AGENDA

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

Regular Meeting

Los Angeles County Office of Education
September 4, 2019
9:30 a.m.

I  Information
D  Discussion
A  Action

I. CALL TO ORDER – Chairperson Ms. Maria Calix

II. FLAG SALUTE – Ms. Calix

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – Ms. Calix

The minutes of the March 6, 2019 regular meeting of the County Committee will be submitted for approval. (Enclosure 1)

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

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

V. COMMUNICATIONS – Mr. Crafton

The Secretary will review any pertinent informational correspondence or newspaper articles.

VI. PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORY FROM THE LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (USD) TO THE PALOS VERDES PENINSULA USD – Mr. Crafton

The Secretary will present a developer’s petition to transfer five parcels of territory from the Los Angeles USD to the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD. (Enclosure 2)
VII. PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORY FROM THE TORRANCE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT USD TO THE PALOS VERDES PENINSULA USD – Mr. Crafton

The Secretary will present a joint districts petition to transfer twenty-nine parcels of territory from the Torrance USD to the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD. (Enclosure 3)

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

The Secretary will present a petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting in the Little Lake City SD. (Enclosure 4)

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

The Secretary will present a petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting in the South Whittier SD. (Enclosure 5)

X. PETITION TO IMPLEMENT TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING IN THE WHITTIER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT (HSD) – Mr. Crafton

The Secretary and staff will present a feasibility study on the petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting in the Whittier Union HSD. (Enclosure 6)

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

The Secretary and staff will present a feasibility study on the petition to transfer territories between the Sulphur Springs Union SD and the Saugus Union SD. (Enclosure 7)
XII. PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORY FROM THE GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT USD TO THE LA CANADA USD – Mr. Crafton

The complete update is: The Secretary and staff have conveyed to the County Committee all documents and correspondence from various parties related to the petition to transfer territory from the Glendale USD to the La Canada USD. The County Committee will consider the submissions during their further review, and upcoming vote on the petition at a future regularly scheduled meeting.

For your information, the Glendale USD has a new Superintendent, Dr. Vivian Ekchian, who is being informed on the matter by the former Interim Superintendent, Dr. Kelly King.

XIII. UPDATE ON PETITION TO FORM A MALIBU 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 within the Santa Monica-Malibu USD. Following the introduction of the petition in November, 2017, the city submitted additional material to the petition rationale, including a trustee area map, a description of the fiscal impact of the unification, and letters requesting that the scheduling of the County Committee’s preliminary public hearing be postponed until after further discussions occur related to the petition.

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

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

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

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

XVI. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE – Mr. Crafton

The Secretary will provide an update on legislation that staff is following. (Enclosure 8)

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

The Secretary will provide an update on school district reorganization proposals affecting the Los Angeles USD. (“Summary of Los Angeles USD Reorganization Proposals”). (Enclosure 9)

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

The Secretary will provide an update on school district reorganization proposals affecting Los Angeles County school and community college districts, other than the Los Angeles USD. (“Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals [excluding those affecting the Los Angeles USD]”). (Enclosure 10)

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

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

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

XXI. ADJOURNMENT
UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF THE
LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION
Regular Meeting
March 6, 2019

The Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) met on Wednesday, March 6, 2019, at the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) in Downey. The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m., by Chairperson Maria Calix.

### Members Present
- Frank Bostrom
- Maria Calix
- Ted Edmiston
- John Nunez
- Frank Ogaz
- AJ Willmer

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

Chairperson Ms. Maria Calix called the meeting to order.

Chairperson Calix led the flag salute.

It was MOVED by Mr. Frank Bostrom and SECONDED by Mr. Frank Ogaz that the minutes of the regular meeting held on January 9, 2019, be approved. Motion carried. Votes are:

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

Dr. Kelly King, Interim Superintendent of the Glendale Unified School District, Mr. Nick Karapetian, Chief Petitioner, and Mr. Scott Tracy addressed the Committee.

Secretary Crafton directed the Committee to their folders for recent articles relating to matters currently before the committee and other related school district organization issues. Also, several items that were published after the Agenda was distributed, including correspondence regarding the Sagebrush territory transfer, are in your packet.
Secretary Crafton informed the Committee that there is petition to implement Trustee Areas and Area Voting in the Whittier Union High School District. The next step is to hold a public hearing, staff will reach out to the Committee in order to coordinate dates.

Secretary Crafton stated that there is a letter from Interim Superintendent King of the Glendale USD requesting to delay petition in order for her to familiarize herself with the petition. Staff continues to receive correspondence and distributes to the Committee for review. A motion was made by Mr. Willmer and seconded by Mr. Bostrom to agendize this petition as an action item at the May County Committee meeting. Motion carried, votes are:

Mr. Frank Bostrom  Yes  Mr. John Nunez  Yes
Ms. Maria Calix  Yes  Mr. Frank Ogaz  No
Dr. Ted Edmiston  Yes  Mr. AJ Willmer  Yes

Superintendent Dr. Ben Drati of the Santa Monica-Malibu USD addressed the Committee.

David Soldani, Legal Counsel for Santa Monica-Malibu USD, addressed the Committee to update them on the ongoing negotiations.

Christine Wood, Legal Counsel for the City of Malibu, also addressed the Committee and stated that the parties are still holding meetings and are still in negotiations. She stated that they are hoping to bring forth proposals later in the year.

Secretary Crafton stated that we received a petition and staff has been working with all districts involved. The next step is to set up public hearing, staff will reach out to Committee to coordinate dates for the hearing.

Mr. Bostrom stated that it is in progress, further review by general counsel is still being conducted, once completed the policy committee will meet.

Secretary Crafton indicated that we continue to receive information on districts, both local and statewide, related to CVRA. LACOE Staff has been working on how to support districts in complying with CVRA, we are discussing a possible forum on CVRA.

Secretary Crafton stated that staff is tracking bills. Mr. Hass stated that SB 47 would institute transparency of who is funding the petition. He also stated that SB 212 would allow ranked choice voting.
Secretary Crafton stated that there are no other items to discuss.

Secretary Crafton stated that other than the districts which have already been discussed, there are no other updates.

Secretary Crafton stated that there is a 70 day window to fill the vacancy on the County Committee, and after that, it is the County Superintendent who has to appoint.

Secretary Crafton stated that staff will reach out to Committee to schedule the public hearings.

Chairperson Calix made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Willmer. Meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

Votes are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Frank Bostrom</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. John Nunez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Maria Calix</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mr. Frank Ogaz</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ted Edmiston</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mr. AJ Willmer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Territory Transfer Petition:
Los Angeles USD to Palos Verdes Peninsula USD
June 19, 2019

Debra Duardo, M.S.W., Ed.D.
Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242

RE: Landowner Petition to Transfer Uninhabited Territory

Dear Ms. Duardo:

On behalf of the Chadmar/Colfin Rolling Hills, LLC the owner of five lots (Lots 94-98) of uninhabited property located at 94 Thorsen Ranch Road, 95 Thorsen Ranch Road, 96 Thorsen Ranch Road, 97 McCarrell Ranch Rd and 98 McCarell Ranch Road, (hereafter, Transfer Territory), (hereafter, Petitioner) request the Los Angeles County Office of Education accept and approve this landowner petition to transfer the Transfer Territory from Los Angeles Unified School District (“LAUSD”) to Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District (“PVPUSD”) to allow students from the same 114-unit neighborhood to attend the same schools.

The petition is made pursuant to subdivision (c) of Education Code Section 35700, which allows a property owner to petition to reorganize one or more school districts if the territory is uninhabited and if the owner has filed an application for any project, as defined in Section 21065 of the Public Resources Code, with one or more local agencies.

The Transfer Territory is uninhabited and includes five residential lots located entirely within the City of Rolling Hills Estates (“City”). The Transfer Territory is currently served by LAUSD and is adjacent to the PVPUSD boundary line. Exhibit A illustrates the existing and the proposed school district boundaries for the Transfer Territory. The five lots are part of a 114-unit Specific Plan that is currently uninhabited. Under the existing boundaries, approximately one third of the units would be served by Torrance Unified School District (TUSD) at buildout, while the remaining two thirds of the units would be served by PVPUSD. TUSD and PVPUSD reached an agreement under which both school districts agree that it is in the best interest of the future student residents of this community to be served in its entirety by PVPUSD. TUSD and PVPUSD are submitting a concurrent application for the territory transfer of the portion of lots currently assigned to TUSD. Both governing boards support the transfer as it would allow students from the planned neighborhood to attend the same schools.
Regardless of the jurisdiction, schools are not located within a walking distance of the Transfer Territory. However, the nearest LAUSD schools are located outside of the social center of this future community. Placement of jurisdictional boundaries can influence the extent to which a community member identifies with, feels committed to, and participates in school and district affairs. It can also influence the degree of citizen oversight and the extent of school and district accountability. Boundaries can enhance and reinforce community cohesion, or if drawn or redrawn in an ill-considered manner, can damage a sense of community. The proposed transfer will strengthen community, school and social ties, further enhancing community identity by allowing all students within the 114-unit Project to attend the same schools located within their community, as well as, to participate in the same social activities as their neighbors.

The proposed territory transfer meets requirements of Education Code Section 35753 (See Exhibit B) and is also endorsed by the PVPUSD. Please, feel free to contact me to discuss this petition. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Chadmar / ColFin Rolling Hills LLC

[Signature]

Charles R. Lande
Authorized Signatory

Cc: Allison Deegan, Ed. D., Regionalized Business Services Coordinator, Division of Business Advisory Services, Los Angeles County Office of Education
Austin Beutner, Superintendent, Los Angeles Unified School District
Scott Price, Chief Financial Officer, Los Angeles Unified School District
Alex Cherniss, Ed.D., Superintendent Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District
Keith Butler, Associate Superintendent, Business Services, Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District
George Mannon, Ph.D., Superintendent, Torrance Unified School District,
Tim Stowe, Ph.D., Deputy Superintendent, Administrative Services, Torrance Unified School District
Douglas Prichard, City Manager, City of Rolling Hills Estates
Jeanette Justus, Jeanette C. Justus Associates
EXHIBIT B:
Analysis on Compliance with Education Code Section 35753(a)

This Exhibit (Exhibit B) is in regards to the request for the Los Angeles County Office of Education to accept and approve this landowner petition to transfer five lots (Lots 94-98) of uninhabited property, located at 94 Thorsen Ranch Road, 95 Thorsen Ranch Road, 96 Thorsen Ranch Road, 97 McCarrrell Ranch Rd and 98 McCarell Ranch Road, (hereafter, Transfer Territory), from Los Angeles Unified School District ("LAUSD") to Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District ("PVPUUSD") to allow students from the same 114-unit neighborhood to attend the same schools.

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

Condition Satisfied: This topic is defined by Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 18573 (a), which states that in order for a school district to be adequate in terms of number of pupils, it should have the following projected enrollment on the date that the transfer of territory proposal becomes effective:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary District</td>
<td>901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School District</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified District</td>
<td>1,501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two school districts are affected by the potential transfer of Project territory. The Transfer Territory lies within current jurisdictions of LAUSD, serving grades K-12. If the transfer of territory is approved, the territory would be served by PVPUUSD for grades K-12. During the 2018-19 school year, the LAUSD enrolled 607,723 pupils and PVPUUSD enrolled 11,217 pupils. Both school districts currently meet the requirement of adequate enrollment. As the Transfer Territory is completely uninhabited and no pupils are generated within it, the proposed change in school district boundaries would not have an enrollment effect on any of the districts. Students will be yielded from the proposed Transfer Territory area only after development of currently planned residential uses. The Project would only generate two students from the five homes under consideration.

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

Condition Satisfied: Community identity is determined by the following criteria: isolation, geography, distance between social centers, distance between school centers, topography, weather, community, school and social ties and other circumstances peculiar to the area.
The proposed Transfer Territory is a part of the City of Rolling Hills Estates currently served by LAUSD and PVPUSD. The Transfer Territory is currently uninhabited. The weather is similar in LAUSD and PVPUSD, but PVPUSD topography along with the Transfer Territory is distinct and mainly consists of hills and bluffs, whereas LAUSD is a large geographic territory of over 720 square miles with varied topography.

The community served by the PVPUSD and the adjacent Subject Territory has an extensive system of nature preserves including the Linden H. Chandler, George F. Canyon, Portuguese Bend, Forrestal, Filiorium, Three Sisters, Alta Vicente, Agua Amarga and other parks, as well as, the South Coast Botanical Garden. The Chadmar development will be built with identifiable architecture and style of homes reflective of the City of Rolling Hills Estates and the PVPUSD community. The ultimate residents of the uninhabited territory will live in the City of Rolling Hills Estates and use the Palos Verdes Peninsula as their social center. The Peninsula Shopping Center is a local gathering place that includes a children's skating rink and other child-centric activities. The future residents of the Project will participate in all child-oriented activities along with other residents of PVPUSD.

The following existing schools would be affected by development of residential uses within the proposed Transfer Territory. Distance and travel times were measured from intersection of Chandler Ranch Rd and Haslin Ranch Rd, which is an intersection in the middle of the development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Travel Distance</th>
<th>Travel Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAUSD – A</td>
<td>Eshelman Avenue ES (K-5)</td>
<td>1.7 miles</td>
<td>6 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAUSD – A</td>
<td>Fleming Middle (6-8)</td>
<td>2.0 miles</td>
<td>7 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAUSD – A</td>
<td>Narbonne HS (9-12)</td>
<td>2.9 miles</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVPUSD – N</td>
<td>Dapplegray ES (K-5)</td>
<td>2.3 miles</td>
<td>7 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVPUSD – N</td>
<td>Miraleste Intermediate (6-8)</td>
<td>4.4 miles</td>
<td>12 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVPUSD – N</td>
<td>Palos Verdes Peninsula HS (9-12)</td>
<td>5.2 miles</td>
<td>14 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regardless of the jurisdiction, existing public schools are not located within walking distance from the prospective residential development.

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

*Condition Satisfied:* The property does not contain any school facilities. No students are currently being generated from the property.
Provisions for the exchange of property tax revenue are set forth in Revenue and Taxation Code Section 99(i):

(1) The governing body of each district, county superintendent of schools, or county whose service areas or service responsibilities would be altered by the change shall determine the amount of property tax revenues to be exchanged between and among the affected jurisdictions. This determination shall be adopted by each affected jurisdiction by resolution. For the purpose of negotiation, the county auditor shall furnish the parties and the county board of education with an estimate of the property tax revenue subject to negotiation.

(2) In the event that the affected jurisdictions are unable to agree, within 60 days after the effective date of the jurisdictional change, and if all the jurisdictions are wholly within one county, the county board of education shall, by resolution, determine the amount of property tax revenue to be exchanged. If the jurisdictions are in more than one county, the State Board of Education shall, by resolution, within 60 days after the effective date of the jurisdictional change, determine the amount of property tax to be exchanged. (3) Upon adoption of any resolution pursuant to this subdivision, the adopting jurisdictions or State Board of Education shall notify the county auditor who shall make the appropriate adjustments.

With this proposed transfer there would be division of property, funds or obligations, and current law would provide for shifts in responsibility of existing bonded indebtedness, if the territory were approved for transfer.

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

*Condition Satisfied:* No students currently live in the affected area. The top two racial/ethnic groups in LAUSD are Hispanic at 74% and White at 11%, whereas the top two racial/ethnic groups in PVPUSD are White at 45% and Asian at 28%. Only two students are projected after buildout of the Project. The There would be no measurable effect on the ethnic balance of either district as a result of the transfer of these students from one school district to another. It is anticipated the new development will have a population mix reflective of the existing student population as it is located in the City of Rolling Hills Estates. The proposed transfer of territory is not anticipated to promote racial or ethnic discrimination or segregation.
5. The proposed reorganization will not result in any substantial increase in costs to the state.

*Condition Satisfied:* There are no regulations regarding this condition but CDE’s District Organization Handbook recommends review of the following factors.

A. Whether the implementation of the proposal would change one or more of the affected districts’ basic aid status.

The status of all districts involved would not change if the proposal were to be approved. For operational funding purposes, LAUSD and PVPUSD are non-basic aid districts.

B. Additional state costs for school facilities.

The proposed Transfer Territory is currently uninhabited. As discussed in detail in the analysis of Condition 7, two students will be generated after completion of the residential projects. School facility construction would not be required to house them.

C. Other state special or categorical programs and any increased state costs if students transferring would qualify in the gaining district and not in the losing district.

Each school district affected by the transfer of territory participates in categorical programs funded by the state. This funding is allocated on individual student basis and would not result in higher cost to any of the districts. The Transfer Territory would only generate two students.

The current Local Control Funding Formula (“LCFF”) amount per pupil for the 2017-2018 school year was $11,374 for LAUSD and $8,077 for PVPUSD.iii The LCFF provides 50% additional funding per student for school districts with 55% or more students participating in the Free and Reduced-Lunch program, students classified as English learners or foster youth.

D. The additional costs to the state if costs per student for special or categorical programs are higher in the gaining district.

Each school district affected by the transfer of territory participates in categorical programs funded by the state. This funding is allocated on individual student basis and would not result in higher cost to PVPUSD than to LAUSD.
E. The effect on the district’s home-to-school and special education transportation costs and state reimbursements.

Without a transfer of territory, to house the new students, LAUSD would need to make bussing available to transport the students distances anywhere between 1.7 and 2.9 miles away from the project. The nearest PVPUSD schools are between 2.3 and 5.2 miles away.

Students are unlikely to walk to school due to the topography of the area, mainly consisting of hills and bluffs, and will likely be driven by parents. Transportation for special education students will have to be provided regardless of the school district.

F. Increased costs resulting from additional schools becoming eligible for “necessary small school” funding pursuant to Sections 42280 through 42289.

The Education Code (EC) Section 42283 defines a necessary small school as an elementary school with an average daily attendance of less than 101, exclusive of pupils attending the seventh and eight grades of a junior high school, maintained by a school district which maintains two or more schools. EC Section 42285 defines a necessary small high school as a high school with an average daily attendance of less than 301, excluding continuation schools. No schools within the affected districts would become eligible for “necessary small school” funding as a result of a transfer.

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

**Condition Satisfied:** The proposed transfer of territory will not have a negative impact on the educational program of either district. The student enrollment is 607,723 and 11,217 at LAUSD and PVPUSD, respectively. The territory proposed for transfer would only generate two students. While the academic achievement, as evaluated by the districtwide California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) scores, varies by district, the projected two students would not have a measurable effect on performance of each affected school district. The California Department of Education reports CAASPP scores as follows, in Table 2:
Table 2
LAUSD and PVPUSD Academic Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Science*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAUSD</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVPUSD</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: CAASPP English and Math scores are as of the 2017-18 school year; Science scores are as of 2015-16 school year. A new science test was piloted in 2016-2017 and, therefore, not reported to the state.

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

*Condition Satisfied:* The Transfer Territory is completely uninhabited. After buildout, the Project would only generate two students. Either district must provide space for the new students that will be generated after development is completed. Regardless of the district of service, students are unlikely to walk to school due to the topography of the area, mainly consisting of hills and bluffs, and will likely be driven by parents. The nearest LAUSD schools are 1.7 and 2.9 miles away from the project, while the nearest PVPUSD schools are between 2.3 and 5.2 miles away.

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

*Condition Satisfied:* The transfer of territory is not designed to result in a significant increase in property values or to create a financial advantage to property owners. The transfer of territory is expected to result in more efficient provision of school services.

TUSD (Torrance) and PVPUSD are working together to align school district boundaries so that all students in the Project would go to the same elementary, middle and high school. Transfer of the five units subject of this petition from LAUSD to PVPUSD would help accomplish this goal. Allowing all students in the City of Rolling Hills Estates to go to schools in the same school district would benefit these students and strengthen the community.
9. The proposed reorganization will not cause a substantial adverse effect on the fiscal management or fiscal status of the proposed district or any existing district affected by the proposed reorganization.

*Condition Satisfied:* The territory proposed to be transferred is uninhabited. After buildout the Project would only generate two students. The proposed transfer of territory will not cause a substantial negative effect on the fiscal operations of the affected districts. If approved, the Transfer Territory would fall into the jurisdiction of PVPUSD, a district enrolling more than 11,000 students with established central operations and support services equipped to handle any future enrollments.

---

i Los Angeles County Enrollment by Grade with District Data (2018-19). Educational Demographics Unit. California Department of Education. Web retrieved at CDE DataQuest (dq.cde.ca.gov) (May 2019).

ii Student projection based upon 5 dwelling units and the SGR of 0.4417 as provided in PVPUSD Enrollment Analysis (January 9, 2017) prepared by Cooperative Strategies.

Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization

Attachments for meeting on September 4, 2019

Territory Transfer Petition:
Torrance USD to Palos Verdes Peninsula USD
June 3, 2019

Dr. Debra Duardo  
Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools  
Los Angeles County Office of Education  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, CA  90242

Re:  Joint Petition of Torrance Unified School District ("TUSD") and Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District ("PVPUSD") to Transfer Territory from TUSD to PVPUSD

Dear Dr. Duardo:

We represent the Torrance Unified School District ("TUSD") in connection with the above-referenced Petition which is jointly submitted pursuant to Education Code section 35700 by the boards of both TUSD and PVPUSD.

The Petition requests the transfer of a small portion of a larger development that is primarily located in PVPUSD boundaries. Twenty-nine (29) lots in the development are currently located outside of the boundaries of PVPUSD, in TUSD. The proposed transfer will align these TUSD lots with the rest of the development that resides within PVPUSD boundaries, to avoid splitting off a small portion of the development into a different school district.

In connection with this Petition, TUSD and PVPUSD have entered into mitigation agreements with the developer in order to offset any adverse financial impacts resulting from the transfer.

Both districts are in favor of the transfer and their respective Resolutions/Petitions are enclosed herewith for consideration.
Please contact the undersigned should you require any additional information.

Very truly yours,

ATKINSON, ANDELSON, LOYA, RUUD & ROMO

David A. Soldani

DAS:las
Enclosure

cc:  Tim Stowe, Deputy Superintendent, Administrative Services
     Torrance Unified School District

     Keith Butler, Associate Superintendent, Business Services
     Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District
TORRANCE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
RESOLUTION NO. 7-2018/19

PALOS VERDES PENINSULA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
RESOLUTION NO. 7-2018/19

PETITION TO INITIATE PROCESS FOR AUTHORIZING
THE TRANSFER OF TERRITORY
FROM THE TORRANCE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT TO
THE PALOS VERDES PENINSULA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,
EACH OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

PURSUANT TO Education Code Sections 35511(b) and 35700(d) the undersigned, constituting the majority of members of the Governing Board of the Torrance Unified School District and the majority of members of the Governing Board of the Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District (collectively referred to as the “Districts”), both of Los Angeles County, hereby petition that a portion of the territory of Torrance Unified School District depicted on the attached Exhibit A, be transferred to the Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District.

WHEREAS, Education Code section 35511(b) authorizes an action to transfer territory, including the transfer of all or part of an existing school district to another existing school district.

WHEREAS, the Governing Boards of the Torrance Unified School District has determined that a transfer of 29 Lots to the Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District is in the best interest of the quality of education for current and future students of that District as such transfer will insure that the entire development will attend the Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District; and

WHEREAS, both Districts have entered into a School Facilities Funding and Mitigation Agreement with a private developer to insure that there are no adverse fiscal impacts resulting from the proposed transfer; and

WHEREAS, Education Code 35704 provides that, within 30 days after any petition for reorganization is filed, the County Superintendent of Schools shall examine the petition, and, if it is found to be sufficient as required by law, shall transmit the petition simultaneously to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization and the California State Board of Education to execute the transfer of territory between school districts.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the undersigned, acting on behalf of and with the approval of the majority of members of the Governing Board of the Districts hereby approve the submission of a joint petition to transfer the territory comprising the 29 Lots from Torrance Unified School District to Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District pursuant to Education Code section 35700(d).

APPROVED BY THE GOVERNING BOARD OF THE TORRANCE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
APPROVED BY THE GOVERNING BOARD OF THE PALOS VERDES PENINSULA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Linda Reid, President

Suzanne Seymour, Clerk

Anthony Collatos, Member

Barbara Lucky, Member

Richard Phillips, Member

(Date)

(Date)

(Date)

(Date)

(Date)

(Date)

(Date)
Torrance Lots

Lots 22-25, 28-30, 40-52 and 105-113 of Tract Map No. 61287 recorded in Book 1385, Pages 1-42 of Maps of Los Angeles County, State of California, on June 30, 2015.

See Tract Map No. 61287 for a depiction of the Lots.
TORRANCE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
RESOLUTION NO. AS-04-18/19

PALOS VERDES PENINSULA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
RESOLUTION NO. _____

PETITION TO INITIATE PROCESS FOR AUTHORIZING
THE TRANSFER OF TERRITORY
FROM THE TORRANCE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT TO
THE PALOS VERDES PENINSULA UNIFIED DISTRICT,
EACH OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

Pursuant to Education Code Sections 35511(b) and 35700(d) the undersigned, constituting the majority of members of the Governing Board of the Torrance Unified School District and the majority of members of the Governing Board of the Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District (collectively referred to as the "Districts"), both of Los Angeles County, hereby petition that a portion of the territory of Torrance Unified School District depicted on the attached Exhibit A, be transferred to the Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District.

WHEREAS, Education Code section 35511(b) authorizes an action to transfer territory, including the transfer of all or part of an existing school district to another existing school district.

WHEREAS, the Governing Boards of the Torrance Unified School District has determined that a transfer of 29 Lots to the Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District is in the best interest of the quality of education for current and future students of that District as such transfer will insure that the entire development will attend the Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District; and

WHEREAS, both Districts have entered into a School Facilities Funding and Mitigation Agreement with a private developer to insure that there are no adverse fiscal impacts resulting from the proposed transfer; and

WHEREAS, Education Code 35704 provides that, within 30 days after any petition for reorganization is filed, the County Superintendent of Schools shall examine the petition, and, if it is found to be sufficient as required by law, shall transmit the petition simultaneously to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization and the California State Board of Education to execute the transfer of territory between school districts.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the undersigned, acting on behalf of and with the approval of the majority of members of the Governing Board of the Districts hereby approve the submission of a joint petition to transfer the territory comprising the 29 Lots from Torrance Unified School District to Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District pursuant to Education Code section 35700(d).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUSD Lot Numbers (9 Units)</th>
<th>TUSD Lot Numbers (23 Units)</th>
<th>PUUSD Lot Numbers (60 Units)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization

Attachments for meeting on September 4, 2019

Trustee Areas Implementation Petition:
Little Lake City SD
RESOLUTION NO. 20-005

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE
LITTLE LAKE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT RECOMMENDING
THAT THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT
ORGANIZATION APPROVE AND ESTABLISH TRUSTEE AREAS
FROM WHICH THE LITTLE LAKE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
TRUSTEES WILL BE ELECTED
IN A BY-TRUSTEE AREA ELECTION PROCESS

WHEREAS, The Little Lake City School District ("District") currently uses an at-large system of electing members of its Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, At-large electoral systems such as the Districts 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 Board of Education (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, One method of transitioning from an at-large electoral system to a by trustee area electoral system is for the school district board of education 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, the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization ("Committee") has indicated that it will initiate this process on behalf of the District at the District’s request, and will consider any recommendation on specific trustee areas made by the District; and

WHEREAS, District held two public hearings on April 30, 2019 and May 14, 2019 to receive public input on drafting trustee area map plans ("Plans") and thereafter, District consultants created four (4) draft map plans that were circulated for public review at community forums held May 20, 2019, and May 21, 2019; and online on the District’s website; and

WHEREAS, Pursuant to Elections Code section 10010, the District held properly noticed public hearings regarding the proposed trustee area plans on May 28, 2019 and June 11, 2019; and

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

WHEREAS, the Board has adopted Plan Orange Map and hereby recommends Plan Orange Map to the Committee for its consideration based upon the findings, analysis and recommendations contained in the report attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit “A”; and
NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Board of Education of the Little Lake City School District as follows:

1. That the above recitals are true and correct.
2. That the Board has adopted Plan Orange Map and recommends Plan Orange Map to the Committee for consideration and adoption.
3. That the Superintendent and/or his designee take all actions necessary to notify the Committee of the Board’s determination forthwith and provide whatever assistance may be required by the Committee to complete the process.

ADOPTED, SIGNED AND APPROVED this 11th day of June, 2019.

[Signature]
President of the Board of Education for the Little Lake City School District

1. Janet Rock, Clerk of the Board of Education of the Little Lake City School District, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Board of Education of said District at a meeting of said Board held on the 11th day of June, 2019, 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 Little Lake City School District
EXHIBIT “A”

APPROVED TRUSTEE AREA MAP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trustee Area</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>6,254</td>
<td>6,613</td>
<td>6,813</td>
<td>6,906</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>33,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from ideal</td>
<td>-227</td>
<td>-138</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Deviation</td>
<td>-3.36%</td>
<td>-2.04%</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>2.21%</td>
<td>5.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hisp</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian-American</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,175</td>
<td>5,148</td>
<td>4,779</td>
<td>5,121</td>
<td>4,490</td>
<td>23,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hisp</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian/Pac.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Voting Age Pop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,675</td>
<td>3,924</td>
<td>4,047</td>
<td>3,495</td>
<td>3,422</td>
<td>18,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Latino est.</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Spanish-Surnamed</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian-Surnamed</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Filipino-Surnamed</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White est.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter Registration (Nov 2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,519</td>
<td>2,732</td>
<td>2,906</td>
<td>2,474</td>
<td>2,363</td>
<td>12,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Latino est.</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Spanish-Surnamed</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian-Surnamed</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Filipino-Surnamed</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White est.</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter Turnout (Nov 2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>4,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Latino est.</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Spanish-Surnamed</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian-Surnamed</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Filipino-Surnamed</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White est.</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS Pop. Est.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,789</td>
<td>7,224</td>
<td>7,241</td>
<td>7,843</td>
<td>7,360</td>
<td>36,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aged-19</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aged-60</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aged-60+</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immigrants</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naturalized</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language spoken at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other lang.</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Fluency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaks Eng.</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Education (among those age 25+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS-Grad</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad-degree</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child in Household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child-18</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct of Pop. Age 16+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employed</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income 0-25k</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income 25-50k</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income 50-75k</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income 75-200k</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income 200k+</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Stats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single family</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multi-family</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>owned</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Trustee Areas Implementation Petition:
South Whittier SD
RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNING BOARD
OF THE SOUTH WHITTIER SCHOOL DISTRICT
Resolution No. 18-19-029

A RESOLUTION APPROVING AND ADOPTING A FINAL TRUSTEE AREA PLAN FOR
THE DISTRICT'S TRANSITION TO A BY-TRUSTEE AREA ELECTION SYSTEM; A
PLAN OF ELECTION FROM THOSE AREAS; AND RECOMMENDING THAT THE LOS
ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION APPROVE
THE DISTRICT'S ESTABLISHMENT OF A BY-TRUSTEE AREA ELECTION SYSTEM
AND ADOPTED TRUSTEE VOTING AREA PLAN

A. On February 19, 2019, the South Whittier School District Governing Board ("Board")
passed Resolution No. 18-19-018 initiating the process for the South Whittier School District
("District") to transition from an "at-large" election system to a "by-trustee area" election system
commencing with the 2020 Board elections.

B. In approving Resolution No. 18-19-018, the Board expressed its view that a transition to
a by-trustee area election system will reduce the District's risk of costly litigation, especially
since a successful plaintiff under the California Voting Rights Act (Elections Code §14025 et
seq.) ("CVRA") is entitled to reasonable attorneys’ fees and experts’ fees, creating great
financial risk to any jurisdiction sued.

C. The District utilized the services of Cooperative Strategies ("Consultant") to prepare
proposed trustee area boundary plans for consideration by the District, Board, and community.
The Consultant has extensive experience working with school districts and local jurisdictions
regarding electoral demographics, taking into consideration the CVRA, the Federal Voting
Rights Act, and related election system choices.

D. All of the proposed trustee area boundary plans prepared by Consultant were drawn with
all applicable laws and regulations in mind, including the CVRA and federal election law.

E. The District conducted public hearings at Board meetings on March 12, 2019 and March
19, 2019 to solicit feedback in advance of map preparation. The map options were released to
the public and available for public review and comment on the District's website from early
April 2019 until final adoption on May 7, 2019. During that time, the District conducted public
hearings at Board meetings on April 16, 2019, April 26, 2019, and May 7, 2019.

F. With thoughtful consideration of all public input received on the draft trustee area plans
and applicable state and federal legal criteria, the Board desires to adopt the trustee area plan and
demographic information described as the "Trustee Plan 4" (attached hereto as Exhibit "A") as
the final trustee area plan establishing the boundaries for the new trustee areas, and to request
timely approval from the County Committee of the trustee area plan and the District's transition
to a by-trustee area election system commencing with the 2020 Governing Board election.

G. In order to complete the transition to by-trustee area elections in a timely and cost
effective manner, and to ensure 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

1
is seeking a waiver of certain portions of the Education Code from the State Board of Education. The District’s request for waiver will be submitted to the State Board of Education for approval.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Governing Board of South Whittier School District does hereby resolve, order and determine as follows:

1. The above recitals are true and correct.

2. The Board hereby adopts the trustee area plan and demographic information described as the “Scenario 4 Map Option” (attached hereto as Exhibit “A”) as the final trustee area map for the District’s transition to a by-trustee area election system commencing with the 2020 Governing Board election.

3. That the District will hold by-trustee area elections in two areas (areas 3 and 4) at its November 2020 election, assuming timely approval by the Los Angeles County Committee. The District will hold by-trustee area elections in three areas (areas 1, 2, and 5) at its November 2022 election subject to any required trustee area boundary adjustments required pursuant to Education Code section 5019.5 following the release of the decennial federal census.

4. That by this resolution and contingent upon the approval by the County Committee of the District’s change to a by-trustee area election system, the Board hereby applies to the County Committee to timely approve the Board’s adopted trustee area plan for implementation commencing with the 2020 Governing Board election, or at the earliest possible election, as conditioned upon approval of the Education Code waiver request submitted to the State Board of Education.

5. The Board hereby authorizes and directs District staff to transmit this resolution, the final trustee area plan adopted, and any additional required documentation to the County Committee and to take any other necessary action to effectuate the purposes of this resolution and complete the District’s transition to a by-trustee area election system for the 2020 Governing Board elections.

6. The foregoing resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board on May 7, 2019, at a duly noticed meeting by the following vote:

AYES: 5
NOES: 0
ABSTAIN: 0
ABSENT: 0
I, Deborah Pacheco, Clerk of the Governing Board of the South Whittier School District, HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution was duly introduced, passed and adopted by the Board at a meeting thereof held on May 7, 2019, by a vote of 5 to 0.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereto set my hand this 7 day of May, 2019.

Deborah Pacheco  
Clerk of the Governing Board  
South Whittier School District
### South Whittier School District

#### Conceptual Trustee Areas - Scenario 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Variance</th>
<th>Trustee Area 1</th>
<th>Trustee Area 2</th>
<th>Trustee Area 3</th>
<th>Trustee Area 4</th>
<th>Trustee Area 5</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>3,780</td>
<td>4,194</td>
<td>3,980</td>
<td>4,268</td>
<td>4,001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Variance</td>
<td>-5.54%</td>
<td>9.34%</td>
<td>-6.60%</td>
<td>-0.95%</td>
<td>-2.80%</td>
<td>-0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>3,981</td>
<td>3,765</td>
<td>3,356</td>
<td>2,949</td>
<td>4,194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3,981</td>
<td>3,765</td>
<td>3,356</td>
<td>2,949</td>
<td>4,194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>5.36%</td>
<td>5.36%</td>
<td>5.36%</td>
<td>5.36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Trustee Area 1</th>
<th>Trustee Area 2</th>
<th>Trustee Area 3</th>
<th>Trustee Area 4</th>
<th>Trustee Area 5</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>3,779</td>
<td>2,528</td>
<td>3,779</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>2,981</td>
<td>3,765</td>
<td>3,356</td>
<td>2,949</td>
<td>4,194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>3,779</td>
<td>2,528</td>
<td>3,779</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Trustee Areas Implementation Feasibility Study:
Whittier Union HSD
REPORT TO THE
LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE
ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION
CONCERNING A PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH TRUSTEE AREAS
AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING WITHIN THE
WHITTIER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

AUGUST 15, 2019

Prepared by:
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Business Advisory Services
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I. INTRODUCTION

On February 20, 2019, the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) received a petition submitted by the Whittier Union High School District (HSD), pursuant to Education Code (EC) §5019(c)(1), to establish trustee areas and trustee area voting within the Whittier Union HSD (Appendix A). The petition was presented on March 6, 2019, 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 Whittier Union HSD, 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 Whittier Union HSD 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 2020). 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 [Whittier Union High School District]. - Yes/No”

“For the election of one member of the governing board of the [Whittier Union High 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 State Board of Education (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 2020) 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 Whittier Union HSD 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 2020.

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 2020).

Please note, for the present proposal, staff has included the trustee area boundary map developed and approved by the Whittier Union HSD 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 2020). 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.
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, 22 are organized into trustee areas and 58 do not have trustee areas. Of the districts that have trustee areas, two elect using an at-large methodology and the remaining 20 elect members by trustee area voting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Trustee Areas (Y/N)</th>
<th>Voting Method (Trustee Area or At Large)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC USD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acton Agua-Dulce USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covina-Valley USD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>TA</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>Y</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keppel Union SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Canada USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lancaster SD</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Virgenes USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lawndale Elementary SD</strong></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><strong>Long Beach USD</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Los Angeles USD</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Nietos SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lowell Joint SD</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynwood USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan Beach USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monrovia USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montebello USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Newhall SD</strong></td>
<td>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><strong>Pasadena USD</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pomona USD</strong></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><strong>Saugus Union SD</strong></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><strong>Sulphur Springs Union SD</strong></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><strong>Whittier City SD</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittier Union HSD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>William S. Hart Union HSD</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td>Trustee Areas (Y/N)</td>
<td>Voting Method (Trustee Area or At Large)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilsona SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiseburn USD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County Totals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20 = TA Voting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: California Department of Education

IV. BACKGROUND

A. Petition to Establish Trustee Areas and Trustee Area Voting Within the Whittier Union HSD

On February 20, 2019, LACOE and the County Committee received a petition submitted by the Whittier Union HSD, 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.1819-25 (Appendix A), adopted on February 19, 2019, by a unanimous 5-0 vote, and an approved trustee area map.

B. Rationale of the Whittier Union HSD as Petitioner

The rationale for this proposal, as stated in the Whittier Union HSD’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 Whittier Union HSD

The petition was submitted by the Whittier Union HSD governing board, which approved it by a 5-0 vote on February 19, 2019, approving a final trustee area map. The petition contained the final trustee area map adopted by the Whittier Union HSD 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 ten years. It is not clear if there is a CVRA violation in this case. The Whittier Union HSD is making the move in response to threatened litigation regarding its use of an 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 ten 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. In addition, a LACOE staff member, a County Committee member, a local professional demographer, and a Chief Business Official (CBO) from a district who implemented trustee areas and trustee area voting, all presented at the California School Business Officials (CASBO) annual conference in April 2019.

Throughout the period of CVRA activity over the past ten 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. Before abundant CVRA activity in the county began, some districts had already implemented trustee areas, including Los Angeles USD, Long Beach USD, Pasadena USD, Alhambra USD, and Centinela Valley Union HSD, the latter two of which still use an At-Large voting methodology. In the past several years, however, 18 school districts in Los Angeles County have implemented trustee area voting to replace current at-large voting schemes. In addition to the current Whittier Union HSD petition, Antelope Valley Joint Union HSD, Castaic Union SD, Downey USD, Eastside Union SD, Glendale USD, Inglewood USD, Lancaster SD, Lawndale SD, Newhall SD, William S. Hart Union HSD, Pomona USD, Saugus Union SD, Sulphur Springs Union SD, ABC USD, Lowell Joint SD, Covina Valley USD, and Whittier City SD 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 SBE. 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 WHITTIER UNION HSD

In an effort to develop its trustee area plan in full compliance with the CVRA, the Whittier Union HSD 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 Whittier Union HSD is included in this study (Appendix C).
Utilizing district, state, county and U.S. Census information, NDC developed several preliminary trustee area maps, on which public input was sought. NDC determined that, based on U.S. Census population within the district of 218,195, each of the five trustee areas would ideally contain approximately 43,639 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 before, during, and after developing maps. Three community meetings were held in November 2018, and three more were held in December 2018. 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, open houses, group presentations, meet the demographer sessions, social media, 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 school site councils. The district consulted with all bargaining units and held direct consultation with their District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC). According to the district, and the catalogued responses which staff reviewed, there was no significant opposition offered by residents and other members of the public.

After receiving feedback from the public about the initial maps presented by NDC, the district held three public hearings on December 11, 2018, January 15, 2019 and February 19, 2019, during which the school district gathered input from the community and additional map scenarios were analyzed. Based on that feedback, the Whittier Union HSD governing board selected the Green Map on February 19, 2019, approving it by a 5-0 vote. The district conducted a public hearing about the waiver of the election to implement the trustee areas and subsequently approved it, and the SBE will be approving the waiver in September 2019.

A. Description of the District and Students

Geography and Residents: The Whittier Union HSD is best described as a suburban 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 help the district honor the spirit of CVRA, beyond just striving for compliance. They were able to construct five Hispanic-majority trustee areas. 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 Whittier Union HSD serves approximately 11,851 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  
Whittier Union HSD Students, 2017-18 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittier Union HSD</td>
<td>11,851</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>1,492,652</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>6,220,413</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS)


The Whittier Union HSD 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 2017, more than half of the school board elections were competitive, during odd years in November, with multiple candidates, with the exceptions of 2009, 2011, 2013, and 2015, which were non-competitive. After the Fall 2017 election, the district moved onto the even-year election cycle, thereby delaying their 2019 election until 2020, as is legally tenable under the California Voter Participation Rights Act (CVPR A), 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 and to reduce election costs by consolidating with major state and national elections.

In 2001, the Registrar-Recorder reported that the Whittier Union HSD had 96,920 registered voters. In the most recent information available from the Registrar-Recorder, the Whittier Union HSD currently contains 117,044 registered voters. The next election is scheduled for November of 2020.
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. Many of the elections were competitive, with multiple candidates.

C. Election Data

Below is raw election data, sourced from the Registrar-Recorder, for the district's elections from 2001 to 2017:

### 2001

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHITTIER UNION HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOTE FOR NO MORE THAN 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEX MORALES</td>
<td>6,538 30.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L M ANDERSON</td>
<td>6,298 29.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFF BAIRD</td>
<td>5,823 26.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSHUA L BARNETT</td>
<td>2,978 13.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL PRECINCTS 60
REGISTRATION 96,920

### 2003

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHITTIER UNION HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOTE FOR NO MORE THAN 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE J GIOKARIS</td>
<td>4,985 41.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RALPH S PACHECO</td>
<td>3,977 33.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOE A DUARDO</td>
<td>2,151 18.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD M PROCIDA</td>
<td>767 6.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL PRECINCTS 54
REGISTRATION 93,930

### 2005

As of Date: 11/28/2005 Time: 16:37

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHITTIER UNION HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOTE FOR NO MORE THAN 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEX R MORALES</td>
<td>24,818 34.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFF BAIRD</td>
<td>19,158 26.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEIGHTON ANDERSON</td>
<td>18,218 25.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIAN BEELNER</td>
<td>9,577 13.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2007

As of Date: 11/21/2007 Time: 16:55

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIM SCHNEIDER</td>
<td>5,551</td>
<td>37.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RALPH S PACHECO</td>
<td>5,190</td>
<td>34.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRY M JACOBS</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>18.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESSE CAROMA</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>9.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2009

No election held

### 2011

No election held

### 2013

No election held

### 2015

No election held

### 2017

As of Date: 11/07/2017 Time: UNK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEIGHTON M ANDERSON</td>
<td>5,806</td>
<td>26.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSELL A CASTANEDA CALLEROS</td>
<td>5,183</td>
<td>23.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFF BAIRD</td>
<td>4,801</td>
<td>21.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIA CARMENITA MENDEZ</td>
<td>4,051</td>
<td>18.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 Whittier Union HSD, 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 Whittier Union HSD will have its first even-year election in November of 2020.

VII. LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE REVIEW OF THE WHITTIER UNION HSD PETITION

On April 24, 2019, the Los Angeles County Committee (County Committee) held a public hearing within the Whittier Union HSD, 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 significant opposition to the district’s selected trustee area plan.

Following the public hearing, the County Committee reviewed the information that the Whittier Union HSD submitted, along with their trustee area petition. On September 4, 2019, the County Committee will have the opportunity to ask questions of the interested parties, including Whittier Union HSD 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 Whittier Union HSD. In addition, the County Committee has the option to delay approval while it gathers additional information it deems relevant to its review of this petition.

The County Committee also has the option to accept or reject the trustee area map submitted by the Whittier Union HSD. The County Committee may task staff to develop additional scenarios of the trustee area plan for the Whittier Union HSD, 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 Whittier Union HSD, including the demographic analysis conducted on behalf of the district, a recounting of the public hearing process where input was sought on multiple 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 Whittier Union HSD’s petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting within the district.**

**Trustee Area Map.** After reviewing the thorough process that the Whittier Union HSD 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 as The Green Map.**

**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 Whittier Union HSD has applied for a waiver from the SBE to stay the requirement of this approval election. The waiver, which is expected to be granted, does not impact the election of any candidates for any trustee areas within the Whittier Union HSD, and the district’s next regular election (November 2020) 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 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, as the SBE is approving the district's waiver request in September 2019.**
IX.
FEASIBILITY STUDY APPENDICES
WHITTIER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
Whittier, California

Resolution No. 1819-25

Resolution Initiating the Process to Change
Election Methodology to By-Trustee Area Method,
Adopt Map of Proposed Trustee Areas
and Sequence of Elections

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

WHEREAS, the Whittier Union High School District ("District") currently uses an at-
large system of electing its Board of Trustees ("Board"); and

WHEREAS, on or about September 6, 2018 the District received a demand letter dated
September 2, 2018, from the law firm of Carlos R. Perez, alleging that the District’s at-large
system of elections violates the California Voting Rights Act of 2001 ("CVRA"); and

WHEREAS, at-large electoral systems such as the District’s are subject to challenge
under the CVRA, codified at sections 14025–14032 of the California Elections Code; 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 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 ("County 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 Board reached an agreement with Mr. Carlos Perez to extend the timeline in Elections Code section 10010 concerning the transition from an at-large elections system to a by-trustee area elections system to allow the District to conduct a transition process that emphasizes public participation; and

WHEREAS, the District retained National Demographics Corporation ("NDC") to prepare draft maps; and

WHEREAS, the District retained VMA Communications ("VMA") to assist with conducting a transparent community outreach process that included numerous opportunities for public participation; and

WHEREAS, the Board passed a resolution on October 30, 2018, identifying the criteria NDC should use in preparing draft maps. Board Resolution No. 1819-13 is attached hereto as Exhibit 1. Unlike some other public entities in California, the Legislature has not established a list of districting criteria that school district governing boards must or must not consider when drawing trustee areas; and

WHEREAS, the proposed timeline for the adoption of a draft map and potential sequence of elections by the Board and the dates of public participation opportunities were shared with the public via the District website at https://www.elections.grafikinc.com/public-participation-opportunities.php, discussed during community open houses and set forth in materials distributed by VMA. A postcard detailing the timeline is attached hereto as Exhibit 2; and
WHEREAS, NDC conducted meet the demographer sessions to allow individuals or small groups to have a more in-depth discussion on the map-drawing process with the demographer; and

WHEREAS, NDC presented three draft maps and potential sequences of election (NDC Green, NDC Orange and NDC Purple) to the Board at its meeting on November 13, 2018. The Board heard from members of the public on the proposed maps, and held a discussion on the three draft maps and the potential sequences of elections as part of a first public hearing; and

WHEREAS, NDC proposed one additional draft map and potential sequence of election (NDC Teal) to the Board at its meeting on December 11, 2018. NDC Teal was the product of one of the community meetings held with the demographers. Also presented to the Board was a draft map prepared by Mr. Perez and his demographer (CPerez 1). The Board heard from members of the public on all of the draft maps and discussed the draft maps and the potential sequences of elections as part of a second public hearing; and

WHEREAS, the Board held a public hearing on January 15, 2019, to consider the draft maps and potential sequences of elections as required by Elections Code section 10010(a)(2). The draft maps presented and discussed included a new map prepared by Mr. George Prather and presented by NDC as GPrather1. Further community and Board input was received regarding the draft maps and potential sequences of elections. During the January 15, 2019 meeting, the Board narrowed the number of draft maps from six to three in order to select a final map and sequence of elections at its February 19, 2019 meeting; and

WHEREAS, all three draft maps complied with the criteria adopted by this Board at its meeting of October 30, 2018, as part of Resolution No. 1819-13; and

WHEREAS, after the January 15, 2019, meeting in which the Board had narrowed the number of draft maps for consideration from six to three, the Board received a seventh draft map from Mr. Carlos Perez (CPerez2) on or about January 23, 2019; and

WHEREAS, the Board held a public hearing on February 19, 2019, to consider the draft maps and potential sequences of elections as required by Elections Code section 10010(a)(2), and selected one of the draft maps as set forth below to send to the County Committee pursuant to Education Code section 5019(c)(2).
WHEREAS, the Board has considered all public input and comment on the draft maps and potential sequences of elections, including the following:

- Public input collected and compiled by VMA in the Preliminary Overview Report attached hereto as Exhibit 3. The Preliminary Overview Report was distributed at the January 15, 2019 public hearing;

- The NDC Summary Report on Draft Map Options which compares all draft maps according to the map drawing criteria adopted by the Board on October 30, 2018 attached hereto as Exhibit 4. The NDC Summary Report on Draft Map Options was distributed at the January 15, 2019, and at the February 19, 2019, public hearings;

- Public input collected and compiled by VMA in the Summary Report attached hereto as Exhibit 5; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to adopt the Green Map and hereby recommends the Green Map to the County Committee for its consideration based upon the findings, and analysis contained in the documents attached hereto. The Green Map and its potential sequence of elections is attached hereto as Exhibit 6; 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 elections system 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

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Board of the Whittier Union High School District as follows:

1. That the above recitals are true and correct.

2. That the Board hereby adopts the Green Map and recommends the Green Map to the County Committee for consideration and approval.

3. That at the District’s next election in November 2020, seats in trustee areas 2 and 3 will be up for election, and in November 2022, seats in trustee areas 1, 4, and 5 will be up for election.

4. That the Superintendent or designee may take all actions necessary to notify the County Committee of the Board’s determination herein and provide whatever assistance may be required by the County Committee to complete the process, including the holding of at least one County Committee meeting in the District.
ADOPTED, SIGNED AND APPROVED this 19th day of February, 2019.

[Signature]
President of the Governing Board for the Whittier Union High School District

I, Leighton Anderson, Clerk of the Governing Board of the Whittier Union High 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 19th day of February 2019, and that it was so adopted by the following vote:

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

[Signature]
Clerk of the Governing Board of the Whittier Union High School District

WHITTIER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
BOARD OF TRUSTEES

By [Signature]
Dr. Russell Castaneda Calleros

By [Signature]
Mr. Jeff Baird

By [Signature]
Mr. Leighton Anderson

By [Signature]
Mr. Tim Schneider

By [Signature]
Dr. Ralph S. Pacheco
Whittier Union HSD
Districting 2018
NDC Green Map

Proposed Sequence:
2020 - Areas 2 & 3
2022 - Areas 1, 4, & 5

Rationale:
The NDC Green Map is a relatively compact map that follows major transportation links and major roads while balancing the adopted criteria. Like every map, each High School Attendance Area is served by a minimum of two trustees and each Trustee will have portions of at least two attendance areas in their Area. Trustee Area 1, 2, and 4 are mostly in the City of Whittier itself, while Areas 3 and 5 are largely outside the City. Trustee Area 1 includes all areas north of the City of Whittier along with much of West Whittier. Trustee Area 2 includes most of central Whittier, bounded by major roads such as Painter Avenue, Whittier Blvd, and Milvia Avenue. Trustee Area 3 includes the west and southeastern portions of the District, including the Los Nietos neighborhood, the portions of Downey and part of Norwalk. Trustee Area 4 includes the areas on the eastern end of the district, including the area north of Whittier Blvd and west of Greenleaf Avenue as well as the part of La Mirada. Finally, Trustee Area 5 includes the southern end of the district, including parts of Norwalk and Santa Fe Springs south of Telegraph Avenue and Milvia Avenue.

Map layers:
- NDC Green Map
- Landmark Area
- Water Area
- Pipeline/Power Line
- Railroad
- River
- Streets
- Cities and Towns
- Elementary School
- High School Attendance
- Trustee Blocks
- Schools Layer
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<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><strong>Ideal</strong></td>
<td>43,485</td>
<td>41,930</td>
<td>44,689</td>
<td>44,846</td>
<td>43,245</td>
<td>218,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from ideal</td>
<td>-154</td>
<td>-1,709</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>-394</td>
<td>2,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Deviation</td>
<td>-0.35%</td>
<td>-3.92%</td>
<td>2.41%</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
<td>-0.90%</td>
<td>6.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Pop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hip</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian-American</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>31,770</td>
<td>26,933</td>
<td>29,976</td>
<td>33,329</td>
<td>26,919</td>
<td>148,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hip</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian/Pac. Island</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citizen Voting Age Pop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Latino est.</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Spanish-Surnamed</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian-Surnamed</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Filipino-Surnamed</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White est.</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>17,828</td>
<td>13,003</td>
<td>16,857</td>
<td>19,007</td>
<td>12,724</td>
<td>80,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Latino est.</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Spanish-Surnamed</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian-Surnamed</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Filipino-Surnamed</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White est.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voter Turnout (Nov 2016)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Latino est.</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Spanish-Surnamed</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian-Surnamed</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Filipino-Surnamed</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White est.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black est.</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACS Pop. Est.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44,739</td>
<td>42,922</td>
<td>47,517</td>
<td>45,868</td>
<td>45,332</td>
<td>220,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 19</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 20-60</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 60+</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immigrants</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naturalized</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language spoken at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>english</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spanish</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asian-lang</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other lang</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Fluency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaks Eng. &quot;Less than Very Well&quot;</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (among those age 25+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high school grad</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bachelor</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduate degree</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child in Household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child-under18</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Pop. Age 16+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employed</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income 0-25k</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income 25-50k</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income 50-75k</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income 75-200k</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income 200k+</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single family</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multi-family</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rented</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>owned</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Stats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total population data from the 2010 Decennial Census. Surveys-based Voter Registration and Turnout data from the California Secretary of State. Latvian voter registration and turnout data are Spanish surname counts adjusted using Census Population Department undocumented estimates. NH White and NH Black registration and turnout counts estimated by NDC. Citizen Voting Age Pop, Age, Immigration, and other demographics from the 2012-2016 American Community Survey and Special Tabulation 5-year data.
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I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On March 6, 2019, the Saugus Union School District (SD) and the Sulphur Springs Union SD submitted their final board resolutions as part of a series of resolutions spanning the past eleven years, culminating in the formal introduction of a joint districts’ petition to transfer (exchange) certain parcels between Sulphur Springs Union SD and Saugus Union SD.

The territory in question consists of 23 residential parcels, referred to as the Skyline Ranch development of the City of Santa Clarita, all of which is within the William S. Hart Union High School District (HSD), as highlighted in the map in the petition (Attachment A).

The petition was presented to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) on March 6, 2019. Pursuant to EC §35705, two public hearings were conducted in the Saugus Union SD and Sulphur Springs Union SD on May 2, 2019.

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

As indicated in the following report, County Committee staff’s analysis of this petition indicates that the proposal to transfer certain territories between the Saugus Union SD and the Sulphur Springs Union SD would substantially meet all Conditions of EC §35753. The information in this report was developed through numerous discussions and meetings with the affected parties, and the review of many pages of materials submitted to the County Committee and to the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE).

Staff’s recommendation is that the Committee approve this petition to transfer territories.
## TABLE 1
### SUMMARY OF CONDITIONS, FINDINGS, AND RATIONALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Adequacy in number of students.</td>
<td>Substantially Met</td>
<td>Neither district will lose students; both districts will gain students who move into the new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Community identity.</td>
<td>Substantially Met</td>
<td>The development shall not impose a deficit upon the Community Identity of either district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Equitable division of assets and liabilities.</td>
<td>Substantially Met</td>
<td>The 23 parcels in-question do not appear to have a discernible impact on assets and liabilities of the development for either district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Will not promote ethnic discrimination or segregation.</td>
<td>Substantially Met</td>
<td>As most of the development is uninhabited, it is unknown what the ethnic makeup of the 23 parcels will be in the future, but they alone would not appear to promote ethnic discrimination nor segregation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Will not substantially increase costs to the state.</td>
<td>Substantially Met</td>
<td>Reorganization would not affect state funding significantly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Will not significantly disrupt educational programs in either district.</td>
<td>Substantially Met</td>
<td>Reorganization would not require changes to educational programs in either district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Will not result in a significant increase in school housing costs.</td>
<td>Substantially Met</td>
<td>Reorganization of the 23 parcels would not affect school housing costs substantially.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Proposal is not primarily designed to substantially increase property values.</td>
<td>Substantially Met</td>
<td>As the 23 parcels are within the same development, the property values are minutely different within each school district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Will not affect the fiscal management or status of the affected districts.</td>
<td>Substantially Met</td>
<td>Reorganization of the 23 parcels would not have a significant impact upon either districts’ fiscal management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

On March 6, 2019, the Saugus Union School District (SD) and the Sulphur Springs Union SD submitted their final board resolutions as part of a series of resolutions spanning the past eleven years, culminating in the formal introduction of a joint districts’ petition to transfer (exchange) certain parcels between Sulphur Springs Union SD and Saugus Union SD. The Saugus Union SD Governing Board conveyed Resolution 2018-19 #22; the Sulphur Springs Union SD Governing Board conveyed Resolution No. R-18-54; and the William S. Hart Union High School District (HSD) did not need to provide a governing board resolution on the matter, since the petition does not suggest changing the boundary lines of the HSD, only the boundary line between two of the feeder districts within the larger HSD’s territory. The territory in question consists of 23 residential parcels, referred to as the Skyline Ranch development of the City of Santa Clarita, all of which is within the William S. Hart Union HSD, as highlighted in the map in the petition (Attachment A).

The Skyline Ranch development will result in approximately 229 homes within the Saugus Union SD, and approximately 991 homes within the Sulphur Springs Union SD. The development had already been mapped-out, Community Facilities Districts (CFD) boundary lines established, public works and utilities agreements granted, Environmental Impact Reports (EIR) filed and approved by the County of Los Angeles and the City of Santa Clarita, before it was discovered that 23 homes within the development would straddle the boundary line between the two Elementary School Districts (ESD).

As such, the districts are jointly petitioning to secure clarity of identity for the prospective residents of the school districts. The agreement that the districts have brokered is that 14 of the lots will be designated to the Saugus Union SD, and the remaining nine shall go to the Sulphur Springs Union SD.

The petition was presented to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) on March 6, 2019. Pursuant to EC §35705, two public hearings were conducted in the Saugus Union SD and Sulphur Springs Union SD on May 2, 2019.

In addition to the public hearings, staff received document submissions from both ESDs, and in light of the volume of material submitted prior to the completion of the feasibility study, staff did not require any formal Requests for Information (RFI) to any of the impacted parties seeking additional information.

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

III. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL AREA

The proposed transfer area consists of approximately 23 parcels, all of which are residential homes located in the City of Santa Clarita, and which are contained within three school districts. The
school districts are Saugus Union SD, Sulphur Springs Union SD, and William S. Hart Union HSD. Attachment A contains a map of the area proposed for transfer.

IV. DESCRIPTION OF IMPACTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

SAUGUS UNION SD

The Saugus Union SD serves K-6 students in Santa Clarita, Canyon Country, Saugus, Valencia, and the surrounding area, including portions of unincorporated Los Angeles County. The district operates fifteen elementary schools with student enrollment of 9,791 for 2018-19. The area supported by the Saugus Union SD is suburban, with both single-family housing and multi-family housing, retail and commercial enterprise, placed in the Santa Clarita Valley with mountainous landscapes.

SULPHUR SPRINGS UNION SD

The Sulphur Springs Union SD serves K-6 students within Santa Clarita, Canyon Country, and the surrounding area, including portions of unincorporated Los Angeles County. The district operates nine elementary schools with student enrollment of 5,336 for 2018-19. The area supported by the Sulphur Springs Union SD is suburban, with both single-family housing and multi-family housing, retail and commercial enterprise, placed in the Santa Clarita Valley with mountainous landscapes.

V. PETITIONERS’ RATIONALE

The rationale for petitioning for the transfers of territories as stated by the school districts is that it will simplify the boundaries of their neighborhoods (the Skyline Ranch development) and eliminate “straddle lots” for many of the prospective future residents of both school districts.

VI. POSITIONS OF THE GOVERNING BOARDS

SAUGUS UNION SD

On October 16, 2018, the Saugus Union SD Governing Board adopted Resolution No. 2018-19 #22 (Attachment B) supporting the petition to transfer territories between the Saugus Union SD and the Sulphur Springs Union SD.

At the public hearings held on May 2, 2019, Saugus Union SD Superintendent Dr. Colleen Hawkins expressed the Governing Board’s support for the proposed territory swaps.

SULPHUR SPRINGS UNION SD

On September 26, 2018, the Sulphur Springs Union SD Governing Board adopted Resolution No. 18-54 (Attachment C) supporting the petition to transfer territories between the Saugus Union SD and the Sulphur Springs Union SD.
At the public hearings held on May 2, 2019, Sulphur Springs Union SD Superintendent Dr. Catherine Kawaguchi expressed the Governing Board’s support for the proposed territory swaps.

WILLIAM S. HART UNION HSD

The William S. Hart Union HSD is not considered by any of the school districts nor the developer to be a significant stakeholder affected by the proposed territory transfers, as irrespective of how many lots are- or are not- transferred, the entirety of both districts remains within the HSD’s boundaries.

At the public hearings held on May 2, 2019, no one from the William S. Hart Union HSD expressed any opposition to the proposed territory swaps.

VII. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Parcels. The petition area is within the City of Santa Clarita and the Saugus Union SD, Sulphur Springs Union SD, and the William S. Hart Union HSD. Per the developer’s maps, the petition area contains 23 parcels, as part of a mostly uninhabited development of approximately 1,220 single family homes, seated on approximately 2,200 acres. Of the 23 straddle lot parcels, the districts agree that 14 of them should go to Saugus Union SD, and the remaining nine should be designated for the Sulphur Springs Union SD.

Petition Area Enrollment. It is expected that while the majority of the future residents of the 1,220 parcels development may be families, it cannot be ascertained with any degree of certainty as to whether or not the future residents of the specific 23 parcels in question will have school-aged children to enroll in the local public school systems.

Permit Process and Agreements. Both the Saugus Union SD and the Sulphur Springs Union SD facilitate the permit process for students throughout their districts, and are amendable to the same arrangement for the petition area as well as the development at-large, for students seeking to transfer out of either district.

VIII. ANALYSIS OF MANDATED CONDITIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

The County Committee may vote to approve a proposal to transfer territory when the conditions in EC §35753(a)(1) through (10) are substantially met. However, the Education Code does not mandate that the County Committee approve petitions where any, a majority, or all of the conditions are substantially met. Likewise, the Education Code does not mandate that the County Committee deny a petition where all, many, or some of the conditions are not substantially met. The Education Code provides the County Committee with broad authority to analyze factors it deems relevant and to assign to those factors the requisite weight they choose to determine how to vote on the petitions that come before it.
The County Committee has the option to disapprove a proposal to transfer territory even when the conditions are substantially met, if it determines that the proposal is not in the best overall interests of those affected; if there is no compelling reason for a change; if the proposal will not improve the effectiveness and/or the efficiency of the delivery of educational services to students; or for any other reason(s) the County Committee deems relevant.

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

**CONDITION 1**

**The reorganized districts will be adequate in terms of number of pupils enrolled.**

The County Committee may approve a proposal for reorganization of districts if the new district is adequate in terms of the number of students enrolled. Section 18573(a)(1)(a) of Title V, California Administrative Code (CAC), specifies that an elementary school district must have a projected enrollment of at least 901 students.

**FINDINGS**

According to the CDE, the 2018-19 student enrollment for the Saugus Union SD was 9,791, and for the Sulphur Springs Union SD was 5,390.

**CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

Because the petition area will appear to yield a smaller number of students compared to the total enrollments of the affected districts, approval of this proposal would not reduce the number of students enrolled in either district. Therefore, it is recommended that the County Committee deem this condition to be substantially met.

**CONDITION 2**

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

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

The petition area is a brand-new development, and the prospective residents of the 23 parcels in question shall all be part of the same neighborhood. There are no perceived discernable differences with community identity for residents enrolled in either district.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The petition area is not inhabited, and based on the geographical proximity of each resident to the next, being in the same housing development, it is not deemed that community identity will be a factor for the future residents. Therefore, it is recommended that the County Committee deem this condition to be substantially met.

CONDITION 3

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

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

FINDINGS

Real Property

No real or personal public school property of either school district is within the boundaries of the area proposed for transfer.

Bonded Indebtedness and Tax Rate

EC §35575 states that “[w]hen territory is taken from one school district and annexed to another school district the area transferred contains no public school property or buildings, the territory shall drop any liability for outstanding bonded indebtedness in the district of which it was formerly a part and shall automatically assume its proportionate share of the outstanding bonded indebtedness of the district of which it becomes a part.” Since there are no school facilities and/or school property in the area proposed for transfer, the bonded indebtedness provisions of EC §35575 would not apply.

The influx of new territory as the result of the development and new ratepayers who will be moving into Skyline Ranch will appear to lower the cost of existing bonded indebtedness to individual property owners within all three school districts, as it will enlarge the pool of property available to cover the bonds. Additionally, all three districts will benefit from the development, as the assessed valuations of all three districts shall increase.
However, it is noted that in concert with agreeing to the development, all three districts consented to the implementation of CFDs which shall encumber the future homeowners with tax and bond obligations beyond what they would pay if they were not in the CFD. The CFDs shall serve as a mechanism by which the developer may obtain reimbursements for early up-front costs, as well as a means for the school districts to build new schools in- or adjacent to-the development, without needing to saddle the entire districts' residents with new General Obligation (G.O.) bonds. It is understood that the developer's representatives and real estate agents are responsible for apprising prospective homebuyers of the additional debts and tax obligations they may encumber as the result of purchasing in the development.

**Student Body Funds**

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

The negligible proportion of uninhabited parcels which this petition proposes swapping does not purport to enact this condition.

**CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

Because no school facilities are within the transfer areas and the parcels in question are currently uninhabited, a division of property, funds or obligations of the school districts would not be required should this proposal be approved.

As such, it is recommended that the County Committee deem this condition to be substantially met.

**CONDITION 4**

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

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

“To determine whether the new districts will promote racial or ethnic discrimination or segregation, the effects of the following factors will be considered:
The current number and percentage of pupils in each racial and ethnic group in the affected districts and schools in the affected districts, compared with the number and percentage of pupils in each racial and ethnic group in the affected districts and schools in the affected districts, if the proposal or petition is approved.

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

The school board policies regarding methods of preventing racial and ethnic segregation in the affected districts and the effect of the proposal or petition on any desegregation plan or program of the affected districts, whether voluntary or court ordered, designed to prevent or alleviate racial or ethnic discrimination or segregation.

The effect of factors such as distance between schools and attendance centers, terrain, and geographic features that may involve safety hazards to students, capacity of schools, and related conditions or circumstances that may affect the feasibility of integration of the affected schools.

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

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

- participation in extracurricular activities;
- equipment of affected school districts;
- state of facilities of affected school districts;
- perception of staff, administrators, and community regarding whether schools are segregated; and,
- racial/ethnic make-up of staff and administration.

**FINDINGS**

Table 2 below displays the 2018-19 district-wide student enrollment by racial/ethnic categories for the Saugus Union SD as provided by the CDE. As shown, the district’s enrollment is mostly comprised of 48% White, 33% Hispanic, 9% Asian, 6% Filipino, 3.6% two or more races, and 3.5% African American (not accounting for non-reporting students).
TABLE 2
Saugus Union SD Racial/Ethnic Distribution*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>3,217</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4,379</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,791</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 3 below displays the 2018-19 district-wide student enrollment by racial/ethnic categories for the Sulphur Springs Union SD as provided by the CDE. As shown, the district’s enrollment is mostly comprised of 25% White, 4.3% Asian, 5% Filipino, 55% Hispanic, 4.4% two or more races, and 6% African American (not accounting for non-reporting students).

TABLE 3
Sulphur Springs Union SD Racial/Ethnic Distribution*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>2,932</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5,336</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Both school districts have a majority of students reporting Hispanic or White as their ethnicity, so the balance of ethnicity in each of the districts is relatively similar. Saugus Union SD has 33% Hispanic students while Sulphur Springs Union SD has 55%. Saugus Union SD has 9% Asian students while Sulphur Springs Union SD has 4.3%. Saugus Union SD has 3.5% African American students, while Sulphur Springs Union SD has 5.8%. It is projected that, should the petition be approved, it would not shift the racial/ethnic balance of either district substantially, as it is unlikely that all of the future homeowners would be of the same exact ethnicity. However, even if they were, it is such a small number, that it would be insignificant. There is no evidence there is any ethnic or racial motive for petitioning for these transfers of territories.

**CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

The territory swaps between Saugus Union SD and Sulphur Springs Union SD would not have a discernable impact on the ethnic or racial distribution of either district. Because there are so few potential students, and the districts have relatively similar ethnic/racial makeups, percentage distribution across ethnic categories would remain very similar for both following transfer resulting from approval of this petition. It is concluded that the proposed petition, if approved, would not promote racial or ethnic discrimination in any of the affected school districts. Therefore, it is recommended that the County Committee deem this condition to be substantially met.

**CONDITION 5**

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

This petition area contains zero students in 2019, and if/when homebuyers with students move in, there would be a minor change in student enrollment for each district. As such, enrollment-based funds would be insignificant to each districts’ overall budget in-comparison to the existing student population.
FINDINGS

Neither district has expressed that these proposed territory swaps would be a financial hardship for them, leading to any increased costs to the state.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Should this proposal be approved, no additional facilities would be required by either district, causing significant additional costs to the state. Funding based on enrollment would perhaps result in a minor uptick for one district or the other, but it cannot be projected based on the fact that it is unknown whether the future homebuyers will have children, and if they do, which homebuyers for which parcels. Therefore, it is recommended that the County Committee deem this condition to be substantially met.

CONDITION 6

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

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

FINDINGS

Neither district indicated that the proposed territories swaps would result in any change to their educational programs whatsoever.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

As this petition would not require that either district modify or discontinue any portion of its current curriculum, it is concluded that the educational programs of the districts would not be disrupted and that the districts would continue to promote sound educational performance. Therefore, it is recommended that the County Committee deem this condition to be substantially met.
CONDITION 7

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

FINDINGS

The Saugus Union SD and the Sulphur Springs Union SD both informed the County Committee during the two public hearings held for this petition that while the Skyline Ranch development in tota lity may result in the construction of a future school facility, this territories swap petition would not be causal, due to the small number of parcels being exchanged.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Because of the small number of parcels which are part of this petition, there would not be increased facilities-related costs to the state. Therefore, it is recommended that the County Committee deem this condition to be substantially met.

CONDITION 8

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

This condition requests that the County Committee should consider whether increasing property values is the primary reason for the petition.

FINDINGS

The school districts have submitted this joint territories swap petition for the declared purposes of providing clarity and simplicity to the prospective future homeowners whom each district would like to move into their respective districts. Eliminating straddle lots would create more finite perimeters by which each district can have certainty about how many homes are within their districts’ boundaries.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

There is no evidence that a significant increase in property values represents the primary motive for this joint petition by the school districts. Therefore, it is recommended that the County Committee deem this condition to be substantially met.
CONDITION 9

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

The County Committee should consider the fiscal consequences on the affected districts that may result from the proposed reorganization, and whether approving the petition would undermine the sound financial management of either district. The County Committee weighs the proposal’s effect on the viability of the reorganized districts to operate educational programs and to assess any negative impact to the fiscal management or status of the reorganized district(s).

FINDINGS

Based on the extremely low number of potential students who may move into one of the parcels designated for swapping within the transfer area, the prospect of the transfers disrupting either districts’ finances is unlikely. In addition, the ability of each district to maintain a statutory reserve for economic uncertainties would not be affected should the proposal be approved.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

It is concluded these parcel transfers would not negatively affect the fiscal management or status of either of the districts who have submitted this joint petition for territory swaps. Therefore, it is recommended that the County Committee deem this condition to be substantially met.

IX. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

After examining the data related to this reorganization petition, provided by the relevant parties, their representatives, and from local and state sources, staff finds that all of the nine conditions have been substantially met.

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

In light of the significant authority vested in the County Committee by the California Education Code, staff has examined the implications of both approval and denial of the current petition. The implications relate to the elements of the school districts’ joint petition, which is based on securing clarity and simplicity for the prospective homeowners which both districts would like to see move into their respective districts.
Staff is informed and understands that if families with students move into the petition area, they will have access to enrollment in both school districts via permit should there be space available, as is the current status with both districts for students outside of the petition area.

**Staff recommends that the petition be approved.** There is a clear and logical need to have clarity and simplicity about the boundaries of neighboring school districts. Given the fact that this petition is seeking to give redress to a pending development, it is in the best interest of both school districts, Los Angeles County agencies (Registrar Recorder-County Clerk, Department of Public Works, Treasurer-Tax Collector, et al.), and the future homeowners that the County Committee grant this joint petition.

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

After discussion on the petition, the County Committee will review each of the nine conditions and vote on the preliminary approval or denial of the petition.
X.

ATTACHMENTS
Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization

Attachments for meeting on September 4, 2019

Territory Transfers (parcels swaps) Feasibility Study: Saugus Union SD and Sulphur Springs Union SD

ATTACHMENT A
PETITION OF THE SULPHUR SPRINGS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT FOR THE
TRANSFER OF TERRITORY BETWEEN THE SAUGUS UNION SCHOOL
DISTRICT AND THE SULPHUR SPRINGS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT

To the County of Los Angeles Superintendent of Schools:

Pursuant to California Education Code Section 35700(d), petition is hereby made by the Board of Trustees of the Sulphur Springs Union School District, located in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, as evidenced by the signatures below, for the transfer of certain lots and uninhabited territory within the development known as Skyline Ranch Development ("Property") between the Sulphur Springs Union School District and the Saugus Union School District. This Petition is made jointly with the Boards of Trustee of the Sulphur Springs Union School District and the Saugus Union School District.

On September 26th, 2018, the Board of Trustees of the Sulphur Springs Union School District adopted Resolution No. 18-54, authorizing the District to initiate the proposed territory transfer by filing this Petition in conjunction with petition from Saugus Union School District. The Resolution further authorized a majority of the members of the Board of Trustees to sign a petition as required by law for territory transfers. A true and correct copy of the Resolution is attached hereto as Attachment “1” and incorporated herein by reference. The Property is located in the County of Los Angeles and is more particularly described by Exhibit “B” to the Resolution. The territory transfer will result in a modification of the boundaries of the Sulphur Springs Union School District and the Saugus Union School District. The official boundaries, as modified, shall be prepared at a later time and shall conform to the intent of Exhibit “B” to the Resolution. This Petition may be amended, as necessary, by the Superintendent of Sulphur Springs Union School District, or her designee, to conform to the Resolution pursuant to the requirements of the County of Los Angeles Superintendent of Schools.

Respectfully submitted,

Ken Chase  
Board President

Denis DeFigueiredo  
Board Clerk

Shelley Weinstein  
Trustee

Lori MacDonald  
Trustee

Dr. Kerry Clegg  
Trustee
Territory Transfers (parcels swaps) Feasibility Study:
Saugus Union SD and Sulphur Springs Union SD

ATTACHMENT

B
October 30, 2018

Via Email and First-Class Mail

Keith D. Crafton, Secretary
Los Angeles County Committee
on School District Organization
9300 Imperial Hwy
Downey, CA 90242

Re:  Saugus Union School District and Sulphur Springs Union School District;
Petition for Transfer of Uninhabited Territory

Dear Mr. Crafton:

Enclosed is Resolution No. 2018-19 #22 of the Governing Board of the Saugus Union School District ("Saugus"), which constitutes a petition for transfer of certain territory ("Petition") between Saugus and the Sulphur Springs Union School District ("Sulphur Springs"). The territory that is the subject of the Petition is presently uninhabited territory and is within the "Skyline" residential development project ("Project") that covers portions of both Saugus and Sulphur Springs. Saugus and Sulphur Springs each anticipate forming Mello-Roos Community Facilities Districts (each a "CFD") over and for the portions of the Project that are within their respective boundaries, as a means of financing school facilities and other infrastructure needed as a result of the development of the Project.

The purpose of the Petition is to resolve "straddle lot" issues associated with development of the Project. Straddle lots result when the boundary line between two school districts bisects individual residential parcels in a development project (thus, the parcels straddle the boundary). Straddle lots create issues not only with respect to determining which school district pupils in the homes will attend, but also with respect to statutory requirements that the entirety of a parcel be included within a CFD.

Through incorporation of a corresponding resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees of Sulphur Springs, the Petition includes the signatures of a majority of the members of each of the Saugus and Sulphur Springs governing boards. In addition, the Petition includes the consent of the developer of the Project (Pardee Homes and its sister company Tri Pointe Homes Inc.) to
the proposed transfer of territory. The Superintendents of Saugus and Sulphur Springs are specified as the chief petitioners for purposes of the Petition. The following exhibits are attached to Saugus’ Resolution No. 2018-19 #22:

Exhibit “A” Depiction of the Project (i.e., Tentative Tract Map No. 60922)
Exhibit “B” Depiction of Straddle Lots
Exhibit “C” Developer Request for Transfer of Territory
Exhibit “D” Depiction of Proposed Saugus-Sulphur Springs Boundary Line
Exhibit “E” Developer Request for Formation of Saugus CFD
Exhibit “F” Sulphur Springs Letter Regarding Territory Transfer
Exhibit “G” Sulphur Springs Resolution No. R-18-54
Exhibit “H” Saugus Findings Regarding Transfer of Territory

We appreciate your attention to this matter. Please confirm with us that you have everything you need to process the Petition with the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization. Otherwise, please don’t hesitate to contact the undersigned if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,

ATKINSON, ANDELSNN, LOYA, RUUD & ROMO

[Signature]
Brian W. Smith

BWS:jis

Encl: Resolution No. 2018-19 #22

cc: Dr. Colleen Hawkins, Superintendent, Saugus (email only)
Dr. Catherine Kawaguchi, Superintendent, Sulphur Springs (email only)
Nick Heinlein, SUSD (email only)
Michael Y.M. Toy, Parker & Covert (email only)
John Yeager, O’Neil LLP (email only)
RESOLUTION NO. 2018-19 # 22

RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNING BOARD
OF THE SAUGUS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
MAKING FINDINGS, AUTHORIZING THE
FILING OF A PETITION, AND AUTHORIZING OTHER
ACTIONS RELATING TO PROPOSED TRANSFER OF TERRITORY

WHEREAS, Pardee Homes and its sister company Tri Pointe Homes, Inc. (together, “Pardee”) is seeking to develop what Pardee refers to as its “Skyline” project (“Project”) on approximately 2,200 acres of presently uninhabited territory (as defined in Government Code Section 35517) located in an unincorporated portion of Los Angeles County, California, in the vicinity of the City of Santa Clarita (“Property”); and

WHEREAS, Pardee has obtained certain entitlements for development of approximately 1,220 single family homes on the Property, including, among others, Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 060922 (“Tract Map No. 60922”), which is depicted in Exhibit “A” attached to this Resolution; and

WHEREAS, in connection with approval of the Project, Pardee and the County of Los Angeles have completed environmental proceedings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), and such proceedings contemplated that Project will include residential development consistent with Tract Map No. 60922; and

WHEREAS, the boundary between the Saugus Union School District (“Saugus”) and the Sulphur Springs Union School District (“Sulphur”) presently bisects the Project, which, based on development in accordance with Tract Map No. 60922, will result in approximately 229 homes within the boundaries of Saugus and 991 homes within the boundaries of Sulphur; and

WHEREAS, if development of the Property were to proceed based on Tract Map No. 60922, approximately 20 residential parcels would straddle the boundary between Saugus and Sulphur (“Straddle Lots”), as depicted in Exhibit “B” attached to this Resolution; and

WHEREAS, Pardee has requested that Saugus and Sulphur (collectively, the “School Districts”) consent and take all necessary steps to implement a transfer of territory between the School Districts as will result in each residential parcel in the Project being wholly within the boundaries of one or the other of the School Districts (i.e., there will be no Straddle Lots), and Pardee’s consent to such territory transfer is set forth in the letter attached as Exhibit “C” to this Resolution; and

WHEREAS, upon completion of the proposed transfer of territory between the School Districts, the revised boundary between the School Districts, as proposed by Pardee and as the School Districts have agreed, would be as depicted in Exhibit “D” attached to this Resolution; and

WHEREAS, the letter from Pardee attached as Exhibit C hereto states that Pardee (i.e., both Pardee Homes and Tri Pointe Homes, Inc.) is the sole owner of the Property and expresses Pardee’s consent to the transfer of territory between the School Districts as depicted in Exhibit D attached hereto; and

WHEREAS, neither of the School Districts presently owns or operates any school or other facilities located within the boundaries of the Project; and
WHEREAS, Pardee and the County of Los Angeles already have evaluated the impact on the environment associated with the Project as required by CEQA and the proposed transfer of territory between the School Districts will not, in and of itself, result in any additional significant environmental impacts; and

WHEREAS, both of the School Districts are “elementary” or “component” school districts with territory wholly within the boundaries of the William S. Hart Union High School District (“Hart”), and Hart presently does not own or operate any school or other facilities within the boundaries of the Project; and

WHEREAS, Pardee requested that, in accordance with the Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982 set forth in Government Code Section 53311 et seq. (“Mello-Roos Act”), the School Districts establish Mello-Roos Community Facilities Districts (each a “CFD”) within their respective territories for purposes of financing school facilities needed to accommodate students generated by development of the Property, and a copy of Pardee’s request that Saugus establish a CFD over the portion of the Project within Saugus’s boundaries is attached as Exhibit “E” to this Resolution; and

WHEREAS, the Mello-Roos Act authorizes a California public school district to establish a CFD only over and for parcels that are wholly within the school district’s boundaries; and

WHEREAS, Education Code Sections 35500 et seq. and 35700 et seq. (“Reorganization Provisions”) set forth requirements for transfer of territory between school districts, and Education Code Section 35700 specifically authorizes the initiation of such transfer of territory by a majority of the board members of each of the school districts affected by the transfer; and

WHEREAS, Education Code Section 35709 authorizes the County Committee on School District Organization for the County of Los Angeles (“County Committee”) to approve and order the transfer of uninhabited territory, and so notify the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, if the governing boards of each affected school district consent, the owner or majority of the owners of the territory consent, and if all conditions enumerated in Education Code Section 35753(a) are substantially met; and

WHEREAS, Education Code Section 35537 provides that the effective date of a transfer of territory, as it relates to the formation, authorization of a special tax, and authorization and issuance of bonds of a CFD, if the territory is uninhabited and all affected school districts have consented to the transfer, shall be the date agreed by the school districts, but in no event shall the effective date be earlier than the date the last of the affected school districts adopts a resolution consenting to the transfer; and

WHEREAS, the California Legislature, in promulgating Education Code Section 35537, intended to establish a procedure for effecting school district boundary changes that would expedite formation of CFDs; and

WHEREAS, the School Districts have agreed that, in order to facilitate establishment on a timely basis of the CFDs intended to finance school facilities for students generated by development of the Project, the effective date of the proposed territory transfer described in this Resolution shall be January 1, 2019, and such agreement is set forth in the letter attached as Exhibit “F” to this Resolution; and
WHEREAS, on September 26, 2018, and for purposes of facilitating the territory transfer described in this Resolution, the Board of Trustees of the Sulphur Springs Union School District, by affirmative vote of a majority of its members, approved and adopted Resolution No. R-18-54, a copy of which is set forth in Exhibit “C” attached to this Resolution, and a majority of the members of the Sulphur Board of Trustees signed the petition attached to Resolution No. R-18-54; and

WHEREAS, the letter attached as Exhibit F hereto also confirms the boundary line between the School Districts intended as a result of the proposed transfer of territory and provides that, in accordance with Education Code Section 35701, the Superintendent of Saugus and the Superintendent of Sulphur shall be designated as the “chief petitioners” for purposes of notice of the public hearings to be conducted in regard to the proposed territory transfer; and

WHEREAS, the Governing Board of the Saugus Union School District (“Governing Board”) believes it would be in the best interests of Saugus, of the students who will reside within the Project, and of the public generally, for the transfer of territory to occur as described in this Resolution;

NOW, THEREFORE, the Governing Board hereby determines, resolves, and orders as follows:

Section 1. The recitals set forth above in this Resolution are true and correct.

Section 2. The Governing Board, having considered the conditions enumerated in Education Code Section 35753(a), hereby finds that the proposed transfer of territory as described in this Resolution substantially meets such conditions, and the Governing Board hereby approves and adopts the findings set forth in Exhibit “H” attached to this Resolution.

Section 3. The Governing Board hereby finds that the proposed transfer of territory as described in this Resolution will be in the best interests of Saugus, Sulphur, Hart, the students who will reside within the boundaries of the Project, and the public generally.

Section 4. The Governing Board hereby approves and consents to the proposed transfer of territory as described in this Resolution.

Section 5. The Governing Board hereby agrees and declares that, in accordance with and for the purposes set forth in Education Code Section 35537, the effective date of such proposed transfer of territory shall be January 1, 2019.

Section 6. The Governing Board hereby requests that the County Committee, having received documents evidencing that each and all of the conditions precedent to approval of the territory transfer described in this Resolution have been satisfied, approve and order the transfer of territory described in this Resolution, effective as of January 1, 2019, as provided by and for the purposes described in Education Code Section 35537, and that the County Committee so notify the County Board of Supervisors.

Section 7. For purposes of the Reorganization Provisions, this Resolution, together with the Exhibits hereto (including, without limitation, Sulphur Resolution R-18-54), shall constitute the duly-authorized and signed petition, by the majority of the members of each of the Governing Board of Saugus and the Board of Trustees of Sulphur, for the transfer of territory described in this Resolution, and the Superintendents of Saugus and Sulphur shall be designated as the “chief petitioners” for purposes of such petition.
Section 8. The Governing Board hereby authorizes and directs Saugus staff and/or consultants to: (i) provide an executed copy of this Resolution to the Los Angeles County Office of Education ("LACOE") and the County Committee; (ii) prepare and provide any cover letter, petition face sheet, and/or other documentation with, or as a follow up to, this Resolution as necessary or convenient for transmittal to LACOE and the County Committee or for eliminating any and all deficiencies relating to this Resolution constituting a petition for transfer of territory; and (iii) provide such other information as Sulphur, Hart, LACOE and/or the County Committee reasonably may seek from time to time in connection with the request for transfer of territory set forth in this Resolution.

Section 9. The Governing Board hereby authorizes the Superintendent of Saugus, the Assistant Superintendent of Business Services of Saugus, and/or their respective designees, to take any and all such actions (including, without limitation, executing documents and expending funds) as reasonably may be required to implement the intent of this Resolution and to consummate the transfer of territory described in this Resolution.

APPROVED, ADOPTED, AND SIGNED this 16th day of October, 2018.

GOVERNING BOARD OF THE
SAUGUS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT

By: ________________________________
Christopher Trunkey, President

By: ________________________________
Paul De La Cerda, Clerk

By: ________________________________
Julie Olsen, Member

By: ________________________________
David Powell, Member

By: ________________________________
Judy Egg Umeck, Member
Territory Transfers (parcels swaps) Feasibility Study:
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EXHIBIT "G"

SULPHUR SPRINGS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
Resolution No. R-18-54


WHEREAS, the Sulphur Springs Union School District is located in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, and is governed by a governing board known as the Board of Trustees of the Sulphur Springs Union School District; and,

WHEREAS, the Saugus Union School District is also located in the County of Los Angeles, State of California and is governed by a governing board known as the Board of Trustees of the Saugus Union School District; and,

WHEREAS, both the Sulphur Springs Union School District and the Saugus Union School District are located within the territorial boundaries of the William S. Hart Union High School District located in the County of Los Angeles, State of California; and,

WHEREAS, Pardee Homes has proposed a new development in Santa Clarita called Skyline Ranch Development, located partially within the Sulphur Springs Union School District and partially within the Saugus Union School District; and,

WHEREAS, twenty-one proposed lots within the Skyline Development straddle both elementary school districts (See Exhibit A); and,

WHEREAS, the developer has proposed a boundary adjustment (hereinafter, "Territory Transfer") to eliminate lots that would straddle both district and would provide a cohesive plan for school attendance from the adjacent communities as illustrated in the attached proposed new boundary map (See Exhibit B); and,

WHEREAS, both the Sulphur Springs Union School District and the Saugus Union School District have carefully reviewed the proposed boundary adjustment and have agreed to proceed with the adjustment; and,

WHEREAS, the Sulphur Springs Union School District and the Saugus Union School District seek to jointly initiate the proposed Territory Transfer; and,

WHEREAS, California Education Code Section 35700(d) provides that an action to reorganize one or more school districts may be initiated upon the filing with the County Superintendent of Schools a petition signed by a majority of the members of the governing boards of each of the districts that would be affected by the proposed reorganization;
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Trustees of the Sulphur Springs Union School District, as follows:

1. The foregoing recitals are adopted as true and correct;

2. Pursuant to California Education Code Section 35700(d), a Petition is hereby made, as evidenced by the attached PETITION OF THE SULPHUR SPRINGS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT FOR THE TRANSFER OF TERRITORY BETWEEN THE SAUGUS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT AND THE SULPHUR SPRINGS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT, signed by a majority of the Trustees of the Board of Trustees of the Sulphur Springs Union School District, requesting the transfer of certain uninhabited territory from the Sulphur Springs Union School District to the Saugus Union School District and from the Saugus Union School District to the Sulphur Springs Union School District. The Territory to be transferred is located in the County of Los Angeles and is more particularly described by Exhibit “A” attached hereto. The Legal description of the territory shall be prepared at a later time and filed with the County Superintendent of Schools for the County of Los Angeles.

3. The transfer of territory as petitioned for herewith will result in a modification of the boundaries of the Sulphur Springs Union School District and the Saugus Union School District. The official boundaries, as modified, shall be prepared at a later and shall conform to the intent of Exhibit “B”.

4. Upon approval by the majority of members of the Boards of Trustee of the Sulphur Springs Union School District and the Saugus Union School District, of a resolution authorizing the submission of a Petition to transfer the territory, the Superintendent of the Sulphur Springs Union School District or designee shall submit a copy of this resolution and all pertinent exhibits and supplements contemplated herein to the County Superintendent of Schools of the County of Los Angeles pursuant to California Education Code Section 35700, et seq.

5. The Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent of Business and their respective designees are hereby authorized and directed, for and in the name of and on behalf of the Sulphur Springs Union School District, to execute and deliver any and all documents, to do any and all things and take any and all actions that may be necessary or advisable, in their discretion, to carry out the purpose and intent of this resolution. All actions hereinafter taken by officers, employees and agents of the Sulphur Springs Union School District that are in conformity with the purpose and intent of this Resolution are hereby approved, confirmed and ratified.

ADOPTED, SIGNED AND APPROVED on this the 26th day of September 2018, by vote of the Board of Trustees of the Sulphur Springs Union School District as noted below in the Clerk’s Certificate.
BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE SULPHUR
SPRINGS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT

Ken Chase
President

Denis DeFigueiredo
Clerk of the Board
CLERK’S CERTIFICATE

I, Denis DeFigueiredo, Clerk of the Board of Education of the Sulphur Springs Union School District, hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of the resolution duly adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Education on the 26th day of September 2018, upon the following vote:

Board President Ken Chase:               
Clerk of the Board Denis DeFigueiredo:   
Trustee Shelley Weinstein:               
Trustee Lori MacDonald:                  
Trustee Dr. Kerry Clegg:                 

Aye         Aye         Aye
Aye         Aye         Aye

An Agenda of the meeting was posted 72 hours before the meeting at Canyon Country, California, a location freely accessible to members of the public, and a brief general description of the resolution appeared on the agenda.

I further certify that the foregoing resolution is a full, true and correct copy of the original resolution adopted at said Board meeting; and that said resolution has not been amended, modified or rescinded since the date of its adoption, and the same is now in full force and effect.

Dated: September 26, 2018

By: Denis DeFigueiredo, Clerk of the Board
Sulphur Springs Union School District
Attachment 8

LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION (COUNTY COMMITTEE)
LEGISLATIVE REVIEW – SEPTEMBER 2019

BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR:
Senate Bill 47 / Allen

INTRODUCTION DATE:
12/03/18

LAST ACTIVITY/DATE:
07/03/19 – Re-referred to Assembly Appropriations (APPR)

DESCRIPTION OF BILL

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

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

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

RECOMMENDED POSITION
Staff recommends the following position:

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

INTRODUCTION DATE: 02/04/19

LAST ACTIVITY/DATE: 07/09/19 – Re-referred to Assembly Appropriations

DESCRIPTION OF BILL

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

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

This bill could possibly have a large impact on Los Angeles County school districts who receive a demand letter to implement trustee area voting.

RECOMMENDED POSITION

Staff recommends the following position:

- Watch Bill should be monitored by County Committee staff, but no action taken at this time.
- Approve County Committee supports the bill’s concept, but will not actively work for passage.
- Support County Committee actively supports the bill.
- Oppose County Committee actively opposes the bill.
- Disapprove County Committee disapproves of the bill’s concept, but will not actively oppose passage.
BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR:  
Senate Bill 585 / Wieckowski

INTRODUCTION DATE:  
02/22/19

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

DESCRIPTION OF BILL

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

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

This bill would likely have a significant impact on territory transfer petitions between elementary and high school districts, when seeking to transfer territory out of a unified school district.

RECOMMENDED POSITION

Staff recommends the following position:

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

INTRODUCTION
DATE:
02/20/19

LAST ACTIVITY/DATE:
07/10/19 – Re-referred to Senate Appropriations

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

POTENTIAL IMPACT OF BILL ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE,
SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION PROCESS AND/OR LOS ANGELES
COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS
This bill would likely not have a significant impact on school districts who are not under a city charter.

RECOMMENDED POSITION
Staff recommends the following position:

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

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

☐ Support County Committee actively supports the bill.

☐ Oppose County Committee actively opposes the bill.

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

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

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

Please direct all comments to Mr. Keith D. Crafton, Secretary to the County Committee at (562) 922-6131
Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals

September 2019

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District (USD) that were at various stages in the school district organization process as of August 14, 2019.

PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORY FROM THE LOS ANGELES USD (LAUSD) TO PALOS VERDES PENINSULA USD (PVPUSD)

On July 10, 2019, Chadmar/Colfin Rolling Hills LLC submitted an owner petition to transfer five parcels of uninhabited territory from LAUSD to PVPUSD. After introducing the petition to the County Committee, public hearings will be scheduled in each school district.

Status: Petition to be introduced
Status Date: *August 14, 2019

RECENT INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last two years)

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Inner City USD / January 2016

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- *LAUSD to Palos Verdes Peninsula USD / July 2019

* = indicates activity since last meeting

This document was prepared by staff to the County Committee.
Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals
(Excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District)

September 2019

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals [exclusive of those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District (USD)] that are at various stages in the school district reorganization process as of August 12, 2019.

PETITION TO IMPLEMENT TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING IN THE LITTLE LAKE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT (SD)

On June 12, 2019, the Little Lake City SD submitted a petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting within the district. The petition, in the form of a board resolution and an adopted trustee area map, will be introduced to the County Committee, and a public hearing will be scheduled in the district.

Status: Petition to be introduced
Status Date: *August 12, 2019

PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORY FROM TORRANCE USD TO PALOS VERDES PENINSULA USD (PVPUSD)

On May 15, 2019, the Torrance USD and PVPUSD submitted a joint petition to transfer twenty-nine parcels from Torrance USD to PVPUSD. After introducing the petition to the County Committee, public hearings will be scheduled in each school district.

Status: Petition to be introduced
Status Date: *August 12, 2019
PETITION TO IMPLEMENT TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING IN THE SOUTH WHITTIER SD

On May 15, 2019, the South Whittier SD submitted a petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting within the district. The petition, in the form of a board resolution and an adopted trustee area map, will be introduced to the County Committee, and a public hearing will be scheduled in the district.

Status: Petition to be introduced
Status Date: *August 12, 2019

PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORIES BETWEEN THE SULPHUR SPRINGS UNION SD AND THE SAUGUS UNION SD

On March 6, 2019, the Sulphur Springs Union School District (SD) submitted their final board resolution as part of a series of resolutions spanning the past eleven years, culminating in the formal introduction of a petition to transfer (exchange) certain parcels between Sulphur Springs Union SD and Saugus Union SD. Public hearings were held in each district on May 2, 2019, both of which are within the William S. Hart Union High School District (HSD). A feasibility study was conducted which will be presented to the County Committee, after which the committee may vote on the matter.

Status: Feasibility study to be presented
Status Date: *August 12, 2019

PETITION TO IMPLEMENT TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING IN THE WHITTIER UNION HSD

On February 20, 2019, the Whittier Union HSD submitted a petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting within the district. The petition, in the form of a board resolution and an adopted trustee area map, was presented to the County Committee at its March 6, 2019 regular meeting. A public hearing was held April 24, 2019, in the district. A feasibility study was conducted which will be presented to the County Committee, after which the committee may vote on the matter.

Status: Feasibility study to be presented
Status Date: *August 12, 2019
FORMATION—MALIBU USD (CURRENTLY LIES WITHIN THE BOUNDRARIES OF THE SANTA MONICA-MALIBU USD)

On September 1, 2017, LACOE received a petition in the form of a 2015 resolution from the City of Malibu to form a separate Malibu USD from territory within the boundaries of the existing Santa Monica-Malibu USD. The petition was introduced at the November 1, 2017 regular County Committee meeting, and at least one public hearing will be scheduled. After this local agency petition was introduced, however, the City of Malibu sent a letter requesting that the County Committee postpone the scheduling of its preliminary hearing to allow the stakeholders more time to discuss further options and details regarding the petition. On February 28, 2018, however, the City of Malibu apprised the committee of their interest in pursuing the preliminary public hearing. Then, in April 2018, the City resolved to further investigate options before asking the County Committee to proceed. At its May 2, 2018 regular meeting, the County Committee voted to delay scheduling the preliminary public hearing until after getting an update on negotiations at its regularly scheduled meeting on September 5, 2018. On September 5, 2018, representatives from the City of Malibu and the Santa Monica-Malibu USD apprised the County Committee of their negotiations, and again at the March 6, 2019 meeting. On May 10, 2019, staff met with the district to ascertain the status of its ongoing study and analyses. The parties to the petition may return to the committee in the Fall to provide on update on their studies.

Status: Preliminary public hearing to be scheduled, pending negotiations
Status Date: May 16, 2019

PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORY FROM THE GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (USD) TO THE LA CANADA USD

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

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

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

In the fall 2017, staff concluded the Request For Proposal (RFP) process, evaluated vendors, and selected an environmental consultant, for whom a contract was agreed upon. The environmental analysis concluded with the report’s comment period spanning August 30 – September 18, 2018. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Public Hearing convened on October 3, 2018, at the County Committee’s regular scheduled meeting.

The County Committee continued to review the petition. On February 20, 2019, they received a request from Dr. Kelly King, Interim Superintendent of the Glendale USD, to delay final review so that she may become familiar with the relevant issues following her recent appointment. In February 2019, staff received a request from the chief petitioners that the final review of the petition not take place at the April 3, 2019 meeting because that date falls during spring break and may impact participation by the public. In April 2019, the chief petitioners requested the June meeting date be changed due to coinciding with the school year ending, which would affect some parents from attending the meeting. Staff provided an update at the March 6, 2019 regular meeting of the County Committee, and since then continued to receive additional materials and correspondence on the petition.

Status: County Committee conducting further review of petition and materials, may adopt CEQA findings and take final vote on petition at a future meeting, unless it deems more time needed and/or requests additional information from petitioners, districts, or staff

Status Date: May 16, 2019

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

On May 15, 2014, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §35700, to transfer territory from the Centinela Valley Union HSD and the Lawndale SD to the Wiseburn USD. The request was submitted by chief petitioners Ms. Shavonda Webber-Christmas and Mr. Bill Magoon. The petition was forwarded to County Counsel to determine its legal compliance regarding format and content. On June 20, 2014, County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient. Staff returned the petition to the chief petitioners on June 23, 2014.

On October 15, 2014, the chief petitioners submitted signed petitions for review. On October 15, 2014, staff conveyed the signed petitions to the Registrar-Recorder for signature verification. On November 6, 2014, staff received notice from the Registrar-Recorder there
were insufficient signatures to move the petition forward. Staff notified the chief petitioner, 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. Prior to the submission of any signed petitions related to this request, the City of Malibu submitted its own petition to form a Malibu USD, which was discussed earlier in this update document.

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

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

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

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

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

Status: Petitioner is gathering signatures.
Status Date: *July 10, 2019

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Unification Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Azusa USD to Glendora USD/October 2016
- *Torrance USD to Palos Verdes Peninsula USD/July 2019

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Malibu USD (Santa Monica-Malibu USD)/May 2019

Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

- East Whittier City SD / May 2019
- El Monte City SD / August 2017
- El Monte Union HSD / May 2019
- *Little Lake City SD / June 2019
- Los Nietos SD / March 2019
- *Pomona USD / July 2019
- *South Whittier SD / June 2019
- Torrance USD / July 2018
- Walnut USD / May 2016

* = indicates activity since last meeting

This document was prepared by staff to the County Committee.