April 23, 2018

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

FROM: Keith D. Crafton, Secretary

SUBJECT: Regular Meeting of the County Committee—Wednesday, May 2, 2018

The next regular meeting of the County Committee will be held at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, May 2, 2018, in the Board Room of the Los Angeles County Office of Education, at 9300 Imperial Highway in Downey. Reserved parking spaces will be available on the east side of the building for County Committee members.

Attached is the agenda for the meeting of May 2, 2018.

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

KDC/AD/EH:ah
Attachments
AGENDA

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

Regular Meeting

Los Angeles County Office of Education
May 2, 2018
9:30 a.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER – Chairperson Mr. AJ Willmer

II. FLAG SALUTE – Mr. Willmer

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – Mr. Willmer  I, D, A

The minutes of the January 10, 2018 regular meeting, and of the
March 8, 2018 special meeting of the County Committee, will be
submitted for approval. (Enclosures)

IV. APPOINTMENT OF NEW COUNTY COMMITTEE MEMBER  I, D, A
– Mr. Willmer

Dr. Cherise G. Moore, of the William S. Hart Union High School
District (HSD) has submitted her nomination to replace Mr. Joel
Peterson in the Fifth Supervisorial District. If appointed, she will
assume her duties immediately after being sworn-in.

V. PRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC – Secretary Crafton  I, D, A

Any persons present desiring to address the County Committee on any
proper matter may do so at this time. (Form to be completed and
submitted to the secretary)– Secretary Keith Crafton  I, D, A

VI. COMMUNICATIONS – Mr. Crafton

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

The Secretary will present a petition to establish trustee areas and trustee area voting within the Inglewood USD.

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

The Secretary will present a petition to establish trustee areas and trustee area voting within the Whittier City SD.

IX. PETITION TO ESTABLISH TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING IN THE COVINA VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (USD) – Mr. Crafton

The Secretary and staff will present a feasibility study on a petition to establish trustee areas and trustee area voting within the Covina Valley USD, after which the County Committee may vote on the proposal. (Attachment 1)

X. PETITION TO ESTABLISH TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING IN THE LOWELL JOINT SCHOOL DISTRICT (SD) – Mr. Crafton

The Secretary will provide an update on a petition to establish trustee areas and trustee area voting within the Lowell Joint SD.

XI. UPDATE ON PETITION TO FORM A MALIBU UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (USD) FROM TERRITORY WITHIN THE SANTA MONICA-MALIBU USD - Mr. Crafton

The complete update is: The City of Malibu has petitioned to form a Malibu USD out of territory currently within the Santa Monica-Malibu USD. Following the introduction of the petition in November, 2017, the city submitted additional material to the petition rationale, including a trustee area map, a description of the fiscal impact of the unification, and letters requesting that the scheduling of the County Committee’s preliminary public hearing be postponed until after further discussions occur related to the petition.
XII. UPDATE ON PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORY FROM THE GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (USD) TO THE LA CANADA USD – Mr. Crafton

The complete update is: The environmental services consultant has begun the study related to requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) on the petition to transfer territory from the Glendale USD to the La Canada USD. A timeline for completion of this work cannot be determined at this time.

XIII. UPDATE ON REVIEW OF COUNTY COMMITTEE POLICIES – Mr. Willmer

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

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

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

XV. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE – Mr. Crafton

There are no bills to report.

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

The Secretary will provide an update on school district reorganization proposals affecting the Los Angeles USD. (“Summary of Los Angeles USD Reorganization Proposals”). (Attachment 2)

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

The Secretary will provide an update on school district reorganization proposals affecting Los Angeles County school and community college districts, other than the Los Angeles USD. (“Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals [excluding those affecting the Los Angeles USD]”). (Attachment 3)
XVIII. ADDITIONAL COMMUNICATIONS, CONCERNS, OR ITEMS FOR NEXT AGENDA

XIX. ADJOURNMENT
The Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) met on Wednesday, January 10, 2018, at the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) in Downey. The meeting was called to order at 11:30 a.m., by Chairperson Frank Ogaz.

### Members Present

Maria Calix  
Ted Edmiston  
Owen Griffith  
John Nunez  
Frank Ogaz  
Joel Peterson  
Susan Solomon  
AJ Wilmer  

### Members Absent

Frank Bostrom  
Nicole Kluft  
Susan Andriacchi  

### Staff Present

Keith D. Crafton, Secretary  
Jeff Young, Staff  
Eric Hass, Staff  
Anna Heredia, Staff  
Diane Tayag, Staff  

Mr. Frank Ogaz called the meeting to order.

Mr. Ogaz led the flag salute.

It was MOVED by Mr. John Nunez and SECONDED by Ms. Suzan Solomon that the minutes of the regular meeting held on November 1, 2017 be approved. Motion carried. Votes are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Maria Calix</td>
<td>Abstained</td>
<td>Mr. Frank Ogaz</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ted Edmiston</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mr. Joel Peterson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Owen Griffith</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ms. Suzan Solomon</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John Nunez</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mr. AJ Wilmer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The nominating committee nominated Mr. AJ Willmer for Chair and Dr. Ted Edmiston for Vice-Chair. Mr. Nunez made the motion to approve the nomination, seconded by Ms. Solomon. Motion carried. Votes are:

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

Secretary Crafton announced that Ms. Calix and Mr. Willmer were re-elected to new four-year terms, representing the 2nd and 3rd Supervisorial Districts.

Mr. Ogaz administered the oath of office to the re-elected County Committee members: Ms. Calix for the 2nd and Mr. Willmer for the 3rd supervisory districts.

There were no presentations from the public.

Secretary Crafton directed the Committee to their folders for recent news related to the California Voting Rights Act impacting local districts, and other documents relating to the City of Malibu and Antelope Valley Joint Union High School District.

Secretary Crafton presented the Committee with a petition to establish trustee areas and trustee area voting in the Covina Valley USD. He also stated that we need to hold a public hearing within 60 days, a survey of date availability is also in the folders for your input. Shortly after the hearing, staff will prepare a feasibility study for the review of the County Committee.

Secretary Crafton stated the City of Malibu has petitioned to form a Malibu USD out of territory currently within the Santa Monica-Malibu USD. Following the introduction of the petition in November, 2017, the city submitted additional material to the petition rationale, including a trustee area map, a description of the fiscal impact of the unification, and a letter requesting that the scheduling of the County Committee’s preliminary public hearing be postponed until after the February 2018, meeting within the district.
David Vierra, Antelope Valley Joint Union High School, Superintendent gave a presentation in support of establishing trustee areas and trustee area voting in the Antelope Valley Joint Union HSD.

Attorney, Milton Foster III, gave a presentation on the timeline and outreach of the Antelope Valley Joint Union HSD.

The demographer presented the map to be approved.

Mr. Eric Hass presented the feasibility report to the Committee.

Mr. Bostrom made a motion to approve the Petition to Establish Trustee Areas and Trustee Area Voting in the Antelope Valley Joint Union High SD, seconded by Mr. John Nunez.

The Petition to Establish Trustee Areas and Trustee Area Voting in the Antelope Valley Joint Union High SD was approved. Votes were:

- Ms. Maria Calix: Yes
- Dr. Ted Edmiston: Yes
- Dr. Owen Griffith: Yes
- Mr. John Nunez: Yes
- Mr. Frank Ogaz: Yes
- Mr. Joel Peterson: Yes
- Ms. Suzan Solomon: Yes
- Mr. AJ Willmer: Yes

Mr. Ogaz made a motion to approved the map presented, seconded by Mr. Peterson. Votes were:

- Ms. Maria Calix: Yes
- Dr. Ted Edmiston: Yes
- Dr. Owen Griffith: Yes
- Mr. John Nunez: Yes
- Mr. Frank Ogaz: Yes
- Mr. Joel Peterson: Yes
- Ms. Suzan Solomon: Yes
- Mr. AJ Willmer: Yes

Secretary Crafton stated that an environmental services consultant has been selected, and a contract is being expedited to provide services related to related to requirements under the California Environmental Quality Act. A timeline for completing this work cannot be determined at this time, but we will keep the Committee updated.

Mr. Willmer stated he continues to have discussions with LACOE general counsel.

Secretary Crafton reported that we continue to see trustee area petitions, both proactive ones like Covina Valley, and others in response to demand letters and other legal action. It expected this activity to continue throughout 2018 as more districts vote to make the move. Secretary Crafton also reported that we are discussing the possibility to host a forum for districts with the Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder.

Secretary Crafton reported that we are monitoring the progress of AB 350. We will continue to work with Ms. Pam Gibbs and staff from State Senator Ben Allen’s office.
Secretary Crafton stated there are no updates to report.

Secretary Crafton stated there are no updates to report.

Secretary Crafton reminded the Committee of the new LACOE ID badges now available.

Meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.
The Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) met on Thursday, March 8, 2018, at the Covina Valley Unified School District (USD). The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m., by Chairperson AJ Willmer.

Members Present

Susan Andriacchi
Ted Edmiston
Owen Griffith (on the phone)
Frank Ogaz
Suzan Solomon
AJ Willmer

Members Absent

Frank Bostrom
Maria Calix
Nicole Kluft
John Nunez

Staff Present

Keith D. Crafton, Secretary
Jeff Young, Staff
Allison Deegan, Staff

Mr. AJ Willmer called the meeting to order.

Mr. AJ Willmer led the flag salute.

Secretary Crafton stated that we received a petition from the Lowell Joint School District. There is a copy in the folders. This is a joint district, the County Committee will coordinate its activity with the Orange County Committee.

Chairperson Willmer stated the Committee has been notified of a petition, there are copies of information about this petition in the folders.

Secretary Crafton stated that the majority of the territory of this district lies in San Bernardino County, some lines cross into L.A. County. The San Bernardino County Committee approved the process and final trustee area map submitted by the Chaffey Joint Union High School District.

Chairperson Willmer read the resolution and called for a motion to approve it. Ms. Suzan Solomon made a motion to approve the San Bernardino County Committee Resolution, seconded by Mr. Owen Griffith. The votes are as follows:

Ms. Susan Andriacchi  Yes  Mr. Frank Ogaz  Yes
Mr. Ted Edmiston  Yes  Ms. Suzan Solomon  Yes
Dr. Owen Griffith  Yes  Mr. AJ Willmer  Yes
Chariperson Willmer stated that we have received a resignation of Mr. Joel Peterson effective February 15, 2018. A copy of the resignation is in the folders.

Secretary Crafton stated that according to County Committee policies the remainder of Mr. Peterson’s term will be filled by appointment by a majority vote of this committee, anyone appointed will need to live in the 5th Supervisorial District. Any appointee will be sworn in and seated immediately after the appointment by the Committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p.m. by a unanimous vote. Votes are as follows:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Susan Andriacchi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mr. Frank Ogaz</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ted Edmiston</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ms. Suzan Solomon</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Owen Griffith</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mr. AJ Willmer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjournment
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I. INTRODUCTION

On December 15, 2017, the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) received a petition submitted by the Covina Valley Unified School District (USD), pursuant to Education Code (EC) §5019(c)(1), to establish trustee areas and trustee area voting within the Covina Valley USD (Appendix A). The petition was presented on January 10, 2018, to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee).

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

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

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

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

Initiation of Proposal

Any such proposal may be initiated by:

a. the County Committee; or

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

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

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

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

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

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

Public Hearing/County Committee Action

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

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

If the proposal is approved, the County Superintendent shall order an election to be held no later than the next election for governing board members of the district (i.e., November 2018). The order of election would include a single ballot measure consisting of two proposals. The two proposals would be stated as follows:

“For the establishment of trustee areas in the [Covina Valley Unified School] District. - Yes/No”

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

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

The election of governing board members would also be operative at the next regular election date (i.e., November 2018) for any seats scheduled for election (either by rotation, every two years, or by specific identification as a result of the County Committee review of the trustee area petition). The election of any members of the Covina Valley USD governing board will be guided by a consolidated election order covering all regular school and community college elections held in Los Angeles County in November 2018.

Development of Trustee Area Boundary Maps

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

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

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

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

The County Committee would then establish trustee area boundaries for the district as authorized pursuant to EC §5019(c). The established trustee area boundaries would be utilized for the next succeeding governing board election (i.e., November 2018).
Please note that, for the present proposal, staff has included the trustee area boundary map developed and approved by the Covina Valley USD governing board, in consultation with its attorneys, demographers, and district staff, and after solicitation of input from governing board members, the public and other parties relevant to the process of developing trustee areas (such as representatives from local municipal entities). The County Committee may consider adopting this map and trustee areas as submitted, or convene an additional process to develop additional maps with alternate trustee areas.

Transition of Incumbent Board Members

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

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

Subject to approval of the proposal by the electorate, as required, the County Committee would determine the applicable trustee areas for nomination and election no later than 120 days prior to the next regular scheduled governing board election (i.e., November 2018). The County Committee would make this determination following adoption of the trustee area boundaries for the district.

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

III. LOS ANGELES COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

There are 80 school districts in Los Angeles County as displayed on Reference Map 1.
Reference Map 1

*Source: Los Angeles County Office of Education, 2016-17 Public Schools Directory.*
Table 1 presents a summary of the governance characteristics of the school districts within Los Angeles County relating to trustee areas. Of the 80 school districts, 19 are organized into trustee areas and 61 do not have trustee areas. Of the districts that have trustee areas, three elect using an at-large methodology and the remaining 16 elect members by trustee area voting.

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

#### A. Petition to Establish Trustee Areas and Trustee Area Voting Within the Covina Valley USD

On December 15, 2017, LACOE and the County Committee received a petition submitted by the Covina Valley USD, pursuant to Education Code (EC) §5019(c)(1), to establish trustee areas and trustee area voting within the district. This petition was submitted in the form of Resolution No. 17-18-10 (Appendix A), adopted on November 6, 2017 by a unanimous vote, and an approved trustee area map.

#### B. Rationale of the Covina Valley USD as Petitioner

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

#### C. Position of the Governing Board of the Covina Valley USD

The petition was submitted by the Covina Valley USD governing board, which approved it by a 5-0 vote on November 6, 2017, approving a final trustee area map. The petition contained the final trustee area map adopted by the Covina Valley USD governing board (Appendix B).

### V. THE CALIFORNIA VOTING RIGHTS ACT

The CVRA has been tracked and discussed at great length among staff and the County Committee for more than five years. It is not clear if there is a CVRA violation in this case. The Covina Valley USD is making the move proactively, to avoid any potential challenge of its use of the at-large voting system. The district decided to move to trustee areas and trustee area voting, determining that this move is in the best interests of the district. Staff makes no judgment on the existence of any violation of the CVRA in this matter and has not investigated any such violation.

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

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

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

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

B. The CVRA in Los Angeles County

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

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

School Districts. In the past five years, 14 school districts in Los Angeles County have implemented trustee area voting to replace current at-large voting schemes. In addition to the current Covina Valley USD petition, Antelope Valley Joint Union HSD, Castaic Union SD, Downey USD, Glendale USD, Lawndale SD, Newhall SD, Pasadena USD, William S. Hart Union
HSD, Lancaster SD, Pomona USD, Eastside Union SD, Saugus Union SD, Sulphur Springs Union SD, and ABC USD presented petitions to the County Committee, which were approved. Several districts in Los Angeles County are in negotiations and/or have received demand letters or other litigation actions related to trustee areas, or are studying the issue on their own.

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

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

VI. ELECTIONS AND THE COVINA VALLEY USD

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

Utilizing district, state, county and U.S. Census information, NDC developed three preliminary trustee area maps, on which public input was sought. NDC determined that, based on U.S. Census population within the district of 77,281, each of the five trustee areas needed to contain approximately 15,456 people, within the federal margin of error. The maps contained different configurations of trustee areas.

In an effort to obtain feedback about the move to trustee areas, their trustee area plan, the draft maps, and submitting a waiver of the trustee area implementation election to the California Department of Education (CDE), the district held community meetings at all three of their high
schools on September 6, 12, and 13, 2017. Each event had community members in attendance, and for the public hearings at board meetings that were more well-attended, some attendees may have been present for another agenda item. The district also implemented an extensive public outreach program, including news articles, letters home to parents in multiple languages, public hearing notices on the district’s website, notices physically posted at district sites, public hearing notices and advertisements in local papers, and notifications to bargaining units and all 16 school site councils. The district consulted with all three of their bargaining units: the Covina Unified Education Association (CUEA), the Covina Valley Association of School Psychologists (CVASP), and the California School Employees Association (CSEA). The outreach campaign included materials in English and Spanish, and direction consultation with their District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC). According to the district, there was very little public opposition offered at any of the forums.

After receiving feedback from the public about the three initial maps presented by NDC, Green, Orange, and Purple, the school district commissioned the demographer to go back out and produce three additional maps with further options for the community. Based on that feedback, Green 2, Orange 2, and Purple 2 were designed and brought back for review.

The Covina Valley USD governing board selected the Green 2 trustee area map, which was based on community feedback, on November 6, 2017, approving it by a 5-0 vote. The district conducted a public hearing about the waiver on December 18, 2017 and subsequently approved it.

A. Description of the District and Students

Geography and Residents: The Covina Valley USD is best described as a suburban unified school district set in a bedroom-community environment, the boundaries of which contain mostly single family dwellings, apartment complexes, and commercial/retail properties. Its geography consists of mostly developed residential space, with small hills and parks.

NDC was able to accomplish something significant in helping the district honor the spirit of CVRA, beyond just striving for compliance. They were able to construct four Hispanic-majority trustee areas, and the map that the board voted to adopt was one of the three additional maps based on community input. NDC was also mindful of the district’s articulated goals for the new election plan, which included that each trustee’s territory overlap school attendance territories, to better align each trustee with stewardship over the entire district, rather than just their slice of the whole pie.

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

Students: The Covina Valley USD serves approximately 11,862 students, according to the CDE’s current enrollment figures. Table 2 lists enrollment by ethnicity, compared to all of Los Angeles County and the State of California.
Table 2
Enrollment by Ethnicity
Covina Valley USD Students, 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino of Any Race</th>
<th>American Indian or Alaska Native, Not Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian, Not Hispanic</th>
<th>Pacific Islander, Not Hispanic</th>
<th>Filipino, Not Hispanic</th>
<th>African American, Not Hispanic</th>
<th>White, Not Hispanic</th>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
<th>Not Reported</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covina Vly USD</td>
<td>1964246</td>
<td>9,333</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>969,055</td>
<td>3,433</td>
<td>115,305</td>
<td>4,899</td>
<td>32,751</td>
<td>111,240</td>
<td>210,831</td>
<td>33,779</td>
<td>11,359</td>
<td>1,492,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>3,376,591</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>569,744</td>
<td>28,920</td>
<td>151,650</td>
<td>340,841</td>
<td>1,442,388</td>
<td>219,429</td>
<td>58,350</td>
<td>6,220,413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS)


The Covina Valley USD governing board consists of five members. Data on raw votes and the number of registered voters within a district at the time of the election are included below, sourced from the Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk (Registrar-Recorder).

Between 2001 and 2015, half of the school board elections were competitive, during odd years in November, with multiple candidates, with the exceptions of 2005, 2007, 2011, and 2013, which were non-competitive. In 2017, the district moved onto the even-year election cycle, thereby delaying their 2017 election until 2018, as is legally tenable under Senate Bill 415. This legislation has led to the vast majority of school districts, cities, and other municipalities moving their elections onto even years in an attempt to increase voter turnout.

In 2001, the Registrar-Recorder reported that the Covina Valley USD had 36,795 registered voters. In the most recent information available from the Registrar-Recorder, the Covina Valley USD currently contains 40,723 registered voters. The next election is scheduled for November of 2018.

In reviewing the available relevant data, staff to the County Committee was not able to determine the ethnicity of any candidate or elected board member. All of the elections were competitive, with multiple candidates.

C. Election Data

Below is raw election data, sourced from the Registrar-Recorder, for all of the district's competitive elections from 2001 to 2015:
### 2001

COVINA-VALLEY UNIFIED SCH

VOTE FOR NO MORE THAN 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES M KEMP</td>
<td>1,817</td>
<td>30.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERI MEISTER</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>26.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARD R COOPER</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>14.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL C SANDT</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>13.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILBERT R RAMIREZ</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>11.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILLIP M GRANA</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL PRECINCTS 19

REGISTRATION 36,795

PRECINCTS REPORTING 19 100.00

### 2003

COVINA-VALLEY UNIFIED SCH

VOTE FOR NO MORE THAN 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARY L HANES</td>
<td>1,524</td>
<td>31.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM L KNOLL</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>27.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARRELL A MYRICK</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>27.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD V EASTMAN</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>13.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL PRECINCTS 18

REGISTRATION 34,674

PRECINCTS REPORTING 18 100.00

### 2005

No election held

### 2007

No election held

### 2009

COVINA-VALLEY UNIFIED SCH

VOTE FOR NO MORE THAN 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES M KEMP</td>
<td>2,101</td>
<td>30.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD WHITE</td>
<td>1,914</td>
<td>27.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIM ROGERS</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>22.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERI M MEISTER</td>
<td>1,354</td>
<td>19.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL PRECINCTS 20

REGISTRATION 36,034

PRECINCTS REPORTING 20 100.00
2011
No election held

2013
No election held

2015

COVINA-VALLEY UNIFIED SCH  GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER
VOTE FOR NO MORE THAN 3

DARRELL A MYRICK 1,574 21.08
SONIA FRASQUILLO 1,525 20.43
SUE L MAULucci 1,338 17.92
WILLIAM L KNOLL 1,197 16.03
ALICE SUZUKI 1,037 13.89
Kien Lam 795 10.65

TOTAL PRECINCTS 27
REGISTRATION** 40,338

Historically throughout California and nationwide, participation in school district elections is lower than participation in general (municipal, county, state or federal) elections. Because the majority of school district elections in Los Angeles County, including Covina Valley USD, have previously been held on odd years, thus on a different cycle than most general elections, voter turnout in those school elections has tended to be significantly lower. Following approval of the trustee area plan, if granted, the Covina Valley USD will have its first even-year election in November of 2018.

VII. LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE REVIEW OF THE COVINA VALLEY USD PETITION

On March 8, 2018, the Los Angeles County Committee (County Committee) held a public hearing within the Covina Valley USD, pursuant to EC §5019(c)(2). The County Committee heard presentations from the district, and was available to receive input from members of the public and other stakeholders during that public hearing. At the hearing, there was no opposition to the district's selected trustee area plan.

Following the public hearing, the County Committee reviewed the information that the Covina Valley USD submitted, along with their trustee area petition. On May 2, 2018, the County Committee will have the opportunity to ask questions of the interested parties, including Covina Valley USD representatives, and the professionals it engaged to develop the trustee area plan and
map, as well as any members of the public who would like to speak, either for themselves or as representatives from other entities relevant to this review.

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

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

VIII. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

Trustee Area Map. After reviewing the thorough process that the Covina Valley USD engaged in, guided by highly-qualified demographic and legal professionals, in consultation with relevant stakeholders, to develop a board and community supported final trustee area map, staff recommends that the County Committee adopt the final map and described trustee area plan as submitted by the district in the Green 2 Option.

Election to Approve Implementation of Trustee Areas Voting and Trustee Area Map. Under EC §5020, if the County Committee approves a petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting, the matter is presented to the voters within the district at an upcoming election. However, the Covina Valley USD has secured a waiver from the SBE to stay the requirement of this approval election. The waiver does not impact the election of any candidates for any trustee areas within the Covina Valley USD, and the district’s next regular election (November 2018) should be held. This waiver was sought only to waive an election question approving the implementation of trustee areas and trustee area voting. To date, the California Department of Education (CDE) has reviewed more than 150 waiver requests to the SBE from districts seeking to waive the requirement to hold an election approving the implementation of trustee areas and/or trustee area voting. All of these requests have been approved by the SBE. Thus, if approved by the County Committee, no election approving the implementation of trustee areas and trustee area voting will be held.
IX.
FEASIBILITY STUDY APPENDICES
The Covina-Valley Unified School District of
Los Angeles County, California
Resolution No. 17-18-10

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

WHEREAS, the District retained National Demographics Corporation ("NDC") to prepare draft maps which were presented to the Board at its meeting on June 19, 2017. The Board held a discussion on the three draft maps Green, Orange, and Purple; and

WHEREAS, at the regular Board Meeting on August 21, 2017, NDC presented the Board with three additional draft maps for consideration which were labeled Green II, Orange II and
Purple II. The Board approved Resolution 17-18-05 and selected the draft maps Green I and Green II to present to the public at the community meetings; and

WHEREAS draft maps Green and Green II were presented to the public during informal community meetings held on September 6, 2017 at South Hills High School; September 12, 2017 at Covina High School and September 13, 2017, at Northview High School; and

WHEREAS, during the Board’s regular meeting of September 18, 2017, the Board considered a summary of the input received at the community meetings and unanimously voted to identify Maps Green and Green II as the maps to be considered during the two public hearings regarding draft maps and the potential sequence of elections required by Elections Code section 10010(a)(2); and

WHEREAS, during the Board’s regular meeting of October 16, 2017, the Board held the first public hearing regarding draft maps and potential sequence of elections as required by Elections Code section 10010(a)(2); and

WHEREAS, at the Board’s meeting of October 16, 2017, the Board unanimously voted to advance Maps Green and Green II to be considered for final adoption at the Board’s regular meeting of November 6, 2017; and

WHEREAS, during the Board’s regular meeting of November 6, 2017, the Board held a second public hearing regarding draft maps and potential sequence of elections as required by Elections Code section 10010(a)(2). Further community and Board input was received during the public hearing; and

WHEREAS, the Board has considered all such public input and comment on the draft maps and potential sequence of elections; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to adopt \( \text{Map Green}^{\text{I}} \) and hereby recommends \( \text{Map Green}^{\text{II}} \) to the Committee for its consideration based upon the findings, and analysis contained in the documents attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit “I”; and

WHEREAS, in order to complete the transition to by-trustee area elections in a timely and cost effective manner, and to guarantee that the new by-trustee area process will be in place in time to elect new governing board members at the Board’s next regularly-scheduled election, the District must obtain a waiver of the election process as set forth in Education Code sections 5019, 5020, 5021 and 5030 from the State Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, the District has submitted Resolution No. 16-17-32 to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors requesting consolidation of the election date for members of the governing board with the date of the California statewide general election held in November of each even-numbered year [Elec. Code § 1001] pursuant to Elections Code section 1302(b); and

WHEREAS, the request for consolidation of election was approved by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors on April 11, 2017, changing the date of the next scheduled governing board election to the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November of 2018, and
each subsequent board member election shall be held two years thereafter in November of even-numbered years in conjunction with the statewide general election; and

WHEREAS, because the request for consolidation of election was approved, the term of office of current governing board members expiring in December 2017 shall be extended to December 2018 and the term of governing board members expiring in December 2019 shall be extended to December 2020.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Board of the Covina-Valley Unified School District as follows:

1. That the above recitals are true and correct.

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

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

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

ADOPTED, SIGNED AND APPROVED this 6th day of November, 2017.

[Signature]
President of the Board of Education for the Covina-Valley Unified School District

I, Darrell A. Myrick, Clerk of the Governing Board of the Covina-Valley Unified School District, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Governing Board of said District at a meeting of said Board held on the 6th day of November 2017, and that it was so adopted by the following vote:

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

[Signature]
Clerk of the Board of Education of the Covina-Valley Unified School District
Board-Adopted "Green II" Map

Election Years:
2019: Areas 2 (Bonilla) and 4 (Kemp)
2020: Areas 1 (Mauheci), 3 (Frasquillo) and 5 (Mylrick)
APPENDIX C
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Pop</td>
<td>15,102</td>
<td>15,202</td>
<td>15,261</td>
<td>16,042</td>
<td>15,674</td>
<td>77,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Deviation</td>
<td>-354</td>
<td>-254</td>
<td>-195</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Deviation</td>
<td>-2.29%</td>
<td>-1.64%</td>
<td>-1.26%</td>
<td>3.79%</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
<td>6.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hip</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian-American</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,004</td>
<td>11,211</td>
<td>11,433</td>
<td>12,307</td>
<td>11,707</td>
<td>57,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hip</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian-American</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Voting Age Pop</td>
<td>10,259</td>
<td>9,204</td>
<td>10,300</td>
<td>11,644</td>
<td>10,778</td>
<td>52,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hip</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian/Pac. Isl.</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,791</td>
<td>7,302</td>
<td>8,193</td>
<td>9,348</td>
<td>8,089</td>
<td>40,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Latino est.</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian-Surnamed</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Filipino-Surnamed</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Spanish-Surnamed</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White est.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,992</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>2,226</td>
<td>2,935</td>
<td>2,103</td>
<td>11,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Latino</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian-Surnamed</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Filipino-Surnamed</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Spanish-Surnamed</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White est.</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,784</td>
<td>4,389</td>
<td>4,910</td>
<td>5,987</td>
<td>4,721</td>
<td>24,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Latino</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian-Surnamed</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Filipino-Surnamed</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Spanish-Surnamed</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White est.</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black est.</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS Pop. Est.</td>
<td>16,168</td>
<td>15,135</td>
<td>15,585</td>
<td>16,651</td>
<td>15,797</td>
<td>79,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=20-60</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age phil</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalized</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language spoken at home</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other lang</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Fluidity</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(among those age 25+)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child in Household</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work (percent of pop age 16+)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute on Public Transit</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income 0-25k</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income 25-50k</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income 50-75k</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income 75+200k</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single family</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Stats</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total and Voting Age Populations data from the 2010 Decennial Census.
Summary Vote Registration and Turnout data from the California Statwide Database.
Latino voter registration and turnout data are Spanish surname counts adjusted using Census Population Department undercount estimates.
NH White and NH Black registration and turnout counts estimated by NDC.

Citizen Voting Age Pop, Age, Immigration, and other demographics from the 2011-2015 American Community Survey and Special Tabulation 5-year
Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals

May 2018

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District (USD) that were at various stages in the school district organization process as of April 19, 2018.

RECENT INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last two years)

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Inner City USD / January 2016

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None
Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals
(Excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District)

May 2018

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals [exclusive of those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District (USD)] that are at various stages in the school district reorganization process as of April 19, 2018.

PETITION TO IMPLEMENT TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING WITHIN THE INGLEWOOD USD

On April 16, 2018, LACOE received a petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting within the Inglewood USD. The petition is to be presented to the County Committee at its regular meeting on May 2, 2018, after which a public hearing will be scheduled within the district.

*Status: Public hearing to be scheduled
Status Date: April 19, 2018

PETITION TO IMPLEMENT TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING WITHIN THE WHITTIER CITY SD

On March 23, 2018, LACOE received a petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting within the Whittier City SD. The petition is being presented to the County Committee at its regular meeting on May 2, 2018, after which a public hearing will be scheduled within the district.

*Status: Public hearing to be scheduled
Status Date: April 19, 2018
PETITION TO IMPLEMENT TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING WITHIN THE LOWELL JOINT SD

On February 16, 2018, LACOE received a petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting within the Lowell Joint SD. The petition was presented to the County Committee at a special meeting on March 8, 2018, after which a public hearing has been scheduled within the district for April 24, 2018.

*Status: Public hearing to be held
Status Date: April 19, 2018

PETITION TO IMPLEMENT TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING WITHIN THE COVINA VALLEY USD

On December 15, 2017, LACOE received a petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting within the Covina Valley USD. On January 10, 2018, the petition was presented to the County Committee, and a public hearing was held within the district on March 8, 2018. A feasibility study was conducted and will be presented to the County Committee on May 2, 2018, after which the County Committee may vote on the proposal.

*Status: Feasibility study completed
Status Date: April 19, 2018

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

On September 1, 2017, LACOE received a petition in the form of a 2015 resolution from the City of Malibu to form a separate Malibu USD from territory within the boundaries of the existing Santa Monica-Malibu USD. The petition was introduced at the November 1, 2017 regular County Committee meeting, and at least one public hearing will be scheduled. After this local agency petition was introduced, however, the City of Malibu sent a letter requesting that the County Committee postpone the scheduling of its preliminary hearing to allow the stakeholders more time to discuss further options and details regarding the petition. On February 28, 2018, however, the City of Malibu apprised the committee of their interest in pursuing the preliminary public hearing. Then, in April 2018, the City resolved to further investigate options before asking the County Committee to proceed.

*Status: Preliminary public hearing to be scheduled
Status Date: April 19, 2018
PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORY FROM THE GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (USD) TO THE LA CANADA USD

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

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

The petition was presented to the County Committee on September 7, 2016. The County Committee held two public hearings (October 26, 2016, in the La Canada USD, and November 2, 2016, in the Glendale USD). In mid-February, 2017, the two districts resumed negotiations in an attempt to find amicable solutions, but as of mid-April, were not able to resolve issues. A feasibility study was presented to the County Committee at the May 3, 2017 meeting, after which the Committee gave a preliminary approval to the proposal.

In Fall 2017, staff concluded the Request For Proposal (RFP) process, evaluated vendors, and selected an environmental consultant, for whom a contract was agreed upon. The environmental analysis is expected to take several months.

Status: CEQA study underway
Status Date: February 16, 2018

PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORY FROM THE CENTINELA VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT (HSD) AND LAWNDALE SD TO THE WISEBURN USD

On May 15, 2014, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §35700, to transfer territory from the Centinela Valley Union HSD and the Lawndale SD to the Wiseburn USD. The request was submitted by chief petitioners Ms. Shavonda Webber-Christmas and Mr. Bill Magoon. The petition was forwarded to County Counsel to determine its legal compliance regarding format and content. On June 20, 2014, County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient. Staff returned the petition to the chief petitioners on June 23, 2014.
On October 15, 2014, the chief petitioners submitted signed petitions for review. On October 15, 2014, staff conveyed the signed petitions to the Registrar-Recorder for signature verification. On November 6, 2014, staff received notice from the Registrar-Recorder there were insufficient signatures to move the petition forward. Staff notified the chief petitioners, who elected to gather additional signatures. On December 4, 2014, the chief petitioners submitted additional signatures, which were submitted to the Registrar-Recorder on December 5, 2014 for signature verification. On December 22, 2014, the Registrar Recorder notified staff that the additional signatures were validated, and the petition had sufficient signatures to move forward.

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

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

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

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

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

Staff reviewed the request and forwarded a draft petition to County Counsel on July 27, 2015, for a legal compliance review regarding format and content. We received notification
on July 30, 2015, from County Counsel informing us that the draft petition was legally acceptable. The petition was mailed to the chief petitioner on July 31, 2015, for circulation within the petition area. Staff is informed that signatures have been gathered, but not yet presented for signature verification, as the petitioners negotiate with the district. A joint committee appointed by both the district and the City of Malibu has released a study addressing the implications of this petition. Staff is reviewing this study.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Status: Petition insufficient; chief petitioners may gather additional signatures.
Status Date: December 5, 2011
FORMATION—MALIBU USD (CURRENTLY LIES WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE SANTA MONICA-MALIBU USD)

Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: February 21, 2008

FORMATION—LA MIRADA USD (CURRENTLY LIES WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE NORWALK – LA MIRADA USD)

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

Unification Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Azusa USD to Glendora USD/October 2016

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- *Malibu USD (Santa Monica-Malibu USD)/April 2018

Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

- Antelope Valley CCD / September 2017
- El Monte City SD / August 2017
- El Monte Union HSD / March 2016
- Walnut USD / May 2016
- Whittier Union HSD / January 2017

* = indicates activity since last meeting

This document was prepared by staff to the County Committee.