



Boundary Committee Report to the June 9th GUHSD Board Meeting

Good evening.

I'd like to give you a brief recap of what we did at our fourth and fifth meetings on May 19th and June 2nd, and what we'll be looking at our next meeting on June 23rd.

In our fourth meeting on May 19th, we reviewed and discussed the following issues:

- We recognized that we are close to being able to compile our final recommendations to the trustees, and we've accelerated our meeting schedule in order to be able to comfortably review all the necessary data, and to compile recommendations for our presentation to the Board at its July meeting. That could be as long as 30 minutes if you'd like us to do a detailed presentation, so we'd like some direction from you in that regard.
- Going forward, we are going to limit our deliberations to two boundary models only. Model 9 will be the model containing boundaries for only the 9 comprehensive high schools, and model HS12 will be the boundary model that includes the 12th HS.
- We reviewed the information that we requested from the District Transportation Department, and concluded that it was not helpful in being able to assess the overall impact on transportation costs to the District. Data provided by the transportation department would require a costly and time-consuming analysis of the routes and riders. Our demographer Vince O'Hara proposed that a rough analysis of costs could be accomplished by assuming that District costs were proportional to the number of students throughout the District who live beyond walking distance from a high school, and we have proceeded on that basis.
- We reviewed State Ed Code requirements and District Administrative Regulations concerning the open enrollment limits at each high school. Based on our review of these regulations, the Committee believes that we can provide the District with new open enrollment limits that are consistent with the requirements of State and District regulations, which reduce intra-District student migrations, and which balance the enrollments at each of the existing nine high schools.
- We reviewed changes in demographic and academic achievement ratios inside the District, based on the new boundaries in both models.
- We reviewed the tentative HS12 model. As it has been defined, HS12 is predicted to have an attendance figure of 933 students, which does not include Blossom Valley. We are proceeding on the basis that the initial functional capacity of HS12 will be 1,000 students.

This document is completely proprietary, and is the intellectual property of DSD Business Systems. The user agrees that DSD Business Systems will be substantially damaged if this agreement is breached, and indicates their acceptance of these terms by reading this document. If this condition is not acceptable, this document is to be returned unread to DSD Business Systems.



Based on our deliberations, we asked for the following information at our June 2nd meeting:

- We asked Vince to provide his best estimate for the number of students that he predicts the District might “recover” from private and charter schools (other than Steele), and from outside the District, if HS12 is built.
- We asked Vince to provide his best estimate concerning how many students the District might “recover” from Steele Canyon, if HS12 is built. For this model, we asked Vince to approximate how many students Steele might take away from other surrounding District high schools, as a result of the loss of students to HS12.
- We asked Vince to produce an estimate of the change in District transportation costs for the two models.
- We asked Vince to produce a detailed view of the Blossom Valley neighborhood, showing the number of residents by DIME grid.
- We asked Vince to produce detailed information concerning the demographics of both models’ transition areas, in order for us to better understand neighborhood integrity issues.

In our fifth meeting on June 2nd, we reviewed and discussed the following issues:

- There is some member turnover on our Committee. Our deliberations have run into the beginning of the summer, and four of our members have let us know that they will not be able to continue to participate. We thank them for their service, and we also recognize that they must be replaced. To-date, Marybeth Meek (West Hills), Frank Foggiano (Grossmont), Steve Vickery (El Cap), and Connie Kaminsky (Valhalla) have dropped out. District staff has assisted us in replacing them with Paul Hedberg from El Cap and Sam Lund from Valhalla, and I believe that they are searching for a third replacement. We are now without Grossmont representation. Because we are down a total of two members from our original makeup, the committee approved lowering our quorum from 9 to 8. All these changes are subject to approval by the trustees and I’d appreciate the board’s consensus, after my report.
- We had a significant turnout from the Blossom Valley community. They voiced their desire to have the Committee continue to designate Blossom Valley as a Granite/El Cap option area, and they voiced their desire to be an option area for HS12 if it’s built. I’d like to advise the trustees that we will likely make the following recommendations:
 - That Blossom Valley not remain as an option area for Granite, whether HS12 is built or not. We will likely recommend that it be located inside the El Cap boundary only.
 - That Blossom Valley be designated as an option area for HS12, but with triggers to ensure that there is sufficient capacity at HS12 for Alpine residents, before it is opened to Blossom Valley students.

The Granite option for Blossom Valley has been the only area of our study that has raised strong community concerns, so I’d like to address it at this time, to better prepare the trustees for future discussions of this issue.

The trustees should know that before the Steele Canyon boundary study in 2000, Blossom Valley was inside the El Cap boundary only, and it was not an option area for Granite. The option for Granite was extended to Blossom Valley because Steele was taking a significant number of Granite students, and there was concern in the boundary committee that Granite's attendance would be too low. As we all now know, Granite, with close to 2,800 students, has anything but a low attendance issue, and the rationale for the Granite option in Blossom Valley has long since disappeared.

Blossom Valley residents are rightfully concerned that the education options at Granite, particularly for high-achieving students and for athletes, are much better than at El Cap. They are right about that, but only because attendance at Granite has grown disproportionately compared to El Cap and other District schools. Because of their size, Granite can offer AP and IB courses and extracurricular activities that most other schools cannot. Conversely, because of their low attendance, El Cap cannot offer all of those same course options, nor can they be as competitive with their sports teams, or offer the same rich array of extracurricular activities that schools like Granite and Grossmont are able to.

The trustees asked our Committee to level the playing fields between the District schools, so that all schools could offer a competitive array of courses and activities. To allow Blossom Valley to continue to attend Granite would be at odds with that concept. By placing Blossom Valley in the El Cap boundary only, we not only raise the El Cap student population to a competitive number, but we also move a portion of what is now the El Cap boundary into Santana's area, solving Santana's attendance challenge which is even more serious than El Cap's. I urge you to accept the Committee's final Blossom Valley recommendation as-is, when we present it to you in July. It will likely be to remove the Granite option from Blossom Valley, whether HS12 is built or not, and it will likely be to designate Blossom Valley as an option area for HS12, with the previously mentioned stipulations.

- At the last District Board Meeting, I let the trustees know that Steele Canyon's attendance had benefitted from about 400 students who were previously not attending District schools. This was about 30% of Steele's attendance at the time. This 400 number was realized after the full four year grade-by-grade ramping up period. Trustee Hoy asked if we could be more precise concerning where those students came from, and I committed that we would investigate. Those results are in, and our demographer Vince O'Hara has indicated that these were the sources:
 - 13% resulted from natural population growth in the area.
 - 12% resulted from residential real estate development
 - 12% likely resulted from address borrowing by residents who live within the Valhalla and Monte Vista boundaries.
 - 50% resulted from population movement from outside the district, likely fueled by the perceived desirability of the new school.
 - 13% resulted from the District's "recovery" of private and charter school students who lived within the District's boundaries but who did not attend a district school.



This is an important analysis because it serves as a model for future demographic shifts caused by the construction of HS12.

- In our May 19th meeting, we asked Vince to use the Steele Canyon model and any other demographic tools that he has available, to assess the potential number of “recoverable” students in the HS12 attendance area. He was able to give us preliminary results, which are as follows:
 - If HS12 is built, and after the four year ramping up period, 90 new students will be attracted from outside the district, and from existing private schools and charters inside the District, other than Steele.
 - 190 to 380 students will be pulled back into the District from Steele. This is net of the predicted number of students that Steele will take back from other District high schools.
 - This is predicted to be a total of between 280 to 470 students who will represent a windfall in ADA revenues to the district, as a result of the building of HS12.

I’d like to emphasize that although we don’t expect these numbers to change significantly prior to our final recommendations, these are preliminary numbers.

- Vince presented his transportation analysis to the Committee. His conclusions are that the building of HS12 will have a slight but beneficial impact on District transportation costs. He also concluded that the enactment of the new model 9 boundaries will have a significant negative impact on the District. The impact is estimated to be approximately 16% of the District’s current transportation costs. This increase is caused by the balancing of school populations, in which some students will be required to travel farther in order to attend a school that is currently in population decline.
- Due to time constraints, we were not able to finalize our recommendation concerning the new open enrollment limits, but it is our intent to do so at the next meeting.
- We studied specific DIME grids in some of the transition areas, and made appropriate adjustments.
- We agreed to have Vince look at the possibility of making the Harbison Canyon area an option area for HS12, with the same stipulations that would be in effect for Blossom Valley.

In our next meeting, we will be reviewing and finalizing all our work, with the expectation of being able to provide the trustees with a detailed set of boundary and demographic recommendations at the July Board Meeting.

I’d be happy to answer any questions at this time.