANALYSIS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Source for 1991-92: 9/25/91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELEMENTARY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-86</td>
<td>Sep-87</td>
<td>Sep-87</td>
<td>Sep-88</td>
<td>Sep-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balboa</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>13.18%</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrillo</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>5.81%</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>9.53%</td>
<td>859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunsmore</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>7.23%</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>-1.06%</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>-8.04%</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
<td>807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keppel</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>11.81%</td>
<td>1046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Crescenta</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>10.34%</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>-5.81%</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mann</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>1029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>16.43%</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Vista</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muir</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
<td>853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdugo Wilds</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.D. White</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>14.68%</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College View</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Elementary</td>
<td>9984</td>
<td>10587</td>
<td>6.04%</td>
<td>11663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUNIOR HIGH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>8.41%</td>
<td>1228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toll</td>
<td>1384</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>9.18%</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>1179</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>2.88%</td>
<td>1331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jr. High</td>
<td>4280</td>
<td>4553</td>
<td>6.38%</td>
<td>4928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SENIOR HIGH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent Valley</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>32.96%</td>
<td>2716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>2126</td>
<td>2134</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>2133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoover</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sr. High</td>
<td>5962</td>
<td>5880</td>
<td>-1.38%</td>
<td>5763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily High</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>-9.83%</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td>20496</td>
<td>21264</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>22586</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENRLPRO2XLS A-135 3/10/92
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>1973/74 Student Enrollment</th>
<th>1991/92 Student Enrollment</th>
<th># of Students Incr/Decr</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dunsmore</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>-91</td>
<td>-15.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>49.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Crescenta</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>-66</td>
<td>-13.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>19.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell *</td>
<td>252 (*)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Vista</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>17.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montrose *</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Avenue</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>-71</td>
<td>-13.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley View *</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdugo Woodlands</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>-211</td>
<td>-26.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Elementary</td>
<td>4,999</td>
<td>3,728</td>
<td>-1,271</td>
<td>-25.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark *</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemont</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-1.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jr High</td>
<td>2,226</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>-1,152</td>
<td>-51.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescenta Valley</td>
<td>2,042</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>-297</td>
<td>-14.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sr. High</td>
<td>2,042</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>-297</td>
<td>-14.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA TOTAL</td>
<td>9,267</td>
<td>6,547</td>
<td>-2,720</td>
<td>-29.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area % of Total Enrollment</td>
<td>40.72%</td>
<td>24.52%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-16.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DISTRICT ENROLLMENT</td>
<td>22,759</td>
<td>26,700</td>
<td>3,941</td>
<td>17.32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: CBEDS

* Note: These sites are no longer used by the District for instructional education.

Montrose and Lowell sites are no longer owned by the District.
* Schools excluded in comparison

MAP OF GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

1. BALBOA
2. CERRITOS
3. COLUMBUS
4. DUNSHORE
5. EDISON
6. FIELD SITE
7. FRANKLIN
8. FREMONT
9. GLENDALE
10. JEFFERSON
11. KEPPEL
12. LA CRESCENTIA
13. LINCOLN
14. LOWELL SITE
15. MANHATTAN
16. MARSHALL
17. MONTE VISTA
18. MOUNTAIN AVENUE
19. MTER
20. VALLEY VIEW SITE
21. VERDUGO WOODLANDS
22. WHITE
23. COLUMBUS ORTHOPEDIC UNIT

JR. HIGH SCHOOLS
24. CLARK SITE
25. ROOSEVELT
26. ROSENBLATT
27. TOLL
28. WILSON

SR. HIGH SCHOOLS
29. CRESCENTA VALLEY
30. GLENDALE
31. HOOVER
32. ALLAN DAILY
33. DEVELOPMENT CENTER
34. GLENDALE COLLEGE
35. GLENDALE COLLEGE - MONTROSE CAMPUS
36. CENTRAL OFFICE
37. M & S & DISTRICT WAREHOUSE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1ST</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ND</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4TH</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5TH</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6TH</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH SDC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH SDC</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LCE</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Paradise Canyon Elementary School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1ST</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ND</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4TH</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5TH</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6TH</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH SDC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH SDC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PCY</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Palms Crest Elementary School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1ST</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ND</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4TH</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5TH</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6TH</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH SDC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH SDC</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PCY</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LA CANADA HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7TH</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-346</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8TH</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LN SDC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM SDC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 7-8</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9TH</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10TH</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11TH</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12TH</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LN SDC</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM SDC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 9-12</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,132</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LCHS</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>1,336</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,561</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,675</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|       | CONTINUING HIGH SCHOOL |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 10-12 | 31        | 21       | -      | 17      | -      | 18      | -      | 0       | 21      | 21      | 21      | 21      | 21      | 21      |       |
| CITY  |           |           |       |         |       |         |       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |       |
| ALL   | 67        | 58       | -      | 65      | -      | 53      | -      | 0       | 53      | 53      | 53      | 53      | 53      | 53      |       |

A-139
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL K-6</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td>1,909</td>
<td>1,763</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH SOC</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH SOC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL K-6</td>
<td>1,803</td>
<td>1,936</td>
<td>1,784</td>
<td>1,862</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL 7-8</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH SOC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH SOC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 7-8</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL 9-12</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>1,094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH SOC</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH SOC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 9-12</td>
<td>1,067</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTHS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>3,521</td>
<td>3,529</td>
<td>3,452</td>
<td>3,708</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE FROM FY</td>
<td>-46</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>-203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"A-140"
Miscellaneous Information
11 April 1992

Mr. R. Wayne Stark
LA County Committee On School District Organization
c/o Mr. James R. Marlett
Division of Business Advisory Services
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242-2890

Dear Mr. Stark,

As a resident of the Sagebrush Area, I would like to request your consideration to allow the students living in this area of La Canada to be transferred to the La Canada School District. I would also suggest that you limit the voting area to the voting residents in the Sagebrush section.

The reasons for this request are many, but to simplify them, I strongly support the idea of community unity that is so needed here. On many issues, we do feel rather left out, because so much of a "small town" environment revolves around the school programs.

I have been most upset by the reactions of the Glendale School Board which has created a rather hostile environment among our PTA workers. And several of my daughter's classmates have blamed her for "the closure of Mountain Avenue School and the loss of her teacher's job." It has been very difficult for her.

We have four sons who attended Mountain Avenue School and the quality of education has never been in question. But after 100 years, changes in boundary lines can be made and the time is right.

Now that the public hearings are over, the Glendale School Board who presented the facts of decreased monies for the school district has now hired an attorney to prevent this transfer of students from taking place. How many more programs will the students lose because of this decision to spend thousands of dollars on non-curriculum expenses?

Thank you for your time and effort to resolve a most sensitive situation. Since both school districts are capable of "surviving" with us or without us, please allow the residents in this area to decide which school district they would like to attend.

Sincerely,

Susan Frost
April 13, 1992

Mr. R. Wayne Stark  
LA County Committee on School District Organization  
C/O Mr. James R. Marlatt  
Division of Business Advisory Services  
Los Angeles County Office of Education  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, CA 90242-2890

RE: Transfer of western La Canada Flintridge from Glendale Unified to La Canada Unified School District

Dear Mr. Stark and Mr. Marlatt:

We are writing to let you know of our support for the transfer of the above mentioned area to the La Canada School District.

We have lived in our home at 2101 Earnslow Drive in La Canada for 12 years. We now have two sons, ages 5 years and 6 months. Although Mountain Avenue is an excellent school, we believe that since we live in La Canada we should have the right to attend a La Canada school. We pay our taxes as a La Canada citizen and even get letters asking us to donate more money to help the La Canada schools, when we don't even have the privilege of attending them.

We believe that only this affected area of western La Canada should be the ones voting on this transfer. What right does "Joe Blow" who lives in Glendale have to tell us, the citizens of La Canada what school we can go to???!!

We hope that you will vote that it is the proper action to correct these school district lines and allow us and our neighbors in La Canada to attend the schools in our city.

Sincerely,

Robert & Sharon Ross  
2101 Earnslow Drive  
La Canada, CA 91011

Robert and Sharon Ross
2101 Earnslow Drive
La Canada, CA 91011

A-142
April 12, 1992

Dear Mr. Stark,

We bought our home in La Canada after living in Beverly Hills for many years because we loved the area and were so impressed with the school system. We also learned that our children were not to be allowed to go to the La Canada schools. What a shock! We live in La Canada schools. What a shock! We are not sure if we can support the La Canada schools, but we are not good enough to attend La Canada schools. There is nothing against the Glendale school system, but we want to be a total member of our city.

I feel that all of La Canada should vote on this—not just our Sagebrush area. We need their support—and we have it!
April 12, 1992

Mr. R. Wayne Stark
Los Angeles County Committee
on School District Organization
Division of Business Advisory Services
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242-2890

Attention Mr. James R. Marlatt

Dear Sir:

As a resident of the western portion of La Canada living in what has become known as the "Sagebrush Area", I would like to express my support for the transfer of this area from the Glendale School District to the La Canada School District. I urge you to allow this issue to be placed before the registered voters of the "Sagebrush Area" so that the people most affected can decide the future for their children.

I know that members of your committee attended both community meetings last month and I am sure you have received a large amount of correspondence from both sides of this issue. Therefore, I won’t rehash the reasons why this transfer should take place since I’m sure you are aware of both sides of the argument. The one point I would like to emphasize, though, is that your decision should be based on what will be best for the students most affected by the proposed change. That is, the residents of the concerned area should be allowed to vote on this issue. The opponents of the change have stated that the residents of this area were misled and that there isn’t the support stated by the "Sagebrush Committee". I recently moved to this area from La Crescenta so I don’t know how true that statement is. However, as a resident who has children who will be affected, I for one support the transfer. If the opponents are right in that there isn’t support in this area, the best way to find out is to allow us to vote.

It would serve no purpose to allow the entire Glendale School District area to vote. The Glendale District has already shown that they will use district resources to mislead the students and their parents creating undue fear. Therefore, if the entire City were to vote on the issue, the election would be moot. Please, allow only those people most affected by the proposed change to decide their future.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Dan Watson
5604 Ocean View Blvd
La Canada, CA, 91011
MR. R. Wayne Stark

Attn: Co. Committee on School District Organization

go to: Mr. James Markett

Division of Business Advisory Services
L.A. Co Office Education

9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242-2840

Dear Mr. Stark:

We live in the Sagebrush area of La Canada and support the transfer of Glendale School District to the La Canada School District.

As parents of 2 pre-schoolers, we feel that the voting should be limited to those in the Sagebrush area as we are the ones directly affected.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Janet Adandini Meyers
David A. Meyers

RECEIVED APR 14 1992
Dear Mr. Stark,

The last thing in the world I would want to happen is for my 6 year old boy to be pulled out of one of the finest elementary schools I've ever encountered. Mountain Ave school has teachers who genuinely care about their students, teaching techniques that make learning fun, and the envolvement of parents. I'm afraid that this battle over a couple hundred students is more of a power play by La Canada to qualify for dollars from the government than it is to inspire community spirit and pride.

Why not let the families of the children decide which school they would like to send their children to? Talk to the teachers at Mountain Ave. Listen to the energy and enthusiasm. Learn about the awards they've received and appearances on talk radio (KABC). Don't ruin a good thing. If Mountain Ave were to give up 1/3 of its students, it would not survive. Please keep that in mind when making your decision.

ANY VOTING SHOULD BE BY THE SAGEBRUSH PARENTS ONLY.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Robert & Yvonne Baldwin
Sagebrush parents
2216 Fairhurst Dr.
La Canada, CA  91011

RECEIVED APR 1 3 1992
Mr. James R. Marlatt  
Management Consultant  
Regionalized Business Services  
Division of Business Advisory Services  
Los Angeles County Office of Education  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, CA  90242-2890

Dear Mr. Marlatt:

We are parents living in La Canada. Our children attend La Canada Schools. We are very much in favor of the transfer of Sagebrush residents to La Canada schools. These people live within the geographical boundaries of our City and we feel it is only right that they attend our schools.

Thank you for your consideration.

Miro and Marian Macho
April 9, 1992

Mr. R. Wayne Stark
LA County Committee on School District Organization
C/o Mr. James R. Marlett
Division of Business Advisory Services
L. A. County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242-2890

Dear Mr. Stark:

As a parent and resident of the La Canada Sagebrush area, I would request your support for the transfer of our area to the La Canada School District from the Glendale Unified School District.

This transfer would not only be beneficial to us Sagebrush area residents but for both Districts. The City of Glendale is experiencing tremendous growth and as such can afford to give us up in order for them to take care of their explosive enrollment growth. It also promotes the community spirit among La Canada residents.

Also, the voting district on this issue should be limited to us, Sagebrush residents.

5414 Rock Castle Drive, La Canada, California 91011

A-148

RECEIVED APR 13 1992

(310) 257-0367
818
April 10, 1992

R. Wayne Stark
L.A. County Committee On School District Organization
% James R. Marlatt
Division Of Business Advisory Services
Los Angeles County Office Of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, California 90242-2890

Dear Mr. Stark:

I would like to state my support of the transfer of the "Sagebrush" area into the La Canada School District. I also believe that the voting district should be limited to the "Sagebrush" area residents. My sons are now college age, but this would still be a tremendous educational opportunity for parents with younger children.

Sincerely,

Daniel G. Minjares
5165 Ocean View Blvd.
La Canada, California 91011
MR. R. Wayne Stark  
L.A. County Committee on School District Organization  
C/O Mr. James R. Lehman  
Div. of Business Advisory Services  
L.A. County Office of Education  
9300 Imperial Hwy  
Downey, CA 90242-2890  

Dear Mr. Stark:  

My wife and I have 2 children (9 & 11 yrs) and we live in the Sagesbrush area of La Canada. Our address is 4907 Ocean View Blvd.  

I am writing to you in support of the transfer of our area into the La Canada school district. It has always bothered me that our La Canada home (address) did not allow us to send our children to the La Canada school system. The city lines, in my opinion, should also be the boundaries of the school district.  

I would also like to express my support for the voting on this matter to be limited to only the residents living in the Sagesbrush area. It is obvious that each district (both La Canada & Glendale) would like to have the additional students and the money that they would bring. If either district, therefore, were to be allowed to vote, the vote would be unfairly skewed in that direction. I feel that only those residents directly involved should be allowed to vote. As I said earlier, I live in La Canada, my kids should be allowed to attend La Canada schools.  

Sincerely,  

Charles H. May

Julie E. Smith  
RECEIVED APR 13 1992
Mr. R. Wayne Stark  
LA County Committee on School District  
Organization  
c/o Mr. James R. Marlatt  
Division of Business Advisory Services  
Los Angeles County Office of Education  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, CA 90242-2890

Re: Transfer of La Cañada Sagebrush Area  
From Glendale School District to  
La Cañada School District

Dear Mr. Stark/Mr. Marlatt:

We express our firm support for the transfer of the Sagebrush Area of La Cañada Flintridge (Ocean View Boulevard) from the Glendale School District to the La Cañada School District. We also urge that the voting district be limited to Sagebrush Area residents, because that area is the part of the City of La Cañada Flintridge directly affected by the initiative.

We are residents and property owners of the above residence in the City of La Cañada Flintridge. We do not live in Glendale or La Crescenta. The proposed measure is of particular relevance to us because we have a three-year-old son who will soon be attending school.

Sincerely,

[Signatures]
Alan M. Kindred
Maureen Kindred

AMK/d1

A-151  RECEIVED APR 13 1992-
April 8, 1992

Dear Mr. Stark and Committee Members,

You and I worry about the children in L.A. County. We worry about drugs, teen pregnancy, gangs, educational achievement, social interaction etc., etc. And we want to help.

Moving the "Sagebrush" families into the La Canada School District is one way to help some of our kids. It gives them one more very strong strand in their network of support. So often we hear that kids opt for gang membership or drugs because they feel isolated. They want to feel like they belong or they don't want to feel anything. Whether or not they go to the extremes of gangs or drugs, our kids need to feel like they belong.

By allowing the "Sagebrush" children to attend their community schools, you integrate them into their community. They belong, they are not just a fringe element. It is very easy to trivialize this desire for community identity. Some people do not value it especially if they have not experienced it.

My children attended Mountain Ave School the first year that we lived in La Canada. Then Palm Crest School reopened in our neighborhood and because of day care needs the children were permitted to attend this school. There was a big change in our participation in town activities, and in our identification with the town itself. Much more than before, the town belonged to us and we to it.

La Canada is a small town. Almost all of the residents are in the La Canada School District. In La Canada many town activities are centered around the schools. If children are not in the La Canada schools they miss out or feel like outsiders. They are not part of the main stream.

I think there is a trend toward community identity and participation today. Reflecting this trend, La Crescenta, where Mountain Ave School is located, formed a Town Council recently. I think this trend is a good one that will help our children and our communities.

We all work hard for our children to flourish. We try to provide our kids with family, sports, community and educational activities to nurture and support them. By allowing the "Sagebrush" children to attend their community schools, you would give them the opportunity to strengthen the fabric of their support system. This interwoven network of support is the best we can give our kids. Please give it to the "Sagebrush" children.

Thank you for caring about our children.

Best wishes,

Chris Lavery
"Sagebrush" Resident
2225 Cross St.
La Canada, Ca. 91011

A-152

RECEIVED APR 13 1992
Dear Mr. Stark,

I am writing to let you know of my support of the "Sagebrush" proposal to make the La Canada Flintridge city boundaries and school district boundaries the same. My family lives on the eastern edge of the disputed area. We can see Palm Crest School from our yard and reach it easily with a four minute walk. To attend Mountain Avenue requires a longer walk and involves crossing a heavily traveled intersection. We believe La Canada children should attend La Canada schools. We also feel that should this come to a vote, the Sagebrush area should be the voting area as this truly concerns us. Thank you for your presence at the public hearings and your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Laura E. Serxner

[Signature]

RECEIVED APR 13 1992
Dwight D. Campbell  
5201 Castle Road  
La Canada, CA 91011  
818/502-0452

Mr. R. Wayne Stark  
LA County Committee On School District Organization  
C/o James R. Marlatt  
Division of Business Advisory Services  
Los Angeles County Office of Education  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, Ca. 90242-2890

April 7th, 1992

Dear Sir,

I am write about the Sagebrush Area and the Residents. It would be a great thing to see it transferred back to La Canada. Also, I think belongs within the boundaries of this community. When the voting district is picked I hope that it is representive of the people affected by the issue.

The studies I've read draw a lot of comparisons in terms of abilty, size and specialities of the schools in Glendale/La Canada. However, the growth and needs seem to support the change back to the natural boundaries of the sagebrush area.

Please keep us informed about future changes.

Sincerely Yours,

[Signature]

Dwight D. Campbell
April 8, 1992

Mr. R. Wayne Stark
LA County Committee on School District Organization
c/o Mr. James R. Marlatt
Division of Business Advisory Services
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242-2890

Dear Sir:

As a resident of the Sagebrush Area of La Canada, I wish to register the strong wishes and feelings of both my wife and myself that this area be transferred from the Glendale School District into the La Canada School District.

We very much favor this move since it is only natural and right that as residents of La Canada, we be in the same school district as the community of which we are a part. La Canada is where we live, shop, go to church, and to which our loyalties are, and therefore we also want to be a part of the La Canada School District.

We also feel strongly that the only ones who should be permitted to vote in this matter are the residents of the Sagebrush Area since we are the only ones really affected by this matter.

Thank you for your kind and gracious consideration of this matter.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

A. J. Straatemeyer, Ph.D. (and Mrs. Marcine Straatemeyer)
5035 Ocean View Blvd.
La Canada, CA 91011-1239

A-155 RECEIVED APR 13 1992
5467 La Forest Drive
La Canada, CA 91011
March 31, 1992

Mr. James Marlett, Management Consultant
Regionalized Business Services
Los Angeles County Board of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242-2890

Dear Mr. Marlett:

I am writing in support of the Sagebrush Committee’s objective of annexing their area to the La Canada Unified School District. I believe the issue should be placed on a ballot to be voted upon by those who reside in the immediately affected areas only. Any extension of the voting eligibility to the full Glendale district would unfairly skew the results to reflect the opinions of others who are not directly involved with the problems Sagebrush families face.

I live on a street where my near neighbors are forced to attend La Crescenta schools. The children are basically next door to me and within easy walking distance of La Canada’s Palm Crest Elementary, yet they are not allowed to attend due to the district lines. I believe this is wrong.

I understand that one of the objections of the Mountain Avenue parents is that there is a possibility of their school closing. I have no way of knowing if this is a legitimate concern. However, when I moved to La Canada in 1984, Palm Crest was closed, so I know what it is like to drive children to another elementary, and then later to high school four miles from home (starting in 7th grade, since the junior high was also closed). I know it is an inconvenience, but it is not a serious enough problem to stand in the way of reuniting a community’s students. With carpools, the inconvenience became quite minor.

I hope the Board of Education will act fairly in this regard and allow only those affected the most to vote on this matter.

Yours truly,

Noreen Kukkonen

RECEIVED APR 13 1992
Fritz Riel
5414 Rock Castle Drive
La Canada, CA 91011
818-957-0367

8 April 1992

Mr. R. Wayne Stark
LA County Committee on School District Organization
c/o Mr. James R. Howlett
Division of Business Advisory Services
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242-2890

Gentlemen:

As a resident and parent of the La Canada Sagebrush area, I am kindly requesting your support in transferring our children back to the La Canada School District where we as residents of La Canada should have been all along. Only the residents of the Sagebrush area should be eligible to decide this matter since they are the only people affected.

Received Apr 9, 1993

We appreciate your help and support in this matter.

Sincerely,

Fritz Riel
April 7, 1992

Dear Mr. Stark and Committee Members,

I completely support the petition to include all of Ta Canada in Ta Canada Schools. As a resident of the Sagebrush area, I have experienced first hand the sense of being "neither fish nor fowl." It's amazing what a difference a school boundary can make as to who you get to know and who you are able to mingle with.

I would hope that when this subject comes to a ballot, you will let the residents of the Sagebrush decide their future. This change has been long overdue. A boundary established in the 1880's is archaic. Take a drive in our neighborhood. Ask for yourself. It's time our small city of 2000 was reined.

Thank you for your time and effort in listening to our petition.

Genuely,

Alice Butts
2150 Lyons Dr.
La Canada CA. 91011
Mr. James R. Marlett  
Management Consultant  
Regionalized Business Services  
Division of Business Advisory Services  
Los Angeles County Office of Education  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, CA. 90242-2890  

Subject: Transfer of Western LA Canada Flintridge from Glendale Unified to La Canada Unified School District  

Dear Mr. Marlett;  

I support the above mentioned transfer from the Glendale Unified to the La Canada Unified School District. We are residents of La Canada and we strongly believe that our children should get their education in the city they are living in and not in another city. We are not implying that the Glendale Unified School system is not providing good education to the children in their district, it is just the time to have our children attend the schools in our area.  

Please consider this pledge when making your decision on the fate of the unity of our school district as a whole.  

Thank you for your wise decision.  

Freddy J. Dickens  
5802 Ocean View Blvd.  
La Canada Flintridge, CA 91011  
(818) 957-0094
Mr. R. Wayne Stark, Chairman  
L. A. County Committee on School District Organization  
c/o Mr. James R. Marlett  
Division of Business Advisory Services  
Los Angeles County Office of Education  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, CA 90242-2890

Dear Mr. Stark:

I have attended the two hearings you have held regarding the petition by 51% of the voters residing in the Westerly part of La Canada Flintridge who have requested that the school district boundaries be changed so that children in this area may attend school in the city in which they reside.

Due to time constraints at the hearings, I did not have an opportunity to adequately express my thoughts.

First of all, it is hard to understand the hard-line stance of the Glendale Unified School Board against giving up no more than 260 of its 27,000 students. This number is far fewer than the annual growth of the Glendale District.

The Sage Brush Committee, which represents residents in the small strip of La Canada involved, requested that the change be implemented over a period of time with grandfather provisions. It is difficult to understand why the Glendale Board objects to this orderly transition while at the same time saying it is concerned about disruption. They allow other children to enroll in their district using inter-district transfers through out the summer.

Why has the Glendale Board threatened to close the Mountain Avenue Elementary School at a time when the district enrollment is rapidly growing, other schools are crowded and class sizes are increasing?

Many of the children and their parents have been frightened by literature distributed by the Glendale Schools, and some appear gullible enough to believe it because of the source.

Glendale School events are not covered by the La Canada Valley Sun, the weekly newspaper subscribed to by most residents of the Sage Brush area. Identity is missing for students living in this area that other children living elsewhere in La Canada enjoy.
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The questionable leadership of the Glendale District is holding hostage children that want to establish roots, community identity, civic pride and truly become a part of the city in which they live.

Isn't it about time to look at the true motives of those who have frantically opposed the wishes of La Canada residents to send their children to La Canada Public Schools?

The truth of the matter was not revealed by the protesters at the hearings. Instead, a smoke screen of irrelevant issues was raised.

I urge you to think about their motives and know through your experience that you will exercise your best judgement.

In all fairness, please let this matter proceed to a vote that is restricted to residents of the Sage Brush Area.

Sincerely,

John R. Burrows
April 6, Ocean View Blvd.
La Canada
CA 91011

March 30, 1992

Jim Marlagt
Division of Business Advisory Services
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242 - 2890

Subject: Proposed Change of School District from Glendale to La Canada for the residents of Western La Canada.

Dear Sir:

I am a resident of 4606 Ocean View Blvd. in the Western La Canada. I am writing to this committee because I did not get a chance to speak at the second public hearing at Palmcrest School on the subject matter.

Most of my neighbors and myself have been extremely anguished by the present school district boundaries. We live in the city of La Canada and yet our children cannot participate in the social and cultural events enjoyed by kids living in the rest of La Canada. There are some occasions when our kids have to play against La Canada. The emotional toll on our kids is very severe. This is a great injustice that needs to be rectified now.

The Glendale School District pays little attention to the loss of community identity for kids in the Sagebrush area. If they had any regard for our kids, they would have readily agreed to the proposed grandfather clause. But their unwillingness to agree to this clause as well as opposition to the proposed change in the school district boundary shows that they are interested in nothing other than the dollars that they get from this area which is pretty meager an amount compared to their total budget.

I strongly urge the committee to let residents of Western La Canada decide about their school district by means of the ballot process. This is the least we can ask for in a democratic society to try to change an old and outdated system. Further, the issue should be decided only by the residents of La Canada. Otherwise, we would lose our privilege of being able to decide an issue so important to our city.

Truly yours,

Pramod K. Sharma

Pramod K. Sharma
Mon. 31st 92

Please, just the bottom line on the whole subject. Families who live in the Canadian
Flintridge should be able to have their children attend the schools in their district.
That's all there is to it.
Not complicated at all.
Just the right thing to do.
Right the wrong that was done long time ago.

Sincerely yours,

Alice M. Carroll

President of the Bond Trustee for 29 yrs.

RECEIVED APR 6 1932
Mr. James R. Marlatt                              April 1, 1992
Management Consultant
Regionalized Business Services
Division of Business Advisory Services
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242-2890

Subject: Proposed Transfer of Territory from Glendale Unified to La Canada Unified School District

Dear Mr. Marlatt,

I attended the recent public hearings at Mountain View Elementary School in La Crescenta and at Palm Crest Elementary School in La Canada Flintridge. I am a resident of the "Sagebrush Area" and I strongly support the transfer of territory from the Glendale School District to the La Canada School District. I feel compelled to express my personal views on this issue to you in this letter. As I see it, the entire opposition to the proposed transfer of territory from the Glendale to La Canada boils down to three main issues:

1) **Glendale Schools teachers/employees fear of losing their jobs:**

   This is an unfounded fear inspired by the Glendale School Board (GSB) in their statement that they "may" have to close Mountain Avenue School. This fear is emphasized by the fact that the majority of "public" speakers opposed to the transfer and living in the Sagebrush area at both public hearings are themselves (or their spouses) employees of the Glendale School District.

   I feel the GSB is intentionally misleading the public on this issue in order to stir up emotional opposition. The fact that Glendale Schools are currently overcrowded with only rapid growth in sight seems to go unnoticed. This transfer of territory would give Glendale a chance to relieve some of the overcrowding in neighboring elementary schools, and at the same time let these Glendale students attend their premiere elementary school.

   It seems to me that the GSB is acting irresponsibly in their consistent exaggeration of the possible negative impacts. They used terms such as "as much as" when describing lost revenue, which is apparently grossly overstated. They did not acknowledge that fewer students require less money to support. They used the terms "may have to close" Mountain Avenue without discussing the other more reasonable and rational options. In my mind, this must be a well planned misinformation campaign on the part of the GSB in order to raise support for their position. At this point,
I have been unable to figure out the real reason why the GSD opposes this transfer other than maintaining the size of their "empire".

2) Fear of disruption of students forced to transfer to other schools:

The GSB claims to oppose the transfer of territory on the basis that it will cause the disruption of students and families. The fact is, if the GSB would honor the "Grandfather Clause" and allow the change to happen gradually, not a single student would have to change schools against their will. Glendale's insistence that they cannot commit to such a clause is further evidence that they are prone to overstatement instead of discussing the facts. Grandfather clauses are the rule, not the exception, when territory transfers such as the one proposed are implemented.

The GSB is using this refusal to even consider the grandfather clause to create serious misgivings in area children and their families. They have created the false threat of forcing children to switch schools. I feel that what they have done by telling elementary school students at Mountain Avenue that their school may close is unconscionable. Young children should not be used as pawns in the political fight the GSB is mounting against the proposed transfer. It certainly has already created more disruption than could be possible by a transfer of territory. The GSB has clearly proven that they have little consideration of creating disruption of students when they have money at stake.

Recent conversations with parents whose children attend Mountain Avenue indicate that teachers are continuing to tell students in their classrooms that Mountain Avenue will close if the proposed transfer takes place. This conjures up visions in my mind of Communists force feeding the "Party Line" to their little Comrades. This using of the children is unethical at least and such use of school funds for the purpose of political gain ought to be illegal. I only hope this despicable behavior on the part of the GSB hasn't accomplished its intended effect of tainting the reasonable discussion of this proposed transfer. I see this as politics at its lowest level.

The Glendale School District has already changed some of their school boundaries inside the District within the last year and they currently have a task force studying further changes in school boundaries. They can hardly use the excuse that school boundaries cannot be changed to justify their opposition when they are changing boundaries for their own reasons, which are probably very good reasons.

On the one hand, the GSB discussed the potential disruption of students in such a transfer, and on the other hand, they trivialize the existing disruption to the La Canada Flintridge
community caused by being divided along an arbitrary boundary established over 100 years ago.

3) The attitude by some of the long time residents that "what was good enough for my kids is good enough for yours":

Several residents spoke at both public hearings who had past experience with their children having had good experiences with the Glendale School District. They also mentioned that Mountain Avenue was built long ago to serve its current territory. What was right 15 or 30 years ago is not necessarily what is right today and for the future. We must look at current conditions and plan for the future. La Canada Flintridge is currently a divided community. No amount of trivializing of this issue by the opponents can deny this. We must strive to improve conditions for our children, our families, and our community.

Conclusion:

In conclusion, I must reiterate my strong support of the proposed transfer of territory from the Glendale School District to the La Canada School District. We now have a chance to make right what past petitioners had failed to do, that is to unite the City of La Canada Flintridge within a single school district. I encourage you to consider the arguments and ultimately find in favor of the transfer. That will allow the people of this community to exercise their right to local control on this important issue of family and community. I feel that the voting area should be limited to the "Sagebrush" area, since these are the only families that are truly affected. It is fundamentally unjust to allow the very large Glendale School District to dictate their misguided will onto the residents of the independent city of La Canada Flintridge.

Sincerely,

Morley Male Jr.
Dear Commissioners, 

April 2, 1992

As a supporter of the Sagebrush Committee’s proposal — I hope the County Commission will decide to: 1) Allow non-Canada residents to attend schools in their own community; 2) If it becomes a ballot measure to limit the Vote to the Sagebrush area; 3) Allow the Blanket Transfer System if all else fails.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]
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Michael A. & Charlotte M. Zarour  
5391 Ocean View Boulevard  
La Canada Flintridge, Ca. 91011-1212  
telephone (818) 248-4231  
fax (818) 248-4932

Mr. R. Wayne Stark  
L.A. County Committee  
School District Organization  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Room 123  
Downey, Ca. 90242-2890

March 27, 1992

Dear Committee Member,

We request that you move to give us the opportunity to vote on where our children attend school. Currently, we live in the "Sagebrush" area of Western La Canada Flintridge. We have one daughter currently attending Cresenta Valley High School and three children not yet school age. This issue is of great importance to us and our family future.

We attended both hearings which were conducted locally in order to hear the arguments both for and against the transfer of the children. Our observations really came down to the following facts.

1. The quality of the education our children will receive will not change and is not in question.

2. There is overcrowding at some of the Glendale Schools. Consequently they are about to undertake a study rearranging students and schools. Thus now is the time to settle this issue.

3. Only the citizens of the "Sagebrush" area of La Canada Flintridge really know if they feel included or excluded in their own community, and the children involved are theirs; therefore only they should vote on the issue.

We urge you to let us control our family’s future. Many Thanks!!

Kind Regards,

Michael Zarour

Charlotte Zarour

RECEIVED APR 2 1992

A-168
Regarding the proposed transfer of Western La Canada Flintridge from Glendale Unified to La Canada Unified School District.

Certified mail P539-07-1740
March 30, 1992

Mr. James R. Marlatt
Division of Business Advisory Services
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 East Imperial Highway
Downey, California

Dear Mr. Marlatt:

After reading in the March 28, 1992 issue of the Foothill Leader that a group in opposition to the proposed transfer, the Canada-Crescenta Committee, has organized a petition and letter writing effort, I also would like to express a few thoughts on the proposal as a resident of the west end of La Canada and a parent of a preschoo child.

I believe it is hypocritical of the Glendale School Board to say they need the children living in the La Canada "strip" while at the same time voting to oppose the "grandfather clause" which would allow the affected students currently in their School District to continue in their system if their parents so chose and allow for a smooth and orderly transfer. This mean-spirited stance of threatening to involuntarily disenroll all of these children in order to frighten the parents in the La Canada "strip" who would vote to allow their children to continue in Glendale Schools along with implying a threat to close Mountain Avenue School in order to incite opposition to this proposal indicate a School Board that has lost sight of making the education and future of children its priority.

Glendale School Board's unanimous refusal of the "grandfather clause" also serves to exemplify the complete lack of representation that we residents of the West La Canada "strip" have in the Glendale School District.

In regards to the issue of what area should be allowed to vote if a vote is to be held, I believe that the vote should be by Western La Canada "strip" residents because I don't think it is fair to allow residents of Glendale or La Crescenta to dictate what District the children that live in La Canada should attend since both Districts clearly want them. That choice should be the decision of the parents and their children who live in the La Canada "strip". I also think this choice is logically correct since your requirement for this proposal to be considered called for 25% of the voters of West La Canada's "strip" to petition your committee (over 50% of the voters actually signed the petition) and not 25% of Glendale Schools.

Please allow the West La Canada "strip" to vote on this proposal so our children and families can have the opportunity to really be united with the rest of our city and end our "strip" designation.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Mike Rukstalis

4601 Ocean View Blvd, La Canada, CA 9101
5625 STARDUST ROAD
LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE,
CALIFORNIA 91011

MARCH 30, 1992

MR. JAMES MARLETT, MANAGEMENT CONSULTANT
REGIONALIZED BUSINESS SERVICES
LOS ANGELES COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION
9300 IMPERIAL HIGHWAY
DOWNY, CA 90242-2890

DEAR MR. MARLETT:

I AM MAUREEN FROGAR AND I RESIDE IN LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE. I AM
PRESIDENT OF LA CANADA HIGH SCHOOL PTSA, WHICH REPRESENTS GRADES 9
THROUGH 12. I HAVE BEEN A RESIDENT OF THIS CITY FOR 25 YEARS AND
HAVE NEVER UNDERSTOOD WHY THE BOUNDARIES OF THE CITY WERE NOT
COTERMINOUS WITH THE SCHOOL DISTRICT BOUNDARY. I SUPPORT THE
EFFORTS OF THE SAGEBRUSH COMMITTEE AND FEEL THAT ONLY THOSE WHO LIVE
IN THE SAGEBRUSH AREA SHOULD VOTE ON THEIR FUTURE.

IF GLENDALE UNIFIED TRULY CARED ABOUT THEIR STUDENTS, THEY WOULD
ALSO CONSIDER THE GRANDFATHER CLAUSE TO EASE THE TRANSITION BUT
INSTEAD HAVE CHOSEN TO SPEND THEIR TIME CREATING HAVOC AMONG THE
PARENTS OF MOUNTAIN AVENUE SCHOOL BY SUGGESTING A POSSIBLE CLOSURE
IF THIS TRANSFER OCCURS.

THE BOTTOM LINE IS THE OPPONENTS ARE NOT REALLY OBJECTING TO THE
TRANSFER OF THE SAGEBRUSH AREA TO ITS OWN COMMUNITY SCHOOLS BUT ARE
RALLYING TO PREVENT THE RIDICULOUS THEORY THAT MOUNTAIN AVENUE WOULD
CLOSE IF THIS SHOULD OCCUR.

AS PTSA PRESIDENT, I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE THREE POINTS IN SUPPORT OF
THE EFFORTS OF THOSE STUDENTS WHO LIVE IN THE CITY OF LA CANADA BUT
MUST ATTEND SCHOOLS OUTSIDE THEIR OWN COMMUNITY.

FIRST: AT THE HIGH SCHOOL WE ARE NOT OVERCROWDED AND HAVE ROOM FOR
THESE STUDENTS AND HAVE VOTED TO SUPPORT THE SAGEBRUSH COMMITTEE IN
THEIR EFFORTS TO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO SEND THEIR CHILDREN TO THE
SCHOOLS IN THEIR COMMUNITY..... LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE.

SECOND: LA CANADA HIGH AND OUR PTSA ARE APPROACHED BY MANY LA
CANADA COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS THAT OFFER SPECIAL RECOGNITION AWARDS
AND SCHOLARSHIPS TO STUDENTS WHO LIVE IN THE CITY OF LA CANADA.
PTSA IS A RESOURCE, A NETWORK OF SUPPORT TO THESE COMMUNITY
ORGANIZATIONS FOR SUBMITTING NAMES OF STUDENTS OR DISSEMINATING
INFORMATION TO OUR STUDENTS AND THEIR FAMILIES ABOUT THESE COMMUNITY
SCHOLARSHIPS AND AWARDS. THIS IS DONE THROUGH OUR PTSA MONTHLY
MEETING AND OUR MONTHLY NEWSLETTER MAILED TO ALL LA CANADA HIGH
SCHOOL FAMILIES. THOSE FORGOTTEN STUDENTS RESIDING IN THE
SAGEBRUSH AREA OF LA CANADA ARE NOT AWARE OF THE MAJORITY OF THESE
FINE SCHOLARSHIPS AND STUDENT SERVICES, EVEN THOUGH THEY QUALIFY.
THESE LA CANADA COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS CONTACT THE LA CANADA
SCHOOLS. THIS IS AN OBVIOUS DEDUCTION: COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS
CONTACT THEIR OWN COMMUNITY SCHOOLS.
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SOME EXAMPLES:
LA CANADA JUNIOR WOMAN'S CLUB OFFERS A TEENAGE CITIZEN AWARD. THE RECIPIENT OF THIS $500 AWARD MUST BE A 12TH GRADE LA CANADA STUDENT.

LA CANADA GUILD OF HUNTINGTON HOSPITAL ALSO HAS A $500 SCHOLARSHIP FOR AN ElIGIBLE STUDENT RESIDING IN LA CANADA.

LA CANADA COORDINATING COUNCIL HAS THE LES TUPPER YOUTH AWARD FOR AN 11TH OR 12TH GRADE STUDENT RESIDING IN THE CITY OF LA CANADA.

ASSISTANCE LEAGUE OF LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE OFFERS A MULTITUDE OF CLASSES AND COLLEGE/CAREER PLANNING SERVICES FOR STUDENTS.

THE KIWANIS CLUB OF LA CANADA, LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE SCHOLARSHIP LEAGUE AND MANY MORE USE LA CANADA SCHOOLS AND LA CANADA PTA'S AS A NETWORK OF COMMUNICATION. MY POINT IS, HOW WOULD THESE STUDENTS IN THE SAGEBRUSH AREA OF LA CANADA KNOW ABOUT THESE SCHOLARSHIPS IF THEY ARE REQUIRED TO ATTEND SCHOOLS OUTSIDE OF THEIR OWN COMMUNITY?

IF THE STUDENTS IN THE SAGEBRUSH AREA OF LA CANADA HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO ATTEND THEIR OWN COMMUNITY SCHOOLS, THEY WOULD BE AWARE OF THE MANY OPPORTUNITIES AVAILABLE TO THEM BY THESE WONDERFUL SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS. THEY ARE FORGOTTEN....LEFT OUT.

MY THIRD POINT AND IN CONCLUSION, THE SITUATION AS IT NOW STANDS IS WRONG, AND IT IS NOT IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE CHILDREN WHO RESIDE IN THE SAGEBRUSH AREA OF LA CANADA IF THEY WISH TO ATTEND LA CANADA SCHOOLS.

IN THE PROCESS OF MAKING YOUR FINAL DECISION, I HOPE THE COMMITTEE WILL THINK LONG AND HARD ON THE FACTS AND NOT BE INFLUENCED BY ALL THE EMOTIONAL PROPAGANDA STIRRED UP BY GLENDALE UNIFIED.

CORDIALLY,

[Signature]

MAUREEN C. PROGAR

A-171
RECEIVED APR 1 1992
Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization
Attn: Mr. James Marlatt
9300 Imperial Highway
Room 123
Downey, Ca 90242-2890

Dear Committee Members,

It has come to my attention that in addition to hearing the public's view during the "public hearing" Process, that it is also helpful to consider information shared in writing. I am a member of the Sagebrush Committee... I am writing to you to reinforce my feelings and commitment in regards to the issue of being transferred to the La Canada school District. It has also come to my attention that the opposition has sent many post cards in their behalf. I think thoughtful letters should have a more meaningful impact than post cards that are handed out. Having stated that, I would like to outline my stance:

-Our request is straight forward and simple. We want to educate our children in our own community among our neighbors and friends.

-The opposition tried to cloud the issue by bringing up how the GUSD would be hurt financially and how we are making up this request to raise property values. Regarding the first objection, at the rate students are pouring into GUSD's area, losing a few hundred students over a few years will be infinitesimal. Regarding the second objection, I am offended that someone would actually think I would put money before my children's welfare. This request comes from the heart not my pocketbook. The second objection about property values tells me that the education in La Canada must be better—why would property values increase? If education in Glendale schools was superior then those property values would be higher. I think this is a very weak argument.

-I would like to point out that the first public hearing at Mountain Ave School had a very interesting attendance on the opposition's side—over 75% were either employees or spouses of employees of Glendale School District!
I don't want the main focus of this letter to be putting down the opposition however, the GUSD school board has never once approached parents in the Sagebrush area to find out what their concerns or needs are. This school district does not care about our small area. I firmly believe we will better be served by La Canada's school district.

My greatest concern now is the decision on who should vote on this issue. It's quite obvious that allowing all of or a greater part of Glendale to vote would assure us defeat. Frankly, I think only the Sagebrush area should vote on their own outcome. With the lack of interest or support that Glendale has already demonstrated, I am angered that they think they could decide our future. They're probably going to appeal any decision made anyway.

Whatever the outcome, I do appreciate people like yourselves who volunteer your time. It's a great service you provide and I thank you.

Sincerely,

Teri Thompson

P.S. I forgot to bring up a overlooked point that Mountain Ave School has functioned with a much lower census for many, many years. Several months ago I overheard several staff make the comment that they may lose the computer room due to all the new students coming in—that they didn't have enough room. Just last year my daughter was subjected to a split 5th - 6th grade class due to overcrowding!
I support the joining of the Sagebrush area to L.C. schools.

The City of La Canada Flintridge is a small, family-oriented town. The Sagebrush area is more attached, geographically, socially, and educationally to L.C. than to Glendale.

The arguments put forth by Glendale seem without any logic, especially their threat to close Mt. Ave. Surely the projected influx of students to Glendale will more than make up for the relatively small number that could go to L.C. schools. This is especially true if a "grandfather clause" is accepted by Glendale (a clause already has been by L.C.).

Glendale's actions seem more motivated by petty emotions than genuine concern for their students.

Dear Sir:

I am writing in support of allowing the La Canada area of La Canada to become a part of the La Canada School District. I urge you to allow those students of this area to exercise their constitution rights and choose for themselves which school district they would like to be aligned with. For the good of the children involved, and with the understanding of new ideas of community identity in the school affiliation, I strongly support their desire to join with their fellow La Canadians and neighbors in our La Canada schools, since Glendale School District is facing severe overcrowding problems now and for the foreseeable future, this change will also be in the best interest of those Glendale children. Thank you for considering my opinion.

Sincerely, Charles Fave-___

RECEIVED APR 1, 1776
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Dear Mr. Harlatt and LA County Commissioners,

Having attended both hearings on the Sagebrush area transfer and read numerous pro and con articles on the issue, I feel compelled now to write and voice my opinions to you also. My family and I personally do not benefit one way or another since my two children reside in the LCUSD area and soon to be graduated of La Canada high school. However, I have often thought it was senseless that the Sagebrush area was not a part of the LCUSD. In fact several years ago I posed that very question to our district office and was told they cannot solicit students or start any kind of process to do so.

Being that most of my friends are parents of children who are in school contact with my kids, I realize there is little opportunity to meet those people who reside in the west side of La Canada. I am very involved in the schools and community and definitely feel the “Sagebrush” people do really exist in a state of limbo. Currently I am VP of PTA Council and LCUSD PTA board member, Assistance League of Flintridge board member, Treasurer of La Canada Jr. Baseball and Foothill Flyers Soccer Club, LCF Kappa Alpha Theta Alumnae Club board member and volunteer in many other organizations. Not once have I met a person from the Sagebrush area in these groups.

As to the possible disruption that opponents of the transfer state as potential problems, see as positive outcomes and challenges. Several years ago when my children were at La Canada Elementary (LCE) school, our district did go through the reconfiguration of school boundaries when opening a third elementary school. It was a known fact among the community that Paradise Canyon Elementary was the “better” elementary school and there was some resentment and envy on the part of LCE families. When the change went into effect, not only did students attend different schools, teachers and principals were also changed. It was the best thing that happened to our elementary schools. There were new ideas, new friends to be made and a real opportunity to come together I know first hand - I was PTA president at LCE the year prior to the boundary change and the year it went into effect. Although it was worrisome and frightening for many parents (not the children surprisingly!) to face such changes and more work for the district at first, the transition was smooth and continues to make all the schools better. This third elementary school that opened was due solely to the efforts of parents who banded together and worked hard to have our district study that option.

I suggest to the opposition to channel their energies to the GUSD to “save” Mountain Avenue School by looking at these possibilities and not work against a group of people who just want identity with their own community.

I am a 10 year resident of LCUSD area having lived in Glendale previously. When we were house hunting for a new home, I can attest to the fact that there was as much confusion then as now with both realtors and homeowners as to where school district boundaries actually are.

I feel you should allow an election to occur and that those people in the Sagebrush area be the ones to determine their own choice - not those who will be giving them up or those who will be receiving them.

I also wish to comment on the “grandfather clause” that seems to be a bigger issue now. Recently served on a committee, appointed and chaired by our assistant superintendent, that studied the out-of-district concern that has affected our La Canada school district. I have learned quite a bit about the state code and the rules and laws that the county dictates to all districts about students who do not reside in their school district. The conflict always arises in the “relieving district giving the transfer permit rather that the “accepting” district. Most districts will accept out of district students if they have space as it is financially beneficial to them to do so for ADA monies. In my study, it was determined that hundreds of hundreds of applications are received yearly from GUSD families requesting transfer to LCUSD. The majority are denied in Glendale and many people have resorted to creative and devious ways to enter our district which is something I personally have tried to combat since it is not legal or morally right.

I certainly can understand why GUSD cannot guarantee an indefinite permit to the Sagebrush families to stay, but I do know that for every student who wishes to remain, there is another student most likely willing to transfer out. This certainly could be worked out between the districts. In this case the outcome benefits everyone.

Another solution would be for the Sagebrush families to indicate at what year they wish to make the transfer for each child. This would be a “no-change” choice that would be enforced so that Glendale could plan easier for their future enrollment.

I appreciate all the time and work you are putting into this decision. I know you will consider what is best for all children. Thank you for taking the time to let me express my feelings.

Sincerely yours,

Martha Burns

4385 Cobblestone Ln
La Canada, CA 91011  A-175
March 26, 1992

Mr. James R. Marlatt, Business Consultant
Regionalized Business Services
Division of Business Advisory Services
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242-2890

Reference: Sagebrush Area Transfer to La Canada School District

Dear Mr. Marlatt:

As a resident of the "Sagebrush" area since 1962, I support the transfer to the La Canada School District.

When our children were growing up, we experienced the "community identity problem" because virtually all our friends lived in La Canada, with their children attending La Canada schools and community activities.

I will not burden you with the details except to state that this problem caused us to transfer our son from Crescenta Valley High School to St. Francis High School, where he was much happier.

Many people against this transfer have claimed the main reason for the petition is an assumed increase in property values. I resent this claim because it distorts the real purpose of the Sagebrush petition, which is to have total community identity in the city we live in. Personally, my wife and I have decided to live the rest of our lives in La Canada, and we would like to see our young neighbors and their children enjoy a full community life without the kind of school problem we encountered.

I urge you to give a favorable response to the transfer.

Thank you for your consideration, and your contribution of personal time to help resolve these problems.

Richard J. Stanczak

Natalie H. Stanczak
March 30, 1992

Dear Mr. Maulett,

Please allow the parents in the Sagebrush area of La Canada to determine for themselves where their children should attend school. Don't allow our children to be hostages of petty school district politics. The parents should be allowed to vote on this.

Sincerely,

Leslie Baker Gertz
4920 Hampton Road
La Canada 91011
March 30, 1992

Dear Mr. Marlett,

This is written in the hopes that reason will prevail and the Sagebrush area will at long last be permitted to be a part of the La Canada School District.

The children in this area live in La Canada, but are not allowed to go to La Canada schools. They are deprived their rightful sense of community.

Glendale should stop fighting to keep children in an already terribly overcrowded district and consider the children first. It should accept the grandparent clause and open inter-district transfer policy so that the children and their families may have their rightful opportunity to get the best possible educational environment.

Glendale is not being reasonable. There hasn't been "Sagebrush" there for many, many years. It is
time to allow these families to go to the schools in the city in which they live, socialize, worship, shop and pay taxes!

Also, the recent "scare" tactics used by Glendale: "We'll have to close Vista Ave. School!" "We'll lose too much revenue and have to fire teachers!" "We will not allow a grandfather clause!"

Shame, shame on Glendale for being greedy and agististical and not letting the people of the Saguaro area decide for themselves. Please use your influence, Mr. Shadlock, to push for open transfers and no repercussions or intimidation tactics. C'mon, Glendale, we're talking about KIDS -- not politics.

MAR 31 1992

(852) 952-1676
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Dear Mr. Medatt,

I believe that the Sagbrud area of La Canada should be part of the La Canada Unified School District. We are a small community and much of our social activities revolve around our schools.

Glendale students are able to attend Glendale schools and I believe La Canada students should be able to attend La Canada schools.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Wendy Kolokotrue

---

Dear Mr. Medatt

We would like the Sagbrud homes to be allowed to transfer to the La Canada School System. They are La Canada residents and I think they should have the ability to attend our schools.

Sincerely,

Andrea Swanar

---

Please vote to allow the residents of La Canada Flats to have the choice to decide where their children attend school.
Mr. James Ruckle
11353 Dover Rd
La Cañada, Ca 91011
Dec. 30, 1992

Dear Mr. Ruckle,

I am a resident of La Cañada, parent of La Cañada student, and wish to have the
Seyburn area become part of La Cañada
Unified School District. Our school district's
boundaries should be the same as our city
boundaries. Our school district has closed
and re-opened, re-drawn the boundaries
for new elementary schools over the years,
so it has been very confusing. I am
sure Glendale is capable of re-delineating
their children to keep their "flagship"
school open.

Thank you for listening to your
interest to re-delineate to the children.

Sincerely,

Carol Fischer
Mr. James R. Marlatt  
Management Consultant  
Regionalized Business Services  
Division of Business Advisory Services  
Los Angeles County Office of Education  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, CA 90242-2890

Dear Mr. Marlatt;

We are writing this letter to express our support for the La Cañada Sagebrush petition. We have lived in the Sagebrush area of La Cañada for 1 1/2 years and have one preschool child. When the Sagebrush petition first circulated, we had no real opinion on it. But after listening to the speakers at the public hearings, we are now strong supporters of the transfer of our schools to the La Cañada district.

Most importantly, we agree with the sense-of-community argument. We believe that when our daughter starts school, having her be in La Cañada schools would enhance her and our sense of being part of the La Cañada community. We chose to settle in La Cañada because it gave us a small town feeling that we were accustomed to in New England, and a sense of community truly does exist in La Cañada. Consider that:

- When we moved in, the La Cañada Newcomers Club called to welcome us to the community. We have participated actively in their events, and Gail is current vice president and starting in April will be president of that organization.

- We joined a La Cañada church.

- We joined a La Cañada tennis club.

- Our bank is in La Cañada.

- When Ken jogs, he uses the La Cañada high school track.

- We try to buy in La Cañada so that the sales tax revenues stay in the town.

- With only one exception, all of the people we socialize with locally live in La Cañada, not La Crescenta or Glendale. It annoys us when we tell people where we live and their response is, "I didn't know that was part of La Cañada."
Not having the La Cañada town and school district boundaries aligned frankly does not make sense to us. The school districting seems to be an historical accident that should be rectified, if possible.

We also think our daughter would be better off as part of the smaller La Cañada school district, rather than as part of the giant urban Glendale district, because we would have a greater influence over the ways in which she was being educated. It is clear that the vast majority of people perceive that benefit because the Glendale school administrator who spoke said that Sagebrush-area house prices would increase perhaps 10% if the school district switch were made (and nothing else happened). That is powerful evidence of the advantage of being part of La Cañada schools. (We have no plans to sell our house to reap that gain because Ken is a tenured professor at the University of Southern California.)

The only real broad societal disadvantage that we see to the transfer of territory is the disruption in the lives of the students who would have to shift between schools. But sometimes it is necessary to bear these short-term costs in exchange for long-term good of subsequent generations of students. If these disruptions were allowed to dominate, then no transfers of school district territory would ever be made. Grandfathering the current Glendale students in that district would minimize disruption, but the Glendale administrators obviously don't want to promise that because they want to quash the transfer. Their objections made it clear to us that their primary (only?) motivation is to preserve their power bases. (Their threat to close the Mountain Avenue school which, we understand, is Glendale's best elementary school, is not credible, and we predict that if the transfer were made, they would welcome any students who wanted to stay in their schools.)

We'd like to think that our opinion represents that of virtually all parents with children of our daughter's generation and those to follow. We and our daughter would benefit greatly from the transfer of the Sagebrush territory to the La Cañada district, and we hope your committee is able to sort through the rhetoric to draw this same conclusion and to take action on our behalf.

Thank you for your efforts to consider this petition.

Sincerely,

Gail W. Merchant

Kenneth A. Merchant
March 27, 1992

Mrs. Bruce H. Mc Birney
3136 Stevens Street
La Crescenta, CA 91214

Re: Your letter dated March 10, 1992, to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization

Dear Mrs. Mc Birney,

I am one of the three Chief Petitioners for the transfer of the Sagebrush area from Glendale Unified to the La Canada Unified School District. The staff of the County Committee sent me a copy of your letter; their policy is to keep the Chief Petitioners and the two school districts involved informed.

You are entitled to your opinion.

I must object to your statement, however, that: "As I understand it, one of the spearheads of the Sagebrush group has no school-age children and is planning to sell her home in the near future." This is incorrect.

Each of the Chief Petitioners plans to stay in this area for many years. We are not doing this to increase our property values.

Each of us has young children.

Rose has two children already in elementary school.

Jim has two pre-school aged children; his oldest will start Kindergarten next September.

I have two pre-school aged children; my oldest will start Kindergarten at Mountain Avenue Elementary next September.

I plan on living in the Sagebrush area for a long time (probably until I die or my youngest enters college). I want my children to attend school in my own City of La Canada Flintridge. I also want local control over educational matters and believe this is possible in the much smaller La Canada Unified School District.

Sincerely,

Maureen Burch
Sagebrush Area
La Canada Flintridge

cc: Mr. James R. Marlatt
Los Angeles County Office of Education
March 20, 1992

Committee for School District Organization
c/o County Board of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242

Attn: R. Wayne Stark, Chairman

Re: Transfer of Territory from Glendale Unified School District to LaCanada Unified School District

Dear Mr. Stark:

I am a resident of LaCanada outside the "Sagebrush" territory which has petitioned the County Board of Education to set an election to transfer territory within the corporate limits of LaCanada Flintridge from the Glendale Unified School District ("Glendale") to the LaCanada Unified School District ("La Canada"). I support placing the petition on the ballot for a vote within the small effected area.

As you are aware, LaCanada has excess school facility capacity at all grade levels, is not expected to grow significantly, and the Board has responded favorably to the proposed transfer. I do not believe this is the case in Glendale where some local schools are severely overcrowded, and the projected growth in school age population over the next ten years is alarming. In fact, I recall Glendale has a plan which will realign school service areas to relieve the overcrowded conditions at many schools and preserve student performance.

The transfer of territory to LaCanada will reduce facility construction costs by reducing the need to build new facilities in Glendale, and since there are no facilities of either district subject to division due to the petition, Glendale and the State will incur significant cost savings.

The existing school boundary is a vestige of the last century and has no logical basis measured against existing city boundaries.

Under the unique circumstances of the petition before you, I believe your committee should permit the parents in the small affected area determine the transfer issue.

Sincerely,

Ernest L. Messner

A-185
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March 17, 1992

Mr. R. Wayne Stark, Chairman,
Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization,
Los Angeles County Office of Education,
Division of Business Advisory Services, Room 128,
Los Angeles County of Education,
9300 Imperial Highway,
Downey,
CA 90242-2890

Dear Mr. Stark,

I attended the public hearing at Palm Crest School last night but was unable to speak for the proponents in view of the large number of speakers at the meeting. Having served on a number of boards and commissions I was impressed with the patience and courtesy you and your Committee exhibited during the hearing. All of you deserve a great deal of credit.

From 1980 to 1984 I served on the La Canada Unified School District Board and for the last seven years have served on the La Canada Planning Commission and am presently the Chairman. I am anxious to make two or three points to you and your Committee:

1. The effort to bring what is called the Sagebrush area into the La Canada School District is not a new idea. As you know, a formal attempt was made in the late 70's but the voting procedure simply made it impossible to proceed to a positive conclusion.

However, in each of the years I served on the Board, and at frequent times thereafter, the people in that part of our community have expressed interest in making a change. The state law precluded any serious consideration since the circumstances would have been the same as was the case in the first attempt to make the change. Now it appears this is not the case which has brought the subject forward once again.

2. My years on the Planning Commission have served to convince me the inability of these La Canada citizens to send their children to La Canada schools tends to "split" the town. There is a definite link between our schools and the community. Much of our social life and many of our outside activities center
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around the schools. The fabric of the community is largely woven through interaction between our schools, the faculty and students and the people living in La Canada.

3. Lastly, I am certain you and your fellow committee members are principally concerned with the quality of education available to all of the children in Los Angeles County. Yet we all know education in K-12 grades consists of a variety of experiences including the classroom, extra-curricular activities, a building of values and the development of self-esteem. My experience has led me to be convinced that children are best served when they can identify with a school and their own surroundings. For this reason, perhaps more important than any other, I support the proponents for the transfer of the Sagebrush area to the La Canada School District.

I hope you and your Committee will see fit to allow the subject to be placed on the ballot in a fashion which will allow the appropriate citizens to fairly decide this extremely important matter.

Again, my congratulations on conducting a sensitive and constructive public hearing. Your Committee’s dedication and cooperation is greatly appreciated by all of us who have a concern about our schools.

Sincerely,

Warren M. Gannon

cc: Committee members:
W. Yamaguchi
N. Palm
N. Jenkins
J. Marlatt
D. Padilla
O. Griffith

WMG/at
2. There would be even less of a need for Glendale to say that they might have to close Mountain Avenue due to the fact that they wouldn't be losing as many children as they would if they do not accept the Grandfather Clause.

However, instead of agreeing with the Sagebrush Committee, the La Canada School Board, the La Canada City Council, the La Canada Chamber of Commerce, and most of the residents of La Canada, the Glendale School Board has instead chosen to whip their constituents up into a needless frenzy aimed at the Sagebrush Committee.

Please, please see through their tactics, and help David in the fight against Goliath. The only people who should vote on this issue are the parents of the 240+ children directly affected by this change. The Sagebrush Committee are families who are concerned for our children's welfare - nothing more, nothing less. They don't want the children to be torn apart by this issue. However, the Glendale School Board (as evidenced by their smear campaign in sending the flyers home with the students and telling the teachers to tell the children to fear that their school would be closed down and their teachers out of jobs), apparently do not care about the children — all they want is the measly less than 1% of the money that this will mean to them.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

David & Gloria Hill

Dr. & Mrs. David (Gloria) Hill
5393 Ocean View Blvd.
La Canada, CA 91011
(818) 249-6177

MAR 13 1992
Palm Crest Elementary School
Parent Teacher Association
Resolution

The Palm Crest Elementary School PTA met on March 10, 1992, and voted as an association to adopt the La Canada Unified School Board Resolution #14-91-92 endorsing the transfer of the "Sagebrush" area to the La Canada Unified School District.

Co-PTA President Marian Macho

Co-PTA President Joanna Hurst
La Cañada Flintridge
Chamber of Commerce
& Community Association
4529 Angeles Crest Highway, Suite 102
La Canada Flintridge, CA 91011
(818) 790-1289 • (818) 790-8930 (fax)

March 9, 1992

Mr. Jim Graf
2209 Los Amigos
La Canada Flintridge, Ca 91011

Dear Mr. Graf:

This letter is to inform you that the La Canada Flintridge Chamber of Commerce and Community Association has voted to support the Sagebrush Committee in its efforts to realign the La Canada/Glendale Unified School District boundaries. We feel that having everyone in La Canada Flintridge attend the same school system is important, especially in a smaller community like ours.

Currently families in western La Canada Flintridge are pulled in one direction by a school system and in another direction by recreational and community activities. Both for the children's sense of belonging to school and community and for a family's sense of belonging to La Canada Flintridge, we support western La Canada Flintridge becoming a part of the La Canada Unified School District.

If there is anything further we can do to help you in your efforts, please do not hesitate to call. Good luck to you!

Very truly yours,

B. R. Hull
Brian R. Hull
President

Keep Your Tax Dollars At Home. Shop In La Canada Flintridge!
RESOLUTION NO. 92- 10

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF LA CAÑADA FLINTRIDGE
SUPPORTING A BOUNDARY CHANGE BETWEEN
LA CAÑADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
AND GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

WHEREAS, several hundred children who are residents of La Cañada Flintridge attend schools in the Glendale Unified School District; and

WHEREAS, overlapping boundaries create difficulties in the communication of information to and between the school districts, the cities and the affected families; and

WHEREAS, overlapping boundaries make it difficult for affected children within the City of La Cañada Flintridge to relate to, identify with, learn about and participate in their community; and

WHEREAS, transfer of students will have little or no impact on La Cañada Flintridge schools.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved that the City Council of the City of La Cañada Flintridge supports a boundary change between the La Cañada Unified School District and the Glendale Unified School District which would result in coterminous School District and City boundaries.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 18th day of February, 1992.

[Signature]
Mayor

ATTEST:

[Signature]
City Clerk

Ayes: Edwards, Valente, Faehan, Hastings
Nees: None
Absent: Phelps
Abstain: None
Dear Mr. Stark:

This letter is to add my voice in opposition to the "Sagebrush" proposal to transfer a portion of the Glendale Unified School District area to the La Canada Unified School District.

I oppose the proposed transfer for the following reasons:

1. It will be disruptive to thousands of students across the Crescenta Valley. With the loss of 130 students from Mountain Avenue School, the GUSD would either close the school and assign the remaining students to neighboring elementary schools, OR elementary school boundaries would be redrawn throughout the Crescenta-Canada community to bring additional students into Mountain Avenue's area. In either case, the Sagebrush transfer would have a ripple effect throughout the area.

2. It will impose financial costs on the Glendale Unified School District. The loss of the 262 students in the "Sagebrush" area would cost the GUSD $780,000 a year in state funding. After eliminating staff and teaching expense to offset the reduced student load, the district will realize a net loss of $400,000 a year. The district already faces a $6.7 million budget shortfall for 1992-93, and this further reduction will exacerbate an already perilous situation.

3. It will impose higher costs on California taxpayers. Since La Canada Unified has a higher revenue limit than Glendale, the state will be paying La Canada $106,000 a year more for the same 262 students to attend La Canada schools. This is unacceptable considering the current fiscal crisis in education funding throughout California.

4. It will provide unequal division of property and give a windfall to the La Canada Unified School District. Under education code provisions, a large parcel of land owned by GUSD on Ocean View Boulevard would transfer to the La Canada District without compensation to the taxpayers in the GUSD who paid for the land originally. This parcel, located in an expensive residential neighborhood of $450,000+ homes, is sub dividable into three lots and would give LCUSD a windfall of nearly $900,000.

5. It will enable the petitioners to enjoy increased property values at the expense of the GUSD residents. Realtors boldly published ads in the La Canada Valley Sun at the time the "Sagebrush" petition was being circulated, citing the increase in property values from being in the La Canada district. Furthermore, as the petitioners sought signatures,
they argued that families could keep their children in Glendale Schools even if the
transfer were completed. Thus residents could enjoy higher property values while the
GUSD struggles to balance its budget and maintain quality education for their children.

6. It will factionalize the community identity of the Crescenta Valley. Youth programs in
the area -- Scouting, YMCA, Little League and so on -- do not track along city
boundaries, but rather serve the entire Crescenta-Canada community. Telephone
service areas and the local water district cross over to include the "Sagebrush" area.
Transferring this area to the La Canada district would serve only to splinter the
community. The families in the "Sagebrush" have been an important part of the
Crescenta-Canada community for more than 100 years. Changing school district
boundaries will not give them "identity," particularly since the petitioners seek
assurances that their children can attend Glendale schools after the transfer.

I urge you to halt to this process before further damage is done. The ramifications of the
transfer -- disruption to the education process, unequal division of property, economic costs
and damage to community identity -- are too great. The cost of bringing this issue to an
election of all the concerned and affected parties would also impose an economic burden.
Please deny the request for the confiscation and transfer of the "Sagebrush" area to the La
Canada Unified School District.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]
4606 Rockland Place  
La Canada, CA 91011  
April 9, 1992

Chairman R. Wayne Stark  
c/o Los Angeles County Committee on  
School District Organization  
Los Angeles County Office of Education  
9300 Imperial Highway, Room 123  
Downey, CA 90242-2890

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Our son, Daniel, is in the fourth grade and our daughter, Shannon, is in the second grade, at Mountain Avenue School. As their parents, we made an important decision a few years ago regarding their future and well being. We liked our town, our street, our house and our school. We decided that we would stay put and not consider relocating until our children had both graduated high school, so that they would have stability while growing up and not have to undergo a major disruption that would result from moving to a new town and changing schools. Now that we are settled in, Daniel and Shannon are part way through elementary school and have made friends with classmates, we find that a major disruption is indeed in the works, even though our house is not up for sale and we have no intention of moving. The disruption comes from the people of the Sagebrush Committee, who want to transfer our kids to a different school because they think that would be good for families in our town. We are opposed to any such notion and we are extremely upset by their actions. If it must come to a vote, then let all of La Canada Flintridge and Glendale have their say.

Sincerely,

David DeVoe  
Phyllis DeVoe
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RECEIVED APR 13 1992
April 6, 1992

Chairman R. Wayne Stark
Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization
9300 Imperial Highway
Room 123
Downey, CA 90242-2890

Dear Mr. Stark and members of the committee;

I am very concerned about the proposed transfer of students from the Glendale Unified School District to the La Canada School District. If this transfer is allowed, my children or hundreds like them will be forced to transfer to different schools in order to accommodate some parents who choose to transfer their children to a neighboring district. The purpose of this letter is to discuss the negative impact on children's lives when their educational process is interrupted by unnecessary school transfers.

Changing school boundaries is more than redrawing a line on a map. It is redrawing children's lives, as they know it. Children thrive on consistency. There is comfort in knowing their physical environment, whether it is the familiar walk to school or the sense of belonging a child feels in her classroom because her older sister was in the same room with the same teacher two years before. Children obtain power and mastery from knowing their environment, in being able to plan, in knowing what to expect and what is expected of them. There is a sense of community and inspiration in children watching older friends and relatives complete the sixth grade in their shared school, and pride as they follow in their footsteps. Children attending a school they know, with friends, teachers and administrators they know, makes their "family" at school secure, safe and predictable. The school is more than a place children go to.
learn. It is, like the family, a constant in their ever changing lives. When children are forced to change schools there is a disruption in the security that school provides by being familiar, consistent, and predictable. Children being forced to change their school is analogous to an adult being forced to change their job. Changing jobs, even by choice is extremely stressful. Take away the power to choose and the stress is overwhelming. There is a major psychological difference in the empowerment one feels when they make a choice to change and the helplessness one feels when they are forced to make a change against their will.

People do not like change. We, as a species, are drawn to the familiar. When given a choice we shop at the same stores, attend the same church, see a regular doctor, maintain old friendships, stay in the same house, and so on. Does this mean that all change is bad? No, it means there are human costs associated with forced change that must not be minimized. Change in structure, against our will, is disruptive change. This is change that requires a period of recovery, a period of grieving and a period of restructuring. It does not take a child psychologist to figure out that uprooting a child against his will is disruptive. A parent with a listening ear can hear it loud and clear.

Mrs. Jenkins, if you still don't believe being forced change schools is disruptive to the emotional well being of children, ask the children. They are the ones who are directly affected by being uprooted in the middle of their school process.

Mr. Stark, ask your son, if he had a son in his last year of high school, would he choose to transfer him to a new school, if it was not necessary to do so.

In my family, when there is a decision to be made that affects the family, we all have a say. We do not always get to have things go our own way, but there is comfort in being heard and in having a vote. Right now I am not feeling safe. The decision of whether or not I will be allowed a vote, in a decision that has a direct impact on my children, lies in your hands. I have to trust that you will be fair, by reading this letter, by hearing both sides, and by granting me a vote. Please allow all the parents in the
Glendale Unified School District their parental right to decide which changes are healthy and constructive for their children and which changes are unnecessary and disruptive for their children.

Finally I would like to comment on how La Canada looks at the Sagebrush area. Among the cliques of La Canada, there are names for less affluent areas of their own community. The Sagebrush area on the west end has been referred to as the "Oceanview" or "La Crescenta" end of La Canada, or more recently "Baja La Canada". On the east end of town is the area known as "Poverty Meadows". Unfortunately for all of La Canada, this way of thinking is inherent in the community itself. It is a shame, and I sympathize with the families there. However, I believe this prejudice can not and will not be corrected through the educational system. Changing school boundaries will not change La Canada's social prejudice, just as inclusion will not command acceptance. Let the Sagebrush petitioners fight the real problem by writing letters, forming groups, and becoming involved in La Canada politics to earn their way up the social ladder if that is their goal. I believe it is unconscionable of the Sagebrush petitioners to undermine the well-being of hundreds of children around them in order to accommodate their desire to change school districts. Please do not allow them to undermine our children's security and disrupt their educational family in a futile attempt to correct a flaw in the La Canada social system.

Yours truly,

Cynthia Klinger

Cynthia Klinger
April 4, 1992

Mr. R. Wayne Stark  
Los Angeles County Committee  
School District Organization  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, California 90242-2890

Dear Mr. Stark,

I would like to add my voice in opposition to the "Sagebrush" proposal to transfer a portion of the Glendale Unified School District area to the La Canada Unified School District.

Attached are a list of reasons, which I completely support, why I oppose this transfer.

My husband and I have three children, ages 5, 3 and 1 year. Our son is attending kindergarten at Robbins Nest School and will enter first grade at Monte Vista in September 1992. When we purchased our home 8 years ago we specifically chose a home in the boundaries of Monte Vista Elementary, Rosemont Jr. High and C.V. High. We did this because of the quality of education that would be available to our children.

Should the committee feel that the "Sagebrush" petition warrants going to vote, I cannot urge you and the committee enough to include all affected area's in the vote. This could affect my children and their education and I have the right to be heard.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Kyle Studebaker  
4938 Ramsell Avenue  
La Crescenta, California 91214

cc: Mike Antonovich  
215 North Marengo, Suite 120  
Pasadena, California 91101

The Leader  
Letters to the Editor  
3527A North Verdugo  
Glendale, California 91208
Dear Mr. Stark:

This letter is to add my voice in opposition to the "Sagebrush" proposal to transfer a portion of the Glendale Unified School District area to the La Canada Unified School District.

I oppose the proposed transfer for the following reasons:

1. It will be disruptive to thousands of students across the Crescenta Valley. With the loss of 130 students from Mountain Avenue School, the GUSD would either close the school and assign the remaining students to neighboring elementary schools, OR elementary school boundaries would be redrawn throughout the Crescenta-Canada community to bring additional students into Mountain Avenue's area. In either case, the Sagebrush transfer would have a ripple effect throughout the area.

2. It will impose financial costs on the Glendale Unified School District. The loss of the 262 students in the "Sagebrush" area would cost the GUSD $780,000 a year in state funding. After eliminating staff and teaching expense to offset the reduced student load, the district will realize a net loss of $400,000 a year. The district already faces a $6.7 million budget shortfall for 1992-93, and this further reduction will exacerbate an already perilous situation.

3. It will impose higher costs on California taxpayers. Since La Canada Unified has a higher revenue limit than Glendale, the state will be paying La Canada $106,000 a year more for the same 262 students to attend La Canada schools. This is unacceptable considering the current fiscal crisis in education funding throughout California.

4. It will provide unequal division of property and give a windfall to the La Canada Unified School District. Under education code provisions, a large parcel of land owned by GUSD on Ocean View Boulevard would transfer to the La Canada District without compensation to the taxpayers in the GUSD who paid for the land originally. This parcel, located in an expensive residential neighborhood of $450,000+ homes, is subdividable into three lots and would give LCUSD a windfall of nearly $900,000.

5. It will enable the petitioners to enjoy increased property values at the expense of the GUSD residents. Realtors boldly published ads in the La Canada Valley Sun at the time the "Sagebrush" petition was being circulated, citing the increase in property values from being in the La Canada district. Furthermore, as the petitioners sought signatures,
they argued that families could keep their children in Glendale Schools even if the transfer were completed. Thus residents could enjoy higher property values while the GUSD struggles to balance its budget and maintain quality education for their children.

6. It will factionalize the community identity of the Crescenta Valley. Youth programs in the area -- Scouting, YMCA, Little League and so on -- do not track along city boundaries, but rather serve the entire Crescenta-Canada community. Telephone service areas and the local water district cross over to include the "Sagebrush" area. Transferring this area to the La Canada district would serve only to splinter the community. The families in the "Sagebrush" have been an important part of the Crescenta-Canada community for more than 100 years. Changing school district boundaries will not give them "identity," particularly since the petitioners seek assurances that their children can attend Glendale schools after the transfer.

I urge you to halt to this process before further damage is done. The ramifications of the transfer -- disruption to the education process, unequal division of property, economic costs and damage to community identity -- are too great. The cost of bringing this issue to an election of all the concerned and affected parties would also impose an economic burden. Please deny the request for the confiscation and transfer of the "Sagebrush" area to the La Canada Unified School District.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

4938 Ranodell AV
La Crescenta

A-202

RECEIVED APR 8 1992
Chairman R. Wayne Stark  
Los Angeles Committee on  
School District Organization  
8300 Imperial Highway  
Room 123  
Downey, Ca. 90242

Dear Chairman Stark,

I am a resident of La Crescenta and would like to voice yet another opinion against the Sagebrush initiative. I and my wife have lived in La Crescenta all of our lives and have attended the Glendale Unified School District schools throughout our Elementary, Junior High and Senior High school years. We now have a daughter in third grade at Mountain Ave. and a son who will hopefully be attending Mountain Ave. in one year. I am not going to rehash all of the arguments which you have already heard. I want only to express that what I have heard boils down to an economic consideration and a concern for community.

I assume that as a committee, you have access to more data than I so I am not in a position to give advice about economics. I can say that my impression from the meetings is that the number of students involved will make neither a significant impact on Glendale Unified School District nor will it rescue La Canada from its difficulties as the third smallest District in California. I don't think that the passion generated in the meetings stems from this kind of economic concern anyway.

It seems like the community question has been put forward as the really significant factor in the Sagebrush initiative. Here I will articulate my own opinions. It seems to me that community is where you make it and certainly cannot be prescribed by city boundaries. I was formerly Youth Pastor of the largest Church in La Crescenta. I ran numerous youth activities throughout the year. Our calendar had to take into account both Glendale and La Canada school calendars and only once a year was that ever a problem: Spring break. (This year even that is not a problem!) I always had several La Canada students in my groups and never felt that they were isolated from anyone socially. I and my family currently attend La Canada Presbyterian Church. Again we have little concern over calendars and even less over "community". We are choosing to make that our community and are becoming active in leadership roles there. My children's friends are equally split between living in La Crescenta and La Canada; they do not know or care about each other's zip codes. The activities they are becoming involved in are Crescenta-Canada YMCA, Crescenta-Canada Youth House, Girl Scouts, Crescenta-Canada Sports Association, and so on. None of these organizations exclude anyone due to their zip code or telephone pre-fix. My experience has been that the families in and around the Mountain Ave.
Elementary School form a community which is very vital. It is precisely this community spirit and pride which has contributed to Mountain Ave. being the showplace school in the Glendale School District. I and my wife moved into this part of La Crescenta so that our children could grow up in this community. I strongly urge you not to consider the Sagebrush initiative as it would damage a really fine community which has had a rich twenty-year history.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Daniel A. Campana, Chair
Philosophy Department
Los Angeles County Commission
on School District Organization
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242-2890

Re: Sagebrush

Dear Madam and Sirs:

Allow me to comment on the March 16, 1992 meeting regarding the proposed school district boundary changes from the Glendale Unified School District to the La Canada School District. The major concern voiced by proponents of the change is that of community identification. I can certainly empathize with that, as we in La Crescenta have a great deal of community identification. That identification, however, is not necessarily with the City of Glendale.

A portion of the Glendale Unified School District falls within an unincorporated area of Los Angeles County. We have no ties to the City of Glendale other than through the schools. I think I speak for many in saying that we have a community identification with the Crescenta-Canada Valley area. My children, for example, attended pre-schools in La Canada, they still participate in activities at the La Canada Youth House and the Crescenta-Canada YMCA, and are active in sports associations drawing their memberships from the entire Crescenta-Canada Valley area. I do my shopping up and down Foothill Blvd., regardless of the La Crescenta-La Canada boundary. And, as a matter of fact, our family has walked in the La Canada Memorial Day Parade -- TWICE!

We have formed "mini communities" within our schools. Our children have built friendships with children in their schools and neighborhood, as have the parents. Should these communities be disrupted because of a few malcontents?
Let me address some of the issues they raised. One of these was, of course, wanting to be more of a part of La Canada. The City of La Canada wholeheartedly supported this, but the reasons are to me somewhat dubious. First of all, with the number of children they have bootlegged from Glendale and Pasadena, how much is "community identification" really of concern to them? Also, as was pointed out at the meeting, of the 21 schools in La Canada, only four of them are public schools! What do the rest of these people do about the community identification problems supposedly being experienced by the Sagebrush group? Finally, if the La Canada School District were truly concerned about these people, it would seem to me that their concerns could be dealt with with a minimum of adjustment. For example, with only four public schools, why could they not adjust their vacation and holiday schedules to coincide with those of Mountain Avenue School? And couldn't they and the Sagebrush people think of ways for dissemination of La Canada information to this group that normally goes home with La Canada Students?

I truly understand the desire of these people for the change. Perhaps, over time, a solution to the problem could be found that would satisfy everyone, perhaps something gradual rather than as radical and disruptive as the one they propose. I still, however, keep coming back to the fact that these people moved into the area knowing (or they should have bothered to find out) the situation. If living in La Canada and attending La Canada City Schools is so very important to them, why on earth did they buy their homes in this area instead of farther east?

When we bought our home and had our children, we knew darned well which school district we were in and which
schools they would be attending. Why should my children be penalized because others did not do the same? Please, please, do not disrupt our community and our children.

Respectfully yours,

Joanne S. McBurney

Joanne S. McBurney
Mr. R. Wayne Stark  
Los Angeles County Committee  
School District Organization  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, California 90242-2890

Dear Mr. Stark:

This letter is to add my voice in opposition to the "Sagebrush" proposal to transfer a portion of the Glendale Unified School District area to the La Canada Unified School District.

I oppose the proposed transfer for the following reasons:

1. **It will be disruptive to thousands of students across the Crescenta Valley.** With the loss of 130 students from Mountain Avenue School, the GUSD would either close the school and assign the remaining students to neighboring elementary schools, **OR** elementary school boundaries would be redrawn throughout the Crescenta-Canada community to bring additional students into Mountain Avenue's area. In either case, the Sagebrush transfer would have a ripple effect throughout the area.

2. **It will impose financial costs on the Glendale Unified School District.** The loss of the 262 students in the "Sagebrush" area would cost the GUSD $780,000 a year in state funding. After eliminating staff and teaching expense to offset the reduced student load, the district will realize a net loss of $400,000 a year. The district already faces a $6.7 million budget shortfall for 1992-93, and this further reduction will exacerbate an already perilous situation.

3. **It will impose higher costs on California taxpayers.** Since La Canada Unified has a higher revenue limit than Glendale, the state will be paying La Canada $106,000 a year more for the same 262 students to attend La Canada schools. This is unacceptable considering the current fiscal crisis in education funding throughout California.

4. **It will provide unequal division of property and give a windfall to the La Canada Unified School District.** Under education code provisions, a large parcel of land owned by GUSD on Ocean View Boulevard would transfer to the La Canada District without compensation to the taxpayers in the GUSD who paid for the land originally. This parcel, located in an expensive residential neighborhood of $450,000+ homes, is subdividable into three lots and would give LCUSD a windfall of nearly $900,000.

5. **It will enable the petitioners to enjoy increased property values at the expense of the GUSD residents.** Realtors boldly published ads in the La Canada Valley Sun at the time the "Sagebrush" petition was being circulated, citing the increase in property values from being in the La Canada district. Furthermore, as the petitioners sought signatures,
they argued that families could keep their children in Glendale Schools even if the transfer were completed. Thus residents could enjoy higher property values while the GUSD struggles to balance its budget and maintain quality education for their children.

6. **It will factionalize the community identity of the Crescenta Valley.** Youth programs in the area -- Scouting, YMCA, Little League and so on -- do not track along city boundaries, but rather serve the entire Crescenta-Canada community. Telephone service areas and the local water district cross over to include the "Sagebrush" area. Transferring this area to the La Canada district would serve only to splinter the community. The families in the "Sagebrush" have been an important part of the Crescenta-Canada community for more than 100 years. Changing school district boundaries will not give them "identity," particularly since the petitioners seek assurances that their children can attend Glendale schools after the transfer.

I urge you to halt to this process before further damage is done. The ramifications of the transfer -- disruption to the education process, unequal division of property, economic costs and damage to community identity -- are too great. The cost of bringing this issue to an election of all the concerned and affected parties would also impose an economic burden. Please deny the request for the confiscation and transfer of the "Sagebrush" area to the La Canada Unified School District.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Robbie George Harwood
When we first heard of the so called "Sagebrush Petition" we couldn't believe it. Mountain Avenue Elementary is one of the finest elementary schools in the state. With so much wrong with our educational institutions, Mountain Avenue stands as something gone right! We oppose any move that would result in the closure of this fine school.

Greg and Lali Olsen

[Signature]

--------------------------
Save Mountain Avenue School

A-210
Thomas and Louise Webb  
2653 Pinelawn Drive  
La Crescenta, Ca. 91214

March 31, 1992

R. Wayne Stark  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Room 123  
Downey, Ca 90242

RE: Opposition to the proposed annexation of the Sagebrush area

Dear Mr. Stark,

I am adamantly opposed to the annexation of the Sagebrush area to the La Canada School District. It would create an unnecessary disruption to the lives and education of the children in the La Crescenta area. The main motivator behind the request is strictly a financial one. The property values of the homes in the Sagebrush area would increase if this proposal is passed. This is not a good reason to grant such a request. In fact at one of the public hearings it was stated that if this was a reason for such a request, the request would not be granted.

Do not approve this request. If any changes are proposed, all residents in the La Crescenta area should be allowed to vote since their children will also be affected. A vote by only the Sagebrush residents would be completely unfair.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Louise Webb
March 29, 1992

Mr. R. Wayne Stark, Chairman
L.A. County Committee on School District Organization
L.A. County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, California 90242-2890

Dear Mr. Stark and Members of the Committee:

My husband and I are the parents of two girls, one who is five and currently attends kindergarten at Mountain Avenue School, and one who is not yet able to attend Mountain Avenue. When we bought our house in La Crescenta several years ago, we specifically investigated the schools our children would attend because it was of utmost importance to us. We have been quite dismayed, as you may well imagine, over the controversy created by the Sagebrush petition, and are particularly upset that some parents in the Sagebrush area are now complaining that their children cannot attend La Canada schools.

If that was so important to them, why didn't they bother to insure that they would be able to attend those schools when they purchased their houses? Should they now be able to cause so much trouble and disruption for the children and families of Mountain Avenue School and the surrounding areas because of their original lack of proper diligence? No one seems to be asking the question of where the responsibility for their own predicament lies, if attending La Canada schools is so important to them.

My husband and I have heard so much of "community identity." Isn't one's community identity something which that person makes of it. Why should the attendance of a particular school be so important to a persons' community identity, particularly in a La Canada area where private schools far outweigh public schools and where apparently La Canada families outside the Sagebrush area shun their Sagebrush counterparts merely because their children attend excellent schools bordering La Canada. What kind of statement does this make about the community identity of La Canada? A pretty sad one indeed. At least, as one gentleman testified at the Palmcrest hearing, the La Canada politicians don't forget about their Sagebrush residents during election time.

Why have the Sagebrush parents gotten even this far in the process? Unfortunately, their efforts at secession have taken everyone's attention away from improving the education of the children involved, which should be everyone's primary interest. I can't for the life of me figure out why they could be devoting
so much time to this issue, when they all admit that they are receiving an exceptional education and when they even want a grandfather clause to allow them to continue to use the Glendale schools.

Please end this unfortunate and wasteful situation, deny the petition, and let everyone go back to focusing on our children's education, which the Sagebrush parents should be focusing on in the first place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

Lori Waldinger

Lori Waldinger
I have talked with members of the sagebrush committee and with members of Crescenta-Canada committee — I would not like my letter to be distributed among them. It was written to the LA County Committee for their consideration only.

C. Fairbanks
Mr. R. Wayne Stark  
Los Angeles County Committee  
School District Organization  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, California 90242-2890

Dear Mr. Stark:

This letter is to add my voice in opposition to the "Sagebrush" proposal to transfer a portion of the Glendale Unified School District area to the La Canada Unified School District.

I oppose the proposed transfer for the following reasons:

1. **It will be disruptive to thousands of students across the Crescenta Valley.** With the loss of 130 students from Mountain Avenue School, the GUSD would either close the school and assign the remaining students to neighboring elementary schools, OR elementary school boundaries would be redrawn throughout the Crescenta-Canada community to bring additional students into Mountain Avenue’s area. In either case, the Sagebrush transfer would have a ripple effect throughout the area.

2. **It will impose financial costs on the Glendale Unified School District.** The loss of the 262 students in the "Sagebrush" area would cost the GUSD $780,000 a year in state funding. After eliminating staff and teaching expense to offset the reduced student load, the district will realize a net loss of $400,000 a year. The district already faces a $6.7 million budget shortfall for 1992-93, and this further reduction will exacerbate an already perilous situation.

3. **It will impose higher costs on California taxpayers.** Since La Canada Unified has a higher revenue limit than Glendale, the state will be paying La Canada $106,000 a year more for the same 262 students to attend La Canada schools. This is unacceptable considering the current fiscal crisis in education funding throughout California.

4. **It will provide unequal division of property and give a windfall to the La Canada Unified School District.** Under education code provisions, a large parcel of land owned by GUSD on Ocean View Boulevard would transfer to the La Canada District without compensation to the taxpayers in the GUSD who paid for the land originally. This parcel, located in an expensive residential neighborhood of $450,000+ homes, is sub dividable into three lots and would give LCUSD a windfall of nearly $900,000.

5. **It will enable the petitioners to enjoy increased property values at the expense of the GUSD residents.** Realtors boldly published ads in the La Canada Valley Sun at the time the "Sagebrush" petition was being circulated, citing the increase in property values from being in the La Canada district. Furthermore, as the petitioners sought signatures,
they argued that families could keep their children in Glendale Schools even if the transfer were completed. Thus residents could enjoy higher property values while the GUSD struggles to balance its budget and maintain quality education for their children.

6. **It will factionalize the community identity of the Crescenta Valley.** Youth programs in the area -- Scouting, YMCA, Little League and so on -- do not track along city boundaries, but rather serve the entire Crescenta-Canada community. Telephone service areas and the local water district cross over to include the "Sagebrush" area. Transferring this area to the La Canada district would serve only to splinter the community. The families in the "Sagebrush" have been an important part of the Crescenta-Canada community for more than 100 years. Changing school district boundaries will not give them "identity," particularly since the petitioners seek assurances that their children can attend Glendale schools after the transfer.

I urge you to halt to this process before further damage is done. The ramifications of the transfer -- disruption to the education process, unequal division of property, economic costs and damage to community identity -- are too great. The cost of bringing this issue to an election of all the concerned and affected parties would also impose an economic burden. Please deny the request for the confiscation and transfer of the "Sagebrush" area to the La Canada Unified School District.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Stamp]

La Crescenta 9/24/47
Dear Mr. Stark:

This letter is to add my voice in opposition to the "Sagebrush" proposal to transfer a portion of the Glendale Unified School District area to the La Canada Unified School District.

I oppose the proposed transfer for the following reasons:

1. **It will be disruptive to thousands of students across the Crescenta Valley.** With the loss of 130 students from Mountain Avenue School, the GUSD would either close the school and assign the remaining students to neighboring elementary schools, OR elementary school boundaries would be redrawn throughout the Crescenta-Canada community to bring additional students into Mountain Avenue's area. In either case, the Sagebrush transfer would have a ripple effect throughout the area.

2. **It will impose financial costs on the Glendale Unified School District.** The loss of the 262 students in the "Sagebrush" area would cost the GUSD $780,000 a year in state funding. After eliminating staff and teaching expense to offset the reduced student load, the district will realize a net loss of $400,000 a year. The district already faces a $6.7 million budget shortfall for 1992-93, and this further reduction will exacerbate an already perilous situation.

3. **It will impose higher costs on California taxpayers.** Since La Canada Unified has a higher revenue limit than Glendale, the state will be paying La Canada $106,000 a year more for the same 262 students to attend La Canada schools. This is unacceptable considering the current fiscal crisis in education funding throughout California.

4. **It will provide unequal division of property and give a windfall to the La Canada Unified School District.** Under education code provisions, a large parcel of land owned by GUSD on Ocean View Boulevard would transfer to the La Canada District without compensation to the taxpayers in the GUSD who paid for the land originally. This parcel, located in an expensive residential neighborhood of $450,000+ homes, is sub dividable into three lots and would give LCUSD a windfall of nearly $900,000.

5. **It will enable the petitioners to enjoy increased property values at the expense of the GUSD residents.** Realtors boldly published ads in the La Canada Valley Sun at the time the "Sagebrush" petition was being circulated, citing the increase in property values from being in the La Canada district. Furthermore, as the petitioners sought signatures,
they argued that families could keep their children in Glendale Schools even if the transfer were completed. Thus residents could enjoy higher property values while the GUSD struggles to balance its budget and maintain quality education for their children.

6. **It will factionalize the community identity of the Crescenta Valley.** Youth programs in the area -- Scouting, YMCA, Little League and so on -- do not track along city boundaries, but rather serve the entire Crescenta-Canada community. Telephone service areas and the local water district cross over to include the "Sagebrush" area. Transferring this area to the La Canada district would serve only to splinter the community. The families in the "Sagebrush" have been an important part of the Crescenta-Canada community for more than 100 years. Changing school district boundaries will not give them "identity," particularly since the petitioners seek assurances that their children can attend Glendale schools after the transfer.

I urge you to halt to this process before further damage is done. The ramifications of the transfer -- disruption to the education process, unequal division of property, economic costs and damage to community identity -- are too great. The cost of bringing this issue to an election of all the concerned and affected parties would also impose an economic burden. Please deny the request for the confiscation and transfer of the "Sagebrush" area to the La Canada Unified School District.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

[Name]

[Relationship]
Wayne Stark  
L. A. Cnty. Comm. on School Dist. Reorganizing  
L. A. Cnty. Office of Education  
9300 Imperial Hwy.  
Downey, Ca.  90242-2890  

Dear Mr. Stark,

As a resident of La Crescenta and a parent who has children attending school in the Glendale School District, I am writing to you to express my opposition to the proposed redistricting of the "Sagebrush" area of La Canada. The changing of the school district boundaries will affect hundreds of students in the Glendale Schools, as well as those in La Canada. If the redistricting is granted, the present boundaries within the Glendale District would have to change or Mountain Ave. School would have to be shut down. Either way, crowding in an already crowded system would occur. If this happens, my family will be directly affected.

The proponents of the "Sagebrush" transfer say it will not affect many students. They are wrong. Boundaries for at least four schools would change, as well as the change to La Canada Schools. My home is on Rosemont Ave. only one-tenth of a mile from Monte Vista Elementary. It is a short walk for my children. If the boundaries change, there is a good chance that Rosemont Ave. would be the new boundary for Mountain Ave. School which is more than a mile from my home. This would mean my 8 year old would have to walk that distance, by herself, and cross at least 2 very busy streets each way. At the present, she has an older sister who walks with her. Next year her sister will be at Rosemont Jr. High which is directly down the street from Monte Vista. I had planned for her to walk up the hill from school, and pick her sister up on the way home. If the boundaries are redrawn, my oldest daughter would not be able to do this. The same problem would occur in the mornings when the oldest could walk the youngest to school and then continue down the hill to her own school. It is necessary that my children be able to walk to school as my husband leaves early for work and I am attending college and my schedule doesn't allow me the luxury of driving or walking them to school myself. The proposed change would complicate my family's life enormously.

The proponents of the change knew the school district boundaries when they bought their homes. Also, Mountain
Ave. School is a California Distinguished School and the school their children would attend in La Canada is not. Rosemont Jr. High has received numerous honors. I fail to see how these parents could question the quality of education their children receive. Glendale has fine schools, which is a reason so many people shop for homes in this area. So many of the people who may have their schools changed due to new boundaries bought their homes just to be in a particular school's area. It would be unfair to ask these people to remove their children to another school after establishing friendships, activities and school attachments.

I urge you to consider my request and those of the hundreds of other parents who oppose the redistricting of the schools. The needs of the many outweigh the needs of the few.

Sincerely,

Linda B. Dingler
Dear Mr. Smith,

My name is Chris. I am five years old. I want to go to nursery school. Please help me make me well. I have a lot of friends.

When I grow up, I want to be a doctor. I want to help people. I will go to college and study hard. I want to be a good doctor.

Love,

Chris

Another farmer

Please make the farmer

not necessary. He also needs

to make his life.

RECEIVED: MAR 16 1882
Dear Mr. Marlatt,

As a resident who lives in the "Sagebrush" area of La Canada, I am offended by the assumption that the few parents who began the petition to change the school boundaries know what is best for my children and the community. They pacified families who would oppose transferring their children to the La Canada school district with the false information that we would be allowed to remain in the Glendale Unified School district. This may not be true, and I am not willing to gamble with the education of my children by supporting this change. Some parents in this area are not only under the impression that they have the option of leaving their children in GUSD, but they can send one child to each district, if they desire.

Since I grew up in this area and attended Glendale schools and my husband teaches at C.V.H.S., we have always felt that our children would be better served in the Glendale School district. Our decision not to purchase a home in La Canada was only altered by the fact that the boundaries were such that we were in the GUSD, and naturally we assumed it would remain so.

We feel that the GUSD offers a better variety of classes, and is set up to deal with the needs of children with a wide ability level. Our girls have benefitted from the excellent A.P. classes that C.V.H.S. has to offer, where they not only have top-notch teachers, but have enjoyed the advantage of the special curriculum. We also believe that the Rosemont middle school cannot be matched for excellence, and feel that this age can best be served in a middle school, rather than a 7-12 high school. Although our children are no longer in Mountain Avenue, this is an outstanding elementary school, which may be adversely affected by these changes. The sense of community and loyalty which the transfer proponents desire is already felt by those who support staying in the GUSD.

One of the primary concerns most families consider when buying a home is the schools that their children will attend. I can only wonder why the other families who live in this area, would ignore this fact and purchase homes here, if they think the La Canada school district is better for their children. Several of the families who support this change have been very active at Mountain Avenue School, and have enjoyed all the best that the GUSD has to offer. Suddenly they want to be "more a part of the La Canada community," and the fact that this effects many students who oppose these changes seems to have no bearing.
Most of my neighbors are retired, or have no children in school. They are part of the "over 50%" who support this change. Many of them signed the petition, and later regretted it because they felt they were given false information. Those who support the change, but have no children in the schools are interested in the increased property value this change might bring. They do not hesitate to state this as their reason for supporting the petition.

Other families feel that as long as their children are guaranteed the option of remaining in the GUSD, they may as well benefit from the property value increase that may occur, thus enjoying the best of both sides of the issue.

It has been stated that the GUSD is using children as pawns to keep the boundaries as they are. I strongly feel that the proponents of this measure are using children for financial gain. The La Canada School District wants this change simply for the money it will generate for their financially strapped district. This "Sagebrush" area has always been the "stepchild" of La Canada, and I feel that it is naive to assume that this mentality will change by altering the boundaries. We have had friends in the past who moved so their children could attend La Canada Schools, and we have always been secure that we made the correct decision by staying in the GUSD. This is an individual family decision, which should not be crammed down our throats to satisfy the whims of a few.

Our children have always been our top priority. We are extremely happy with the excellent education our daughters have received, and are continuing to receive in the GUSD. We made our choice when we bought our home eighteen years ago, and our children are very upset at the possibility that they may have no control over where they attend school.

It's a sad commentary on what friendship and community truly means when a petition that impacts so many was initiated without regard to how it negatively effects friends and neighbors who don't welcome the change.

I feel that property value should not be an issue in the education of our children. We are one family who specifically did not want our children attending the La Canada schools and feel that we are being bulldozed by a few families who now believe they speak for the best interest of the community.

Thank you,

Carol Bake

RECEIVED MAR 17 1992
Mr. R. Wayne Stark  
Chairman, L.A. County Commission  
on School District Organization  
L.A. County Office of Education  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, CA 90242-2890  

March 10, 1992  

Re: Sagebrush  

Dear Mr. Stark:  

This letter is in regard to the "Sagebrush" movement to secede from the Glendale Unified School District and become a part of the La Canada-Flintridge School District. The Sagebrush people would lead us to believe that they are the only ones affected by this plan, and that it should therefore be their decision and theirs alone. The facts are quite different.  

Currently, the children in the Sagebrush area attend Mountain Avenue Elementary, Rosemont Junior High, and Crescenta Valley High schools. Removing these children would significantly impact the schools, children and families of those attending those schools, as well as those attending all of the other valley area elementary schools. The loss of the Sagebrush children would cause either closure of Mountain Avenue Elementary School, or a reshuffling of the popula-
tions of the other schools in the area, including La Crescenta, Monte Vista, Fremont and Dunsmore. The loss of funds and teachers would also be significant.

The Sagebrush people profess "community identification" as their reason for the desired change. These people knew the school district into which they moved when they purchased their homes. Mountain Avenue School is a California Distinguished School, which the corresponding La Canada school is not, so the quality of education is certainly not an issue. The real issue, I expect, is one of property values. As I understand it, one of the spearheads of the Sagebrush group has no school-age children and is planning to sell her home in the near future. The ability to tell prospective buyers that their children would attend a La Canada school would be considered a real estate plus.

Those of us in the valley with children attending our schools knew which schools they would be attending when we purchased (or rented) or homes here. It is the responsibility of parents to make this determination prior to moving into the area. We have children comfortable and secure in their school environment; they have
their friends and school activities; many of us as parents have been involved with our schools and have become active members of a community within a community.

What the Sagebrush people are asking would be to disrupt our lives and the lives of our children for questionable reasons. If they had really wanted to be in the La Canada School District, then they should not have purchased their homes in the Sagebrush area. Why should the rest of us, who intentionally moved into the community knowing the facts of school districting, be uprooted and disrupted due to the whim of a few greedy and selfish people? Please do not allow this to happen!

Sincerely,

Goanne S. McBerney

Mrs. Bruce H. McBerney
Dear Mr. Stark,

I want it on record that my family and I oppose the proposed transferal of territory to the La Canada Unified School District.

We are 23 year residents of the La Crescenta community. We've had 2 children graduate out of the GUSD, and have one child still in school at Monte Vista Elementary.

I (we) cannot believe that a district minority of homeowners — only interested in property values, not children's education and the greater good thereof — could influence a community-wide school decision which will affect a majority adversely.

Please consider wisely this matter.

Sincerely,

Robert F. Cormack

MAR 1 3 1992
March 11, 1992

Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization
9300 Imperial Highway
Room 123
Downey, California 90242-2990

Dear Committee Members:

There are many time consuming community jobs and there is no doubt that serving on your committee is one of those that is never properly thanked for your efforts. Please accept our thanks and appreciation.

We have been residents of the Mountain Avenue La Crescenta area for almost 31 years. Our daughters both graduated from Mountain Avenue and I accompanied all the choral groups there for six years.

More importantly though is the fact that I just retired in 1991 from successfully selling real estate in this whole area for 15 years. I am well acquainted with the attitudes of the people and know that this "sense of community" that they dwell on has not been a problem to the great majority of people who have sent their children to Mountain Avenue from the so-called "Sagebrush Area" (that area has not been known as that until this petition). The dominant factor for most of the proponents of the petition whether they have children in the school system or not is that they hope to enhance the value of their property. And there has always been a differential in the sales prices between La Canada and La Crescenta for comparable properties. The same situation exists in La Crescenta along Lowell Avenue in La Crescenta. The school line is not straight up and down Lowell but zig-zags, thereby creating a differential in the value of homes which are located next door to each other - the other side of the line is LA schools.

As for the Valley Sun Newspaper. I sincerely hope that you will have the opportunity to see enough issues of this narcissistic publication to recognize that property values in the future are foremost in the minds of the "Sagebrush" residents.

Sincerely,

Virginia H. Rodenberger (Mrs. A. E.)
2357 Caracas St.
La Crescenta, CA 91214

818-248-8457
MARCH 11, 1992

MR. JAMES R. MARLOTT
MANAGEMENT CONSULTANT
REGIONALIZED BUSINESS SERVICES
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
9300 IMPERIAL HIGHWAY
DOWNEY, CALIFORNIA 90242

DEAR SIR,

THIS PAST MONDAY, MARCH 9, I ATTENDED THE PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING THE ANNEXATION PETITION SUBMITTED BY THE PARENT GROUP OF THE SAGEBRUSH AREA OF LA CANADA. AS A RESIDENT, PARENT AND REGISTERED VOTER IN THE LA CRESNENTA AREA I ATTENDED THE PUBLIC HEARING TO HEAR ABOUT THE PETITION AND ITS EFFECT ON MOUNTAIN AVE. SCHOOL WHICH IS THE NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL AND WILL BE THE SCHOOL FOR MY CHILDREN IN THE NEXT TWO YEARS.

SEVERAL ISSUES WERE RAISED THAT I FEEL ARE THE CENTRAL POINTS THAT NEED TO BE ADDRESSED. IT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING FROM THE MEETING THAT THERE ARE 9 CRITERIA THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED BY THE COUNTY COMMISSION. ONE OF THOSE AREAS WAS THE ONE REGARDING FINANCIAL GAIN FROM THE PROPOSED ANNEXATION. IN LISTENING MONDAY NIGHT IT SEEMS THAT NOT ONLY WILL THE DISTRICT OF LA CANADA GAIN FINANCIALLY BUT ALSO THE RESIDENTS OF THE SAGEBRUSH AREA. THE LA CANADA DISTRICT LIKE ALL OTHER SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN CALIFORNIA IS FACING A FINANCIAL CRISIS. IN ADDITION TO LOWER STATE ALLOCATIONS THEY ARE FACED WITH DECLINING ENROLLMENT. TO SAY THEY WOULD NOT BENEFIT WITH THE ADDITIONAL REVENUE GENERATED BY THE OVER 200 NEW STUDENTS IS LUDICROUS. IN THAT SMALL A DISTRICT THESE NEW STUDENTS REPRESENT AN ADDITIONAL 7% ENROLLMENT INCREASE. THE LA CANADA DISTRICT WOULD BE FOOLHARDY NOT TO BELIEVE THESE ADDITIONAL STUDENTS WOULD NOT BENEFIT THEIR DISTRICT OR EVEN BE THE ONES COURTING THESE PARENTS IN AN ATTEMPT TO HELP OFFSET THEIR BUDGET CONCERNS.


THE SECOND CRITICAL ISSUE IS THE ONE ON THE EFFECT OF ETHNIC BALANCE OF THE TWO SCHOOL DISTRICTS INVOLVED. IT WAS STATED
That Mountain School is approximately 80% other white as is the La Canada area. This being supposedly equal there would be no negative effect on the ethnic balance of either district. Unfortunately the petitioners were using tunnel vision in making this statement. The overall effect on the Glendale School System would be detrimental. The majority of the new students to the Glendale area are minority students. This pattern is similar to the enrollment patterns throughout Los Angeles County. So in essence, in permitting the loss of a predominate number of other white students to another district this petition is negatively effecting the percentage of other white students in the Glendale District. This is condoning white flight. As a minority parent and citizen I find this not only appalling but also alarming that the county would even consider this annexation knowing the negative effects on the ethnic balance of the Glendale School District.

A third issue, I am not sure if this is also one of the nine criteria being addressed but I believe it is also important, would be the disruption the proposed annexation would create for hundreds of other families. One scenario would be having Glendale Unified closing Mountain Ave School due to lack of enrollment. Here the remaining 300 students would have to transferred to another school or schools creating problems for all the families involved. The next scenario is not better but worse. The Glendale District decides to keep Mountain Ave School open but it needs to redo the school attendance boundaries. Here you are disrupting untold hundreds of families to equalize the enrollments at all the surrounding schools. Both of these scenarios would involve expenditure of monies by Glendale Unified. In a time of budget crisis to create a further financial hardship for a district that would probably have to cut services to students in order to pay for such a process is unconscionable. All this to appease a few families who knew full well or should have known what they were buying into when they purchased in that area.

As a parent and resident of the La Crescenta area I plead with you not to grant the petition. The negative effects on the community as a whole would be too great.

Sincerely,

Alvaro A. Cortes
2417 El Moreno Street
La Crescenta, California 91214

CC: Glendale Board of Education
R. Wayne Starkes, Chairman
Los Angeles County Committee on School Districts
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA. 90242-2890

Sir Sir,

As a family living in the Crescenta Valley area of the Glendale Unified School District, we are very concerned about the proposed annexation of Glendale Unified School District territory to the La Canada Unified School District. Contrary to what the people living in the area in question think or have implied, this proposed action does not affect only them. In fact, it will impact hundreds of families in at least 5 existing elementary schools in the area that will face major boundary changes in order to avoid closure of the fine school that would be losing 20 maps (percentage wise) of its students and/or with its economically forced closure — severely impacting all the remaining elementary campuses. We already are having
children in tears because of the prospect of being separated from their friends. It would also mean a large number of families no longer traveling to what is actually their nearest school.

At the junior high and senior high levels, the loss of students would necessitate the loss of teaching personnel and, most likely, this would occur in the area of electives being able to be offered.

Our main concern is that if this issue were to go to the vote of the public, we in the Crescent Valley area be allowed to voice our opinion as well.

Thank you,

Susan C. Hungerman
2458 Orange Ave.
La Crescenta, CA 91011
March 6, 1992

James Marlatt,
L. A. County Committee for
District Organization
9200 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242

Re: Proposed Transfer of Territory from Glendale School District to the La Canada Unified School District

With reference to above, I have to submit that at present, my two sons attend the Mountain Avenue Elementary School since last three years. The proposed transfer of school district territory will affect the well being of my children since they will no longer be in a position to go to Mountain Avenue School once after the proposed transfer. One of the primary reasons of moving from India & settling down in this country was the desire to give my children good education. After making an extensive search for a good school we decided to move in the neighborhood of Mountain Avenue Elementary School District so that the children can go to one of the best schools. Now with the proposed transfer, everything seems to be falling apart.

I am sure many other parents will also have the same views. As such I oppose the proposed resolution of transfer.

Mahesh Manchandia

A-236

RECEIVED MAR 9 1992
Jeremy and Mary Burnham  
2955 W. Mountain Pine Drive  
La Crescenta, CA 91214-2057  
March 6, 1992

R. Wayne Stark, Chairman  
Los Angeles County School Districts Committee  
Los Angeles County Office of Education  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, CA 90242-2890

Dear Mr. Stark,

re: Glendale/La Canada Schools Redistricting

I am strongly opposed, as a parent and taxpayer, to any change in the Glendale and La Canada School Districts boundaries at this time.

Some residents of La Canada who currently live in the Glendale School District have proposed changing their area to the La Canada district citing "community cohesiveness" as a reason. This would change boundaries of districts established for close to a century.

The communities involved, La Crescenta and La Canada, have been stable and are of similar sociometry. There are no ethnic or other social factors along the border, real or perceived, which would favor moving children from one district to another. The fact that La Canada is now an incorporated city is of little significance compared to the greater disruption a district change would make.

The factors, proximity and quality of schools, normally favoring changing from one district to another are absent in this case. First, the students who would leave Mountain Avenue Elementary, Rosemont Jr. High and Crescenta Valley High Schools already live close to those schools. In most cases, the children would have to travel farther to attend schools in La Canada than they presently do. Second, although La Canada schools are good, they certainly have no better reputation than the three Glendale schools involved.

The current recession has caused school funding to be very tight. Restructuring districts at this point in time is unnecessary and will cause even more financial hardship. It is not fair to the taxpayers of Los Angeles County to disrupt a school district where capital building complexes are involved by either closing an existing school, building additional buildings on a second or overcrowding a third, all on a mere whim of certain residents of La Canada.

It is not beyond the realm of possibility that in some future year the portion of La Crescenta affected may be annexed into La Canada making the whole proposal a mute point.

Sincerely,

Jeremy & Mary Burnham

A-237
Parents join to oppose La Canada transfers

We think it's obvious that the people who are promoting this are doing so to increase the value of their homes.

Danette Erickson
Crescenta-Canada Committee

LA CRESCENTA — Some 80 Crescenta Valley parents have banded together to oppose the proposed transfer of some 240 school children from the Glendale Unified School District to the La Canada Unified School District.

Calling themselves the Crescenta-Canada Committee, the group hopes to stop the transfer proposed by the Sagesbrush Committee, a group of La Canada Flintridge parents who want their neighborhood included in the La Canada school system. Currently, students living in the Sagesbrush neighborhood, located in the far western part of La Canada Flintridge — must attend Glendale schools.

"We oppose this transfer," said Danette Erickson, a co-leader of the Crescenta-Canada Committee. "We think it's obvious that the people who are promoting this are doing so to increase the value of their homes. They don't especially care about the kids."

The Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization is scheduled to decide in May or June whether the issue will be put before voters for a decision.

Erickson said the Crescenta-Canada Committee is gathering petitions to ask the county committee to at least include all of the Crescenta Valley in the ballot, if not the entire Glendale Unified School District territory.

Opponents of the transfer, including Glendale district officials, have warned that if the transfer is approved, Mountain Avenue Elementary School may be closed, and that hundreds of students in the district may have to be moved to other schools in the district.

Transfer promoters say matching city and school district lines will result in a better sense of community for La Canada Flintridge residents. But Sharon Beauchamp, a member of the Glendale Board of Education, disputed that contention.

The committee will hold another community meeting April 15 at the Crescenta Valley Sheriff's Station. Members of the public may attend.
School Secession Clash

School officials and parents clashed again Monday on the attempt of residents in a La Canada neighborhood of 1,000 families to break away from the Glendale Unified School District.

More than 200 attended the second of two hearings before the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization on the proposal to join the neighborhood, home to 250 students, with the La Canada Unified School District.

Proponents repeated their demands to hold an election. Opponents again said that the loss of the area could mean closure of Glendale's Mountain Avenue Elementary and cost the district $400,000 in state funds.

The 11-member county committee must now decide by June whether to hold an election on the matter and, if so, what area to include in the voting. If an election is called, it would be on the November ballot. LA Times 3/19/92
Illegal school admissions alleged

By Melinda Jensen
Glendale News-Press

The La Canada School District recently struck a deal with the Glendale Unified School District to pay up to $60,000 for illegally admitting students who reside within Glendale's boundaries.

Under the agreement, La Canada would this year pay $3,000 per Glendale student for up to 20 students who were admitted illegally to La Canada, and the affected students would be returned to Glendale schools next fall, according to Phil Kauble, an attendance consultant at the Los Angeles County Office on Education.

In addition, La Canada District currently has enrolled at least 200 students from other areas who may soon be forced to return to their home districts, Kauble added.

"Basically, (La Canada officials) told us this has all been a misinterpretation of inter-district transfer rules," Kauble said.

Under a state-mandated school attendance law, students are required to attend school in the district in which their parents or legal guardians reside, unless they establish residency with a relative in a different district or receive formal permission from the affected districts.

Also, elementary school students are often permitted to attend schools in districts where their parents work under a provision of the law.

But county officials recently found that at least 20 Glendale students who were attending La Canada schools did not meet the requirements for an inter-district transfer, according to Kauble.

La Canada officials have said they "mislabeled" the law by assuming that Glendale students who previously attended La Canada private schools were allowed to transfer.

See Schools / A12
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School District is currently meeting with the La Canada School District to discuss Pasadena students who may be enrolled illegally.

"We know that they're talking about it right now, but we don't know any actual numbers at this time," Kauble said.

La Canada Assistant Superintendent Andrew Meyer said the district was projecting a decline in enrollment of 200 students next fall because the district was "adjusting" the way it handles inter-district transfers.

Normally, transfers would be approved a year before the school year begins, Meyer said.

But the district this year has decided to accept no transfer applications prior to March of the year before the transfer, he added.

"We need more time to plan for the school year," Meyer said.

The La Canada District currently has about 400 students enrolled who do not live in the district, he added.

The La Canada District's plight has led some Glendale parents who oppose a proposal to transfer about 250 city students to La Canada to accuse the district of only wanting Glendale students for monetary reasons.

A group of parents in the Sagebrush area of La Canada recently requested a petition that students in that area be allowed to attend their hometown schools.

At a March 9 hearing on the subject, La Canada officials praised the plan and presented to the county a resolution supporting the transfer.

"We think the possibility of La Canada losing all of those students is a motivating factor in their support of the Sagebrush petition," said Roy Simmons, who is active on a committee that opposes the proposal.

At the hearing, some parents referred to the La Canada school district as "greedy."

But La Canada officials say they support the proposal because they feel it's best for the students.

"There's no denying that additional students are not going to hurt us financially," said Carol Siegel, vice president of the governing board of the La Canada district, "but we're supporting it on that 'sense of community' idea that we feel is important for the children."

Siegel said the boundary line in La Canada that separates the La Canada and Glendale school districts is "divisive."

"It seems a little strange that kids who live in the same city can't go to school together," she said.

RECEIVED MAR 13 1992
La Canada District to Pay for Illegal Students

By DENISE HAMILTON

La Canada Unified could receive up to $60,000.

La Canada District to Pay for Illegal Students

According to the Los Angeles Times, La Canada Unified School District was found to be in violation of state law by State Superintendent of Public Instruction Jack O'Shea. The district had been paid $60,000 in 2008 for each student who was not legally enrolled in the district. This was due to the fact that the district had an agreement with another district to allow their students to attend La Canada Unified schools.

La Canada Unified School District was found to be in violation of state law by State Superintendent of Public Instruction Jack O'Shea. The district had been paid $60,000 in 2008 for each student who was not legally enrolled in the district. This was due to the fact that the district had an agreement with another district to allow their students to attend La Canada Unified schools.

Students
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"We're losing money on this."

The controversy surfaced last fall when an unidentified group of parents apparently tipped off Glendale officials that an increasing number of students were attending La Canada schools illegally.

Although La Canada officials deny it, some local parents say the district has for years looked the other way in order to collect state funds doled out based on the number of students enrolled.

Now, however, "It's gotten so blatant that it's a joke, they're using friends' addresses and everybody knows it," said one La Canada mother, who didn't want to be quoted by name because she fears retaliation against her children.

Some parents claim that up to 200 students from outside the district attend La Canada Unified schools. But school officials say that perhaps only nine to 20 students are enrolled illegally. District officials say they won't have a complete list until late March.

State law requires that enrolled students live with their immediate families within district boundaries.

Exemptions are made for foster children and those placed in local homes by the courts, said Kaubel, who is a county consultant for attendance and administrative services.

Additionally, Kaubel said students can attend elementary school in a district if their parents work within the school district boundaries, a practice utilized, for instance, by some employees of NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory on the La Canada Flintridge-Pasadena boundary.

All such exceptions require authorization from the district in which the child resides.

Kaubel said La Canada officials apparently misunderstood the state law and allowed Glendale students to say they lived in La Canada Flintridge with family friends. La Canada officials also allowed in students who live outside the area but previously attended private schools in La Canada Flintridge.

La Canada officials now concede that they misinterpreted the law but say it is almost impossible for them to prove residency. "It's really difficult to verify where a child lives," Meyer said. "There are only two of us in the office, and we don't make home calls."
La Canada Flintridge

Secession Petition OKd

A petition by a group of La Canada Flintridge residents seeking to break away from the Glendale Unified School District has been approved by the Los Angeles Committee on School District Organization, an official for the committee said.

The 11-member county committee must now decide whether to call an election on the transfer and, if so, what area to include, said Jim Mariatt, the committee's representative from the County Office of Education.

If successful, the secession could result in the transfer of 241 Glendale students to La Canada schools by July, 1993.

Organizers of the secession move gathered the signatures of 51% of the 1,400 registered voters in the neighborhood in the northwest corner of the Glendale district east of Pickens Canyon in La Canada Flintridge.

Proponents and opponents of the secession move and officials from the two districts will be able to address county committee members during two public hearings.

They are scheduled for 7:30 p.m. March 9 at Mountain Avenue Elementary School, 2307 Mountain Ave, in La Crescenta, and 7:30 p.m. March 16 at Palm Crest Elementary School, 5025 Palm Drive in La Canada.
Objective discussion needed

To the Editor:
I read with great interest the March 16 letter to you from Gloria Hill concerning her "disgust" with the Glendale School Board, stemming from a presentation by the school board's president at a recent "hearing" on the Sagebrush petition at Palm Crest Elementary School.
While I am a product of the Glendale schools, while I grew up in Glendale, and while I had, prior to moving to La Canada Flintridge, a fair amount of experience with the Glendale schools, I was not particularly proud of that heritage after hearing Blanch Greenwood's presentation at the Sagebrush hearing.
The issue plaguing the parents of over 200 children who live in the city of La Canada, but are required to attend Glendale schools ("the Sagebrush area"), was whether or not they should be allowed to vote to change the district to allow their children to attend La Canada schools, and, if they should be, who should vote.
To say the least, Ms. Greenwood was in a difficult position when she expressed the position of the Glendale School Board, yet her statements came down squarely against many of those she, and the other board members, owe an allegiance to.
At the hearing, La Canada school "governing board" representatives said parents should be allowed to vote, and, if those parents chose to change their situation, La Canada could accommodate them. As a parent with three children at Palm Crest Elementary, which would receive about 130 of those students, I am very interested in this issue.
In sharp contrast, the Glendale School Board representative completely ignored the issue and, while professing to represent "all" of the involved students, and while asserting beliefs in what is "best" for the students involved, proceeded, at this hearing, to criticize "the petitioners" for, essentially, being "wrong" in their effort, and to outline the "disaster" which would befall Glendale schools if this were allowed. Not once did Ms. Greenwood show objective support for the "procedure" of allowing these parents to have a say in their destiny by being allowed to vote on an issue which affects them.

Harsh words without solutions of issues pertinent to their constituents solve nothing; logic is being replaced by emotion, primarily centered around an unobjective attitude of "them vs. us"; and credibility to the electorate is being ignored (the Glendale School Board, prior to making its bold statements, never asked the parents involved what they would want, and how they would feel).

This issue has many solutions which, if the two school boards coordinate their efforts, could result in a conclusion to the benefit of all. However, the solution must start with leadership and that difficult step of evaluating how "the other guy" feels about the problem. Then, it must be followed with objective discussion, not emotional threats and unrealistic evaluation.

Robert C. Burlison Jr.
La Canada Flintridge

A-243
November 27, 1991

Editor
Daily News
P.O. Box 4200
Woodland Hills, CA 91365

Dear Editor:

I am upset about several misleading statements you printed in the attached article from your Sunday, November 24, 1991, edition.

As chairwoman of the Sagebrush Committee of La Canada, I represent the parent group that is petitioning to transfer our western edge of La Canada from the Glendale Unified School District to the La Canada Unified School District.

I strenuously object to the article's statement that both school boards have said that they will not approve the switch. The La Canada Unified School District has stated to your reporter Russell Rian that they are currently neutral on this issue. Privately, La Canada board members have stated that they would welcome us but that they must maintain a working relationship with the Glendale board and thus do not wish to aggrivate them.

The article also contains a very inflammatory statement about possible closure of the Mountain Avenue Elementary School if this transfer were to take place. To ease the effect on Mountain Avenue enrollment, we have requested that La Canada children attending Glendale schools be allowed to continue at Glendale schools; the La Canada board has already agreed to this (see attached letter). Mountain Avenue is an excellent school and we believe that many La Canada parents will keep their children there until graduation.

Even if all of the La Canada students currently attending Mountain Avenue were to transfer to La Canada's Palm Crest Elementary School when the transfer becomes effective, we doubt that Mountain Avenue would close. According to our records, 130 students of the 469 students attending Mountain Avenue are from La Canada. Where would Glendale place the remaining 339 students? Their adjacent elementary schools are currently overcrowded.
Your November 19, 1991, Glendale Section article on Glendale schools overcrowding (attached) says that Glendale's student population will increase by more than 4,000 within three years. As a result, Glendale is already considering modifying enrollment boundaries and has implemented year-round education. Glendale has already disrupted the lives of thousands of students because of this problem.

We think Glendale should reconsider their attitude and approve our transfer.

I have expressed my concerns to your reporter Russell Rian. In the future, I expect your coverage of this issue to be accurate and fair.

Sincerely,

Rose McCoppin  
5034 Castle Road  
La Canada, CA 91011

Attachments
cc: La Canada Unified School Board  
Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization

P.S. Some of things I should, I should, let you know mark.  

Thx
GLENDALE

Cash woes may stall district change

Parents seek measure to transfer La Canada schools' control from Glendale

By Russell Rian
Daily News Staff Writer

A group of La Canada Flintridge residents are starting a drive to collect signatures to put a measure on the November 1992 ballot to transfer a portion of the Glendale school district to La Canada Flintridge Unified School District.

Under their proposal, about 250 students who live in a .6-acre portion of the western end of the city of La Canada Flintridge would be transferred from the Glendale Unified School District to the La Canada Flintridge Unified School District.

"If I live in La Canada Flintridge, why can't I send my son to La Canada schools," said Rose McCoppin, who is heading the parents group seeking to shift boundaries. "We're not trying to run away from Glendale saying they're bad schools or anything, we just want to belong to our city."

The new school boundary lines would follow the existing city boundary lines. La Canada students who now attend Crescenta Valley High School, Rosemont Junior High School or Mountain Avenue Elementary would be affected. However, a clause in the resident's proposal would allow parents to choose which school their children attended during a still-undetermined adjustment period, McCoppin said.

Jim Marlati, a Los Angeles County education consultant, said there are two ways to transfer the area to La Canada.

Both boards could approve the transfer, and even though neither board has taken a vote on the issue, both have said they will not approve the switch.

Now parents must gather signatures from 25 percent of the registered voters of the affected area and present them to the Los Angeles County Committee of School District Organization, which can reject the plea, ending the process, or approve.

If the committee approves the proposal, it would go to a vote of the people.

Parents say they are proposing the transfer because La Canada students attending Glendale schools are felt isolated when attending city-oriented and other groups such as Scouting programs because they do not attend the same schools.

"I have a son in the Boy Scouts and he's the only one who doesn't go to La Canada schools," McCoppin said. "It makes you wonder who do I belong to."

But Glendale officials say the move would have widespread effects on those remaining in the Glendale district ranging from required boundary changes at other schools, possibly closing Mountain Avenue Elementary.

"There'd be a ripple effect," said Glendale school board member Jane Whittaker. "They're asking us to disrupt the lives of thousands of students."

The dramatic fall in students at Mountain Avenue Elementary, which now has about 460 students, could force officials to close the school because it would be too expensive to operate, said Vic Pallos, spokesman for the Glendale Unified School District.

To keep it open would almost certainly require boundary changes for attendance areas at Mountain Avenue and nearby schools to bring the number of students up enough to make keeping the school open cost-effective.

Busing could be an alternative, however board members and parents alike are against such efforts because the district to maintain neighborhood schools, Whittaker said.

What effect it would have on the Glendale district's $103 million budget is still being determined.
GLendale

District may reconvene task force

Glendale school officials seek recommendations on how to handle student growth

By Laurence Darmiento
Daily News Staff Writer

GLendale — Faced with projections that its student population will increase by more than 4,000 within three years, the Glendale school board will consider reconvening a task force on how to handle the growth.

Superintendent Robert Sanchez is recommending that the Glendale Unified School District re-establish the Futures’ Task Force, which presented a report in February 1990, but has since disbanded.

Nearly all of the task force’s initial recommendations have been carried out, but projections that enrollment will grow nearly 16 percent by the 1994/1995 school year are requiring it to meet again, said Vic Pallos, the school district’s spokesman.

School board member Sharon Beauchamp said that she favored reconvening the task force.

“We had projected we would have 27,000 students by the end of next year,” Beauchamp said. “We are over that already. I think it’s necessary.”

The school board is scheduled to consider the recommendation during its regular meeting at 7:30 p.m. today at Columbus Elementary School, 425 W. Milford St.

The school district’s enrollment is now at 27,078, according to Sanchez’s memo. That is expected to rise to 28,646 next year and to 31,436 in three years.

The task force will have 24 members, including three administrators, three principals, six teachers and six parents, Pallos said. He expects the task force will be composed of both new faces and members from the old group.

While we implemented all of the original recommendations, the continuing enrollment increase shows that it’s time to look at some additional changes,” said Pallos.

The task force’s recommendations included that the district should build new classrooms, modify enrollment boundaries and consider year-round education, according to a memo to the board by Sanchez.

The original task force concentrated on the district’s elementary schools, but Pallos said the new one would be asked to study what can be done to alleviate overcrowding in secondary school classrooms.

Administrators have been discussing the possibility of changing the boundaries of the three district high schools, so that students can be diverted from schools — now just about at maximum capacity — to Cerritos Valley High School, which still has room to grow, Pallos said.

There also has been discussion of turning the now six-period day into nine periods and extending its hours. While each individual student would still attend school for six periods and for the same amount of time, all students would be at school at once, Pallos said.

An extension of this idea would be to start offering night classes for students who would like that option. That would allow them to work part-time jobs...
La Cañada Unified School District
5038 PALM DRIVE • LA CAÑADA, CALIFORNIA 91011
(818) 952-8383 – FAX: (818) 952-8309

November 21, 1991

Rose McCoppin
5034 Castle Road
La Canada, CA 91011

Dear Rose:

This letter is in response to your request for the La Canada Unified School District’s position regarding the attendance of students in the area presently being considered for annexation to the La Canada School District.

Please be advised that the District’s practice is to allow any student within the District to attend schools in the District of their choice. Specifically, if a student is currently attending school in the Glendale Unified School District and is under consideration for annexation to the La Canada School District but chooses to remain in the Glendale Unified School District, the La Canada Unified School District would support that decision and approve an Inter-District transfer request.

Please let me know if you have any further questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Andrew J. Meyer

Andrew J. Meyer

AJM:cb
Student swap seen boosting home values

By Ed Kamian
Glendale News-Press

If 200 students are transferred from the Glendale Unified School District to the La Canada School District, their parents' homes could increase in value by 10 percent, according to La Canada real estate agents.

But a spokesman for the parents' group requesting the change said it was concerned about civic unity and their children's education, not financial gain.

"(Increased home value) is not the issue at all," said Jim Graf, who on Nov. 5, asked the Glendale school board to consider transferring a slice of land within La Canada's city boundaries to the La Canada school district.

"We're not looking for that (higher home values)," Graf said. "(The parents) are doing this because they want a better education for their children."

Nevertheless Bill Abelmann, a La Canada appraiser for 45 years, said homebuyers' perceptions that smaller school districts are better would push the price up at
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"People have perceptions about a lot of things but they're not always accurate," spokesman Vic Pallos said.

A majority of the Glendale board have said the transfer would place an undue financial and organizational burden on their financially strapped district.

Graf said he will approach the Glendale board at its meeting 7:30 p.m. Tuesday at Columbus Elementary School and will provide more information about the proposed transfer.

He said his 70 supporters are prepared to push for a vote on the boundary change.

La Canada, a much smaller district than Glendale, has a much higher percentage of its students take and pass college-level credit tests, according to just-released state figures.

Both districts experienced more than a 150-percent increase in the number of students passing at least one Advanced Placement test since 1983.

"When people go home shopping in La Canada, "they undoubtedly will bring school test scores," said La Canada real estate agent Janice Roberts-Hing.

She said it was not unusual for people to spend $500,000 for a three-bedroom, two-bath fixer-upper that "needs practically everything" instead of a well-kept but otherwise similar residence in Glendale for $350,000 "just to have their children go to La Canada."

Pallos said that test scores should be just one of many factors in evaluating a school district.

"I tell parents consider the scores but don't take the scores as 100 percent of the reason to choose a district," Pallos said.
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COUNTY PANEL APPROVES PETITION

Quest to Transfer Students
To La Cañada Moves Forward

by Dorothy Maddux

A group of westside La Cañada parents, calling themselves the "Sagebrush Committee," has moved forward in its quest to have its children attend La Cañada schools following the approval of a petition by the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization.

The petition asks that the Glendale school board transfer 241 students to La Cañada schools who live within the bounds of the city of La Cañada Flintridge but now attend Glendale schools. The area covers a 0.5 square mile belt east of Pickens Canyon and includes Mountain Avenue Elementary School, Rosemont Junior High School and Crescenta Valley High School.

The petition process is carried out under the state education code and requires that 25 percent of the residents in the area sign the petition. The "Sagebrush Committee" gathered the signatures of 51 percent of the residents.

The Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization will hold public hearings on the signing of the petition on March 9 and March 16. Hearings will be conducted in the La Cañada school district and the Glendale school district, according to James R. Marlat, management consultant to the committee. The meetings are to set at this time to meet at Mountain Avenue School and Palm Crest Elementary School in La Cañada.

Mr. Marlat will then submit a report to the County Committee on his findings from the public hearings, conversations with school districts, questionnaires and the petitions. The report must meet the criteria listed in the Education Code, including the financial, educational and organizational impact, the impact on community identity, racial and ethnic balances and whether the committee feels that the petitioners are just trying to raise their property values.

Glendale school board president Blanch Greenwood has said that Glendale will fight the proposed transfer.

She stated that the Glendale district was doing a good job and that the transfer would affect many people, not just those in the small strip of land.

If approval is granted, the Glendale students could be transferred to La Cañada on July 1, 1993.