February 21, 2019

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

FROM: Keith D. Crafton, Secretary
County Committee

SUBJECT: Regular Meeting of the County Committee—Wednesday, March 6, 2019

The next regular meeting of the County Committee will be held at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, March 6, 2019, in the Board Room of the Los Angeles County Office of Education, at 9300 Imperial Highway in Downey.

Reserved parking spaces will be available on the east side of the building for County Committee members.

Attached is the agenda for the meeting of March 6, 2019.

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

KDC/AD/EH:ah
Attachments
AGENDA

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

Regular Meeting

Los Angeles County Office of Education
March 6, 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 January 9, 2019 regular meetings of the County Committee will be submitted for approval. (Enclosure)

IV. PRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC – Mr. Crafton

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

V. COMMUNICATIONS – Mr. Crafton

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

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

The Secretary will introduce a petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting in the Whittier Union HSD. (Enclosure)
VII. 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 received additional documents and correspondence from various parties related to the petition to transfer territory from the Glendale USD to the La Canada USD. The Secretary is giving these items to the County Committee as additional information to consider 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 Interim Superintendent, Dr. Kelly King. She has requested additional time to become familiar with this petition process, asking that the matter not be agendized for final review at this time. The chief petitioners have also requested that the petition not be heard during the County Committee’s April 3, 2019 meeting, as that is spring break in La Canada USD. The County Committee has not yet determined when the final review of this petition will take place. (Enclosures 3 and 4)

VIII. 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 at the March 6, 2019 regular meeting.

IX. PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORIES BETWEEN THE SULPHUR SPRINGS UNION SD AND THE SAUGUS UNION SD – Secretary Crafton

The Secretary will present a petition to transfer territories between the Sulphur Springs Union SD and the Saugus Union SD. (Enclosure 3)
X. UPDATE ON REVIEW OF COUNTY COMMITTEE POLICIES – Ms. Calix
The Chairperson will request a report from the County Committee policy review subcommittee.

XI. 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.

XII. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE – Mr. Crafton
The Secretary will provide an update on legislation that staff is following. (Enclosure 4)

XIII. 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 7)

XIV. 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 8)

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

XVI. ADJOURNMENT
UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF THE
LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION
Regular Meeting
January 9, 2019

The Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) met on Wednesday, January 9, 2019, at the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) in Downey. The meeting was called to order at 11:05 a.m., by Chairperson AJ Willmer.

Members Present
Susan Andriacchi
Heidi Ashcraft
Frank Bostrom
Maria Calix
Ted Edmiston
Cherise Moore (arrived at 11:20am)
John Nunez
Frank Ogaz
Suzan Solomon
AJ Willmer

Members Absent

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 Mr. AJ Willmer called the meeting to order.

Call to Order

Dr. Owen Griffith led the flag salute.

Flag Salute
It was **MOVED** by Mr. Frank Bostrom and **SECONDED** by Ms. Suzan Solomon that the minutes of the regular meeting held on October 3, 2018, be approved. Motion carried. Votes are:

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

It was **MOVED** by Ms. Susan Andriacchi and **SECONDED** by Ms. Suzan Solomon that the minutes of the regular meeting held on November 7, 2018.

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

It was moved by Mr. Frank Bostrom, and seconded by Ms. Suzan Solomon that Ms. Maria Calix be appointed the Chair of the County Committee. Votes are:

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

It was moved by Ms. Susan Andriacchi, and seconded by Mr. Frank Bostrom that Ms. Suzan Solomon be the appointed the Vice Chair of the County Committee. Votes are:

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

Secretary Crafton reported that the County Committee held its annual election on October 22, 2018, at that event, the following election results were determined:

Mr. Frank Ogaz was re-elected for another term serving the First Supervisorial District, and Ms. Heidi Ashcraft was elected for her first term representing the Fourth Supervisorial District.

Ms. Maria Calix administered the oath of office to Frank Ogaz, in the First Supervisorial District and to Ms. Heidi Ashcraft, in the Fourth Supervisorial District.
Secretary Crafton informed the County Committee that a resignation letter was received from Ms. Nicole Kluft, representing the Third Supervisorial District. Staff notified districts of the vacancy and did not receive any nominations to fill the seat.

Senator Ben Allen recommended a candidate, staff is pursuing that individual to confirm interest.

Petitioner, Nalani Laciewicz addressed the committee and presented a flash drive of information for the Committee to review.

Secretary Crafton directed the Committee to review articles relating to issues regarding CVRA. There is also an article about legal action in the City of Santa Monica. Next, is an article about potential development in Tejon Ranch. Finally, there is a roundup article on changes brought on by CVRA.

Secretary Crafton stated that the only update is that staff is reviewing additional material submitted by the petitioners and members of the public, as well as finalizing the review of the CEQA material and gathering additional information requested by the County Committee.

Secretary Crafton stated that the only update is that the parties are still in active discussions and report that they have made progress on their fiscal issues. They will return to update the County Committee of their progress at a future date.

Mr. Bostrom reported that they have received a review from Counsel’s office on the bylaws. Copies are in the folders, and everyone will read through them and offer suggestions or concerns.

Mr. Bostrom reported that among the significant changes to the bylaws is the requirement that County Committee members complete Form 700 Conflict of Interest form. LACOE’s Ethics Officer will be offering training on this issue and we will update you on the timing of both that opportunity and the compliance deadline. This change was at the request of both LACOE counsel and County counsel.

Secretary Crafton stated there are no other items at this time.
Secretary Crafton stated that Mr. Eric Hass will report on two bills. Mr. Hass reported on AB 2123 (Cervantes) and SB 1018 (Allen).

In addition, staff will be working with LACOE’s legislative team to discuss accommodating the County Committee process into the CVRA process.

Secretary Crafton reported there are no updates at this time, however we are closely watching news developments regarding the potential strike at LAUSD.

Secretary Crafton stated there are no additional updates.

Secretary Crafton introduced Mr. Octavio Castelo as the new Assistant Director in Business Advisory Services.

Secretary Crafton and the Committee recognized Dr. Owen Griffith for his 28 years of service to the County Committee. Dr. Griffith was presented with a plaque and we will be celebrating with a Luncheon and cake immediately after the meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:50 a.m.
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.grafikine.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 (CPerez1). 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.

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

Clerk of the Governing Board of the Whittier Union High School District

WHITTIER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF TRUSTEES

By: Dr. Russell Castaneda Calleros

By: Mr. Jared Baird

By: Mr. Leighton Anderson

By: Mr. Tim Schneider

By: 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 Areas 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 Palos Verdes Avenue, Whittier Blvd, and Mills Avenue. Trustee Area 3 includes the west and southwestern portions of the District, including the Los Nietos neighborhood, the portion 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 Mills Avenue.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Pop</td>
<td>43,485</td>
<td>41,900</td>
<td>44,689</td>
<td>44,846</td>
<td>43,245</td>
<td>218,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Deviation</td>
<td>-154</td>
<td>-1,709</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>-394</td>
<td>4,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Deviation</td>
<td>-0.35%</td>
<td>-3.52%</td>
<td>2.41%</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
<td>-0.90%</td>
<td>6.68%</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>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</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>Total</td>
<td>31,770</td>
<td>26,955</td>
<td>29,076</td>
<td>33,329</td>
<td>26,619</td>
<td>148,950</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>3%</td>
<td>2%</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/Pacific</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25,405</td>
<td>20,831</td>
<td>24,747</td>
<td>27,550</td>
<td>19,433</td>
<td>117,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Latino est.</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Spanish-Surnamed</td>
<td>68%</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>3%</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>4%</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>Total</td>
<td>17,823</td>
<td>13,603</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>70%</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>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White est.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23%</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>Total</td>
<td>7,209</td>
<td>4,648</td>
<td>6,183</td>
<td>9,320</td>
<td>4,676</td>
<td>32,136</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>56%</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>3%</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>5%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44,739</td>
<td>42,022</td>
<td>47,517</td>
<td>45,868</td>
<td>45,352</td>
<td>226,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 0-19</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 20-60</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 60+</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</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>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>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoken Eng. &quot;Less than Very Well&quot;</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</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</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child in Household</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</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>18%</td>
<td>13%</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>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income 75-100K</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income 200K+</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</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>8%</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>
</tbody>
</table>

Total population data from the 2010 Decennial Census.
Sample-based Voter Registration and Turnout data from the California Statewide Database.
Latent voter registration and turnout data are Spanish-surnamed counties adjusted using Census Population Department 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.
February 20, 2019

Allison Deegan, Ed.D.
Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization
9300 Imperial Hwy.
Downey, CA 90242

Dear Dr. Deegan:

I would like to thank you for taking the time out of your busy schedule to meet with me. I very much appreciated the information you provided regarding the territory transfer.

As you are aware, on January 29, 2019, the Glendale USD Board of Education released Dr. Winfred Roberson from his contract as Superintendent, and I have since assumed the duties as Interim Superintendent. Due to this recent change in leadership, the Glendale Board of Education and I would like to request that the LACOE Committee on School District Organization postpone the voting on the petition to transfer territory from Glendale USD to La Cañada USD until the April 2019 meeting. The additional time is needed for me to more thoroughly review this most important issue for the district.

Again, many thanks for your assistance and for your consideration to our request. Please feel free to call me at (818) 241-3111, ext. 1215, if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Kelly King, Ed.D.
Interim Superintendent

KK/pfi

cc: GUSD Board of Education
We will include this as an attachment (after the Glendale Interim Supt letter) with Nick’s contact info redacted. Thanks.

Allison Deegan, Ed.D.
(562) 922-6336
deegan_allison@lacoe.edu
Regionalized Business Services Coordinator
Division of Business Advisory Services
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242

Dear Keith and Allison,

We request that this communication be shared immediately with the Chair of the County Committee on School District Organization.

As Chief Petitioners, we are writing to request that LACOE and the County Committee give consideration to the following item that has bearing on the Petition to Transfer Territory from the GUSD to LCUSD. Specifically, we have concerns with the timing of when the Petition may next be on the agenda of the County Committee.

We request the Petition not be included on the agenda for April, 2019 for the County Committee’s deliberation and action on the CEQA IS/MND findings and/or the Petition itself.

The reason for this request is that the LCUSD schools will be on recess for Spring Break between April 1-5, 2019. It would create great hardship on key stakeholders and affect the availability of school district staff and Sagebrush families that support the Petition to attend an April 3rd meeting of the County Committee should the Petition be included on the agenda for that date.

It appears that GUSD stakeholders would not be impacted in a similar fashion as their schedule indicates that GUSD Spring Break is March 18-22, 2019.
Given that we recently provided additional information to LACOE and our desire to ensure the Committee members have sufficient time to review that information, we can appreciate that being on the March agenda may be unlikely.

Additionally, in a few months, both LCUSD and GUSD schools will be on summer recess which will also affect the availability of key stakeholders to attend what could be a critical meeting of the Committee. However, our Petition being on the May agenda would avoid that.

We understand that matters coming before the Committee are influenced by many other factors, but we thought it best to bring these items and our concerns to your attention.

We would appreciate it if you would please confirm receipt of this e-mail.

Thank you for your consideration.

On behalf of the Co-Chief Petitioners Nick Karapetian and Nalini Lasiewicz
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

Shelley Weinstein
Trustee

Dr. Kerry Clegg
Trustee

Denis DeFigueiredo
Board Clerk

Lori MacDonald
Trustee
ATTACHMENT 1 TO PETITION

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 heretofore 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: Aye
Clerk of the Board Denis DeFigueiredo: Aye
Trustee Shelley Weinstein: Aye
Trustee Lori MacDonald: Absent
Trustee Dr. Kerry Clegg: 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 6

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

BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR: Senate Bill 47 / Allen
INTRODUCTION DATE: 12/03/18
LAST ACTIVITY/DATE: 01/06/19 – Referred to Committees

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:
Assembly Bill 212 / Allen

INTRODUCTION DATE:
02/04/19

LAST ACTIVITY/DATE:
02/13/19 – Referred to Committees

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.

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) 922-613
An act to amend Sections 101, 104, 9008, 9105, 9203, and 18600 of, and to add Sections 107 and 108 to, the Elections Code, relating to elections.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST

SB 47, as introduced, Allen. Initiative, referendum, and recall petitions: disclosures.

The California Constitution and existing statutory law provide for the electors to propose statutes or amendments to the Constitution by initiative. Existing law authorizes a person who is a voter or who is qualified to register to vote in California to circulate an initiative or referendum petition within the state.

The California Constitution enables electors to initiate a recall of state or local officers by gathering sufficient signatures within a specified time period. Existing statutory law requires that the proponents of a recall be registered voters of the electoral jurisdiction of the officer they seek to recall.

Existing law requires that an initiative petition contain specified language advising the public of its right to determine whether the person circulating the petition is a paid signature gatherer or a volunteer. Existing law prescribes other requirements regarding the form, content, and presentation of initiative and referendum petitions.

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. The bill would require the committee to create an Official Top Funders sheet meeting certain requirements and would authorize the committee to create a page on an Internet Web site that includes a link to the most recent Official Top Funders sheet and a link to the full text of the measure. The bill would require the committee to submit the Official Top Funders sheet and any updates to the Secretary of State, who would be required to post that statement on the Secretary of State’s Internet Web site along with the previous versions the committee submitted.

The bill would amend existing provisions to make certain misrepresentations with regard to the Official Top Funders disclosures a crime. By expanding the scope of an existing crime, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program. The bill would require the circulator to certify under the penalty of perjury that the circulator showed each signer a valid and unfalsified “Official Top Funders” sheet if the petition does not include a specified disclosure statement. By expanding the crime of perjury, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

The bill would authorize the pages of a petition to be bound together by any reasonable method, including the use of staples.

By expanding the duties of local elections officials, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.

This bill would provide that with regard to certain mandates no reimbursement is required by this act for a specified reason.

With regard to any other mandates, this bill would provide that, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that the bill contains costs so mandated by the state, reimbursement for those costs shall be made pursuant to the statutory provisions noted above.


The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

1. SECTION 1. Section 101 of the Elections Code is amended to read:
101. (a) Notwithstanding any other law, a state or local
initiative petition required to be signed by voters shall contain in
12-point type, 11-point type, before that portion of the petition for
voters' signatures, printed names, and residence addresses, the
following language: language, in order:

"NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC

THIS PETITION MAY BE CIRCULATED BY A PAID
SIGNATURE GATHERER OR A VOLUNTEER. YOU HAVE
THE RIGHT TO ASK."

(1) "NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC:" This text shall be in a
boldface font.
(2) If the petition does not include the disclosure statement
described by subdivision (b) of Section 107, the text "YOU HAVE
THE RIGHT TO SEE AN "OFFICIAL TOP FUNDERS" SHEET."
This text shall be in a boldface font.
(3) "THIS PETITION MAY BE CIRCULATED BY A PAID
SIGNATURE GATHERER OR A VOLUNTEER. YOU HAVE THE
RIGHT TO ASK."

(b) A state initiative petition shall contain, in the same location
and type size described in subdivision (a), the following language:

"THE PROPORENTS OF THIS PROPOSED INITIATIVE
MEASURE HAVE THE RIGHT TO WITHDRAW THIS
PETITION AT ANY TIME BEFORE THE MEASURE
QUALIFIES FOR THE BALLOT."

SEC. 2. Section 104 of the Elections Code is amended to read:

104. (a) Wherever any petition or paper is submitted to the
elections official, each section of the petition or paper shall have
attached to it a declaration signed by the circulator of the petition
or paper, setting forth, in the circulator's own hand, the following:
(1) The printed name of the circulator.
(2) The residence address of the circulator, giving street and
number, or if no street or number exists, adequate designation of
residence so that the location may be readily ascertained.
(3) The dates between which all the signatures to the petition
or paper were obtained.
(b) Each declaration submitted pursuant to this section shall also set forth the following:

(1) That the circulator circulated that section and witnessed the appended signatures being written.

(2) That according to the best information and belief of the circulator, each signature is the genuine signature of the person whose name it purports to be.

(3) That the circulator is 18 years of age or older.

(4) If the petition does not include the disclosure statement described by subdivision (b) of Section 107, that the circulator showed each signer a valid and unfalsified "Official Top Funders" sheet, as required by Section 107.

(c) The circulator shall certify the content of the declaration as to its truth and correctness, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, with the signature of his or her name. The circulator shall state the date and the place of execution on the declaration immediately preceding his or her signature.

SEC. 3. Section 107 is added to the Elections Code, to read:

107. (a) (1) A committee formed pursuant to Section 82013 of the Government Code that pays for the circulation of a state or local initiative, referendum, or recall petition shall create an Official Top Funders sheet as follows, with all text in a black roman type with a type size of 14 point on a plain, contrasting background, and centered horizontally, except as described below. None of the text shall have its type condensed or have the spacing between characters reduced to be narrower than a normal roman type.

(2) At the top of the sheet shall appear the text "OFFICIAL TOP FUNDERS. Valid only for", followed by a month and year that starts at most seven days after the date the top contributors as defined in subdivision (c) of Section 84501 of the Government Code were last confirmed. This text shall be boldface and with a type size of at least 16 point.

(3) Next, separated by a blank horizontal line from the text in paragraph (2), shall appear the title of the initiative, referendum, or recall as it appears on the petition, in all capital letters.

(4) (A) Next, separated by a blank horizontal line from the text in paragraph (3), shall appear a disclosure statement in a printed or drawn box with a black border.

(B) At the top of the disclosure statement shall appear the text "Petition circulation paid for by" in boldface text.
(C) Next, on a separate horizontal line, shall appear the name of the committee as it appears on the most recent Statement of Organization filed pursuant to Section 84101 of the Government Code. If the committee has any top contributors as defined in subdivision (c) of Section 84501 of the Government Code, it shall be followed by a blank horizontal line and then the underlined text “Committee major funding from:”.

(D) The top contributors as defined in subdivision (c) of Section 84501 of the Government Code, if any, shall each be disclosed in boldface text on a separate horizontal line separate from any other text, in descending order, beginning with the top contributor who made the largest cumulative contributions, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 84501 of the Government Code, on the first line.

(E) The committee, in its discretion, may include the underlined text “Endorsed by:”, followed by a list, not underlined, of up to three endorsers. The text pursuant to this subparagraph shall be separated from the text above and below it by a blank horizontal line.

(F) The following line shall include the text “Latest Official Top Funders:” followed by either (i) the Internet Web page on the Secretary of State’s Internet Web site that lists the “Official Top Funders” statements that are reported pursuant to subdivision (f), or (ii) the Internet Web site described in subdivision (c).

(5) If the petition is a state initiative petition, next, separated by at least two blank horizontal lines from the disclosures of paragraph (4) and (5), shall appear the text “OFFICIAL TITLE AND SUMMARY (SAME AS ON PETITION)”, in boldface text in all capital letters.

(6) If the petition is a state initiative petition, next, starting on a separate horizontal line, shall appear the text “The Attorney General of California has prepared the following circulating title and summary of the chief purpose and points of the proposed measure;”, in boldface text with a type size of 11 point.

(7) If the petition is a state initiative petition, next, starting on a separate horizontal line, shall appear the Attorney General summary of the initiative as it appears on the initiative petition, in plain text with a type size of 11 point.

(b) Notwithstanding any other law, a state or local initiative, referendum, or recall petition that requires voter signatures and for which the circulation is paid for by a committee formed
pursuant to Section 82013 of the Government Code shall either
include a disclosure statement on the petition that is displayed as
follows or the circulator for the petition shall present as a separate
document the Official Top Funders sheet described in subdivision
(a) to a prospective signer of the petition.
(1) The disclosure statement shall have a solid white background
and shall be in a printed or drawn box with a black border and
shall appear before that portion of the petition for voters’
signatures, printed names, and residence addresses. The text in the
disclosure area shall be in a black Arial equivalent type with a type
size of at least 10 point, with all lines centered horizontally in the
disclosure area.
(2) The top of the disclosure shall include the text “OFFICIAL
TOP FUNDERS. Valid only for”, followed by a month and year
that starts at most seven days after the date the top contributors as
defined in subdivision (c) of Section 84501 of the Government
Code were last confirmed. The text of this paragraph shall be
boldface.
(3) Next shall appear, on a separate horizontal line, the text
“Petition circulation paid for by”, followed by the name of the
committee as it appears on the most recent Statement of
Organization filed pursuant to Section 84101 of the Government
Code. If the committee has any top contributors as defined in
subdivision (c) of Section 84501 of the Government Code, it shall
be followed by, on a separate horizontal line, the underlined text
“Committee major funding from:”.
(4) The top contributors as defined in subdivision (c) of Section
84501 of the Government Code, if any, shall each be disclosed in
boldface text on a separate horizontal line separate from any other
text, in descending order, beginning with the top contributor who
made the largest cumulative contributions, as defined in subdivision
(b) of Section 84501 of the Government Code, on the first line.
(5) The committee, in its discretion, may include the underlined
text “Endorsed by:”, followed by a list, not underlined, of up to
three endorsers. The text in this paragraph shall be separated from
the text above and below it by a blank horizontal line.
(6) The following line shall include the text “Latest info:”
followed by the URL for either (A) the Internet Web page on the
Secretary of State’s Internet Web site that lists the “Official Top
Funders” statements that are reported pursuant to subdivision (f),
or (B) the Internet Web site described in subdivision (c). The text
specified in this paragraph shall be underlined.
(c) Any committee formed pursuant to Section 82013 of the
Government Code that pays for the circulation of a state or local
initiative, referendum, or recall petition may create a page on an
Internet Web site that includes both of the following:
(1) A prominent link to the most recent Official Top Funders
sheet as described in subdivision (a). The Official Top Funders
sheet that the page links to shall be in a format that allows it to be
viewed on an Internet Web site and printed out on a single page
of paper.
(2) A prominent link to the full text of the initiative or
referendum.
(d) The disclosure of a top contributor or endorser pursuant to
this section need not include terms such as “incorporated,”
“committee,” “political action committee,” or “corporation,” or
abbreviations of these terms, unless the term is part of the
contributor’s or endorser’s name in common usage or parlance.
(e) If this section requires the disclosure of the name of a top
contributor that is a committee pursuant to subdivision (a) of
Section 82013 of the Government Code and is a sponsored
committee pursuant to Section 82048.7 of the Government Code
with a single sponsor, only the name of the single sponsoring
organization shall be disclosed.
(f) A committee that circulates a state initiative, referendum, or
recall petition shall submit the Official Top Funders sheet required
by subdivision (a), and any updates to that statement, to the
Secretary of State, who shall post that statement on the Secretary
of State’s Internet Web site along with the previous versions the
committee submitted.
(g) This section does not require a local elections official to
verify the accuracy of the information required by this section or
to re-approve the petition upon any updates the committee makes.
(h) Signatures collected on an initiative, referendum, or recall
petition are not invalid solely because the information required by
this section was absent or inaccurate:
(i) For purposes of this section, “endorser” means:
(1) A business that has been in existence for at least two years
and has had at least one full-time staffer during that period.
(2) A non-profit organization that was not originally created for
the purposes of serving as a committee, that has been in existence
for at least two years, and either has received contributions from
more than 50 donors in that period or has had at least one full-time
staffer during that period.

(3) A political party.

(4) An individual, whose name may include their title if they
are an elected official or represent one of the organizations
described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3).

SEC. 4. Section 108 is added to the Elections Code, to read:

108. Notwithstanding any other law, the pages of a petition
may be bound together by any reasonable method, including the
use of staples.

SEC. 5. Section 9008 of the Elections Code is amended to read:

9008. Every proposed initiative measure, prior to circulation,
shall have placed across the top of the petition in 12-point 11-point
or larger roman boldface type, all of the following:
(a) The Attorney General’s unique numeric identifier placed
before the circulating title and summary upon each page where
the circulating title and summary is to appear.
(b) The circulating title and summary prepared by the Attorney
General upon each page of the petition on which signatures are to
appear. The circulating title shall appear in all capital letters.
(c) The circulating title and summary prepared by the Attorney
General as required by subdivision (e) (b) shall be preceded by
the following statement: “INITIATIVE MEASURE TO BE
SUBMITTED DIRECTLY TO THE VOTERS.”, followed by, on a
separate line, “The Attorney General of California has prepared
the following circulating title and summary of the chief purpose
and points of the proposed measure: ” This text shall be in boldface.

SEC. 6. Section 9105 of the Elections Code is amended to read:

9105. (a) The county elections official shall immediately
transmit a copy of any proposed measure to the county counsel.
Within 15 days after the proposed measure is filed, the county
counsel shall provide and return to the county elections official a
ballot title and summary for the proposed measure. The ballot title
may differ from any other title of the proposed measure and shall
express in 500 words or less the purpose of the proposed measure.
In providing the ballot title, the county counsel shall give a true
and impartial statement of the purpose of the proposed measure
in such language that the ballot title shall neither be an argument,
nor be likely to create prejudice, for or against the proposed
measure.
(b) The county elections official shall furnish a copy of the
ballot title and summary to the proponents of the proposed measure.
The proponents shall, prior to the circulation of the petition, publish
the Notice of Intention, and the ballot title and summary of the
proposed measure in a newspaper of general circulation published
in that county, and file proof of publication with the county
elections official.
(c) The ballot title and summary prepared by the county counsel
shall appear upon each section of the petition, above the text of
the proposed measure and across the top of each page of the
petition on which signatures are to appear, in roman boldface type
not smaller than 12 point: 11 point. The ballot title and summary
shall be clearly separated from the text of the measure. The text
of the measure shall be printed in type not smaller than 8 point.
The heading of the proposed measure shall be in a boldface type
in substantially the following form:

The heading of the proposed measure shall be in substantially
the following form:

Initiative Measure to be Submitted Directly to the Voters

INITIATIVE MEASURE TO BE DIRECTLY SUBMITTED TO
THE VOTERS

The county counsel has prepared the following title and summary
of the chief purpose and points of the proposed measure:
(Here set forth the title and summary prepared by the county
counsel. This title and summary must also be printed across the
top of each page of the petition wherein signatures are to appear.)
SEC. 7. Section 9203 of the Elections Code is amended to read:
9203. (a) Any person who is interested in any proposed
measure shall file a copy of the proposed measure with the
elections official with a request that a ballot title and summary be
prepared. This request shall be accompanied by the address of the
person proposing the measure. The elections official shall
immediately transmit a copy of the proposed measure to the city
attorney. Within 15 days after the proposed measure is filed, the
city attorney shall provide and return to the city elections official
a ballot title for and summary of the proposed measure. The ballot
title may differ from any other title of the proposed measure and
shall express in 500 words or less the purpose of the proposed
measure. In providing the ballot title, the city attorney shall give
a true and impartial statement of the purpose of the proposed
measure in such language that the ballot title shall neither be an
argument, nor be likely to create prejudice, for or against the
proposed measure.

(b) The elections official shall furnish a copy of the ballot title
and summary to the person filing the proposed measure. The person
proposing the measure shall, prior to its circulation, place upon
each section of the petition, above the text of the proposed measure
and across the top of each page of the petition on which signatures
are to appear, in roman boldface type not smaller than 12 point;
11 point, the ballot title prepared by the city attorney. The text of
the measure shall be printed in type not smaller than 8 point. The
heading of the proposed measure shall be in a boldface type in
substantially the following form:
The heading of the proposed measure shall be in substantially
the following form:

Initiative Measure to be Submitted Directly to the Voters

INITIATIVE MEASURE TO BE DIRECTLY SUBMITTED TO
THE VOTERS

The city attorney has prepared the following title and summary
of the chief purpose and points of the proposed measure:
(Here set forth the title and summary prepared by the city
attorney. This title and summary must also be printed across the
top of each page of the petition whereon signatures are to appear.)
SEC. 8. Section 18600 of the Elections Code is amended to
read:
18600. Every person is guilty of a misdemeanor who:
(a) Circulating, as principal or agent, or having charge or control of the circulation of, or obtaining signatures to, any state or local initiative, referendum or recall petition, intentionally misrepresents or intentionally makes any false statement concerning the contents, purport or effect of the petition, or the petition's Official Top Funders disclosure required by Section 107, to any person who signs, or who desires to sign, or who is requested to sign, or who makes inquiries with reference to it, or to whom it is presented for his or her signature.

(b) Willfully and knowingly circulates, publishes, or exhibits any false statement or misrepresentation concerning the contents, purport or effect of any state or local initiative, referendum, or recall petition, or the petition's Official Top Funders disclosure required by Section 107, for the purpose of obtaining any signature to, or persuading or influencing any person to sign, that petition.

(c) Circulating, as principal or agent, or having charge or control of the circulation of, or obtaining signatures to, any state or local initiative, intentionally makes any false statement in response to any inquiry by any voter as to whether he or she is a paid signature gatherer or a volunteer.

SEC. 9. The provisions of this act are severable. If any provision of this act or its application is held invalid, that invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications that can be given effect without the invalid provision or application.

SEC. 10. No reimbursement is required by this act pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution for certain costs that may be incurred by a local agency or school district because, in that regard, this act creates a new crime or infraction, eliminates a crime or infraction, or changes the penalty for a crime or infraction, within the meaning of Section 17556 of the Government Code, or changes the definition of a crime within the meaning of Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution.

However, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that this act contains other costs mandated by the state, reimbursement to local agencies and school districts for those costs shall be made
pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4 of Title 2 of the Government Code.
An act to amend Sections 5013, 5020, 5027, and 5028 of, and to add Sections 1018, 1019, 1020, 5010, 5032, and 5096 to, the Education Code, to amend Sections 25040, and 25061 of, to add Section 25001 to, and to add Article 4 (commencing with Section 34910) to Chapter 4 of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 4 of, the Government Code, relating to elections.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 212, as introduced, Allen. Elections: local voting methods.
Existing law provides procedures for the election of candidates for elective offices in cities, counties, and local educational agencies. Existing law specifies the circumstances in which voters in these jurisdictions may elect officers at large or from or by district. Existing law prescribes the length of various terms of office for locally elected officials.
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.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

1 SECTION 1. The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:
2 (a) Each local jurisdiction should have the authority to determine
3 the best voting method for that jurisdiction.
(b) Under current law, charter cities and counties may adopt alternative voting methods while general law cities, counties, and school districts cannot.

c) Ranked choice voting has led to greater voter participation in multiple cities, and voters using ranked choice voting have been more satisfied with candidates’ conduct and have generally viewed those campaigns as less negative.

SEC. 2. Section 1018 is added to the Education Code, to read:

1018. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this article, the county board of education may adopt, or the residents of the county may propose by initiative, a proposal to elect members of the county board of education by ranked choice voting. The proposal shall specify whether the members shall be elected at large or by or from trustee area. A proposal to elect members by ranked choice voting shall apply prospectively only and shall not become operative unless it is submitted to the electors of the county at a regularly scheduled election and a majority of the votes cast on the question favor the adoption of the proposal.

(b) An initiative measure proposed pursuant to subdivision (a) is subject to the procedures set forth in Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 9100) of Division 9 of the Elections Code.

c) This section does not authorize a county board of education to elect members at large if it is required by a court order or judgment to elect its members by or from trustee area.

d) A county board of education member elected to a full term by ranked choice voting shall only be elected in a general election held in November of an even-numbered year.

SEC. 3. Section 1019 is added to the Education Code, to read:

1019. (a) If a county board of education authorizes the use of ranked choice voting pursuant to Section 1018, before that method is used in any election, a county elections official may certify to the county board of supervisors and county superintendent of schools that the county lacks the technological capacity to conduct elections by this method. The elections official shall provide this certification at least seven days, and not more than 60 days, before the later of 113 days before the election or the first day on which a declaration of candidacy may be filed.

(b) If a county elections official provides a certification pursuant to subdivision (a), the county board of education shall conduct its
next election in the same manner as its most recent election was conducted.

SEC. 4. Section 1020 is added to the Education Code, to read:

1020. A special election to fill one or more vacancies with ranked choice voting and an election to elect one or more other members of the county board of education to full terms using ranked choice voting that are held on the same day shall be consolidated into a single contest if the board is elected at large or the contests to be consolidated are for members elected by or from the same trustee area.

SEC. 5. Section 5010 is added to the Education Code, to read:

5010. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this article, the governing board of a school district or community college district may adopt a resolution authorizing the election of members of the governing board by ranked choice voting. The resolution shall specify whether the members elected pursuant to this method shall be elected at large or by or from trustee area, and it shall be presented to the electors of the school district pursuant to Section 5020. A resolution adopted pursuant to this subdivision shall apply prospectively only.

(b) This section does not authorize the governing board of a school district or community college district to elect members at large if it is required by a court order or judgment to elect its members by or from trustee area.

(c) A member of the governing board of a school district or community college district elected to a full term by ranked choice voting shall only be elected in a general election held in November of an even-numbered year.

SEC. 6. Section 5013 of the Education Code is amended to read:

5013. The (a) Except as provided in subdivision (b), the form of ballot for governing board member elections shall be governed by Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 13100) of Division 13 of the Elections Code.

(b) The form of ballot for governing board member elections conducted by ranked choice voting shall be governed by Section of the Elections Code.

SEC. 7. Section 5020 of the Education Code is amended to read:
5020. (a) The resolution of the county committee approving a proposal to establish or abolish trustee areas, to adopt one of the alternative methods of electing governing board members specified in Section 5010 or 5030, or to increase or decrease the number of members of the governing board shall constitute an order of election, and the proposal shall be presented to the electors of the district not later than the next succeeding election for members of the governing board.

(b) If a petition requesting an election on a proposal to rearrange trustee area boundaries is filed, containing at least 5 percent of the signatures of the district’s registered voters as determined by the elections official, the proposal shall be presented to the electors of the district, at the next succeeding election for the members of the governing board, at the next succeeding statewide primary or general election, or at the next succeeding regularly scheduled election at which the electors of the district are otherwise entitled to vote, provided that vote if there is sufficient time to place the issue on the ballot.

(c) If a petition requesting an election on a proposal to establish or abolish trustee areas, to increase or decrease the number of members of the board, or to adopt one of the alternative methods of electing governing board members specified in Section 5010 or 5030 is filed, containing at least 10 percent of the signatures of the district’s registered voters as determined by the elections official, the proposal shall be presented to the electors of the district, at the next succeeding election for the members of the governing board, at the next succeeding statewide primary or general election, or at the next succeeding regularly scheduled election at which the electors of the district are otherwise entitled to vote, provided that vote if there is sufficient time to place the issue on the ballot. Before the proposal is presented to the electors, the county committee on school district organization may call and conduct one or more public hearings on the proposal.

(d) The resolution of the county committee approving a proposal to establish or abolish a common governing board for a high school and an elementary school district within the boundaries of the high school district shall constitute an order of election. The proposal shall be presented to the electors of the district at the next succeeding statewide primary or general election, or at the next succeeding regularly scheduled election at which the electors of
the district are otherwise entitled to vote, provided that
is sufficient time to place the issue on the ballot.
(e) For each proposal there shall be a separate proposition on
the ballot. The ballot shall contain the following words:
"For the establishment (or abolition or rearrangement) of trustee
areas in ___ (insert name) School District—Yes" and "For the
establishment (or abolition or rearrangement) of trustee areas in
___ (insert name) School District—No."
"For increasing the number of members of the governing board
of ___ (insert name) School District from five to seven—Yes"
and "For increasing the number of members of the governing board
of ___ (insert name) School District from five to seven—No."
"For decreasing the number of members of the governing board
of ___ (insert name) School District from seven to five—Yes"
and "For decreasing the number of members of the governing
board of ___ (insert name) School District from seven to
five—No."
"For the election of each member of the governing board of the
___ (insert name) School District by the registered voters of the
entire ___ (insert name) School District—Yes" and "For the
election of each member of the governing board of the ___ (insert
name) School District by the registered voters of the entire ___
(insert name) School District—No."
"For the election of each member of the governing board of the
___ (insert name) School District using ranked choice
voting—Yes" and "For the election of each member of the
governing board of the ___ (insert name) School District by the
registered voters of the entire ___ (insert name) School District
using ranked choice voting—No."
"For the election of one member of the governing board of the
___ (insert name) School District residing in each trustee area
elected by the registered voters in that trustee area—Yes" and "For
the election of one member of the governing board of the ___
(insert name) School District residing in each trustee area elected
by the registered voters in that trustee area—No."
"For the election of one member of the governing board of the
___ (insert name) School District residing in each trustee area
elected by the registered voters in that trustee area using ranked
choice voting—Yes” and “For the election of one member of the
governing board of the ____ (insert name) School District residing 
in each trustee area elected by the registered voters in that trustee 
area using ranked choice voting—No.”
“For the election of one member, or more than one member for 
one or more trustee areas, of the governing board of the ____ 
(insert name) School District residing in each trustee area elected 
by the registered voters of the entire ____ (insert name) School 
District—Yes” and “For the election of one member, or more than 
one member for one or more trustee areas, of the governing board 
of the ____ (insert name) School District residing in each trustee 
area elected by the registered voters of the entire ____ (insert name) 
School District—No.”
“For the election of one member, or more than one member for 
one or more trustee areas, of the governing board of the ____ 
(insert name) School District residing in each trustee area elected 
by the registered voters of the entire ____ (insert name) School 
District using ranked choice voting—Yes” and “For the election 
of one member, or more than one member for one or more trustee 
areas, of the governing board of the ____ (insert name) School 
District residing in each trustee area elected by the registered 
voters of the entire ____ (insert name) School District using ranked 
choice voting—No.”
“For the establishment (or abolition) of a common governing 
board in the ____ (insert name) School District and the ____ (insert 
name) School District—Yes” and “For the establishment (or 
abolition) of a common governing board in the ____ (insert name) 
School District and the ____ (insert name) School District—No.”

(f) If more than one proposal appears on the ballot, all must 
carry in order for any to become effective, except that a as follows:
(1) A proposal to adopt one of the methods of election of board 
members specified in Section 5030 which that is approved by the 
voters shall become effective unless a proposal which that is 
inconsistent with that proposal has been approved by a greater 
number of voters.
(2) An inconsistent proposal approved by a lesser number of 
voters than the number which that have approved a proposal to 
adopt one of the methods of election of board members specified 
in Section 5030 shall not be effective.
SEC. 8. Section 5027 of the Education Code is amended to read:

5027. Whenever if the boundaries of a county high school district are coterminous with the boundaries of a county, the board shall consist of one member from each supervisorial district in the county elected at large from the district. of the following:

(a) One member from each supervisorial district in the county elected at large from the county high school district.

(b) As many members as there are supervisorial districts with the members elected at large using ranked choice voting.

SEC. 9. Section 5028 of the Education Code is amended to read:

5028. In every community college district which that was divided into five wards on or before September 7, 1955, one member of the board shall be elected from each ward by the registered voters of the ward. On or before January 1st of a fiscal year the governing board of the district may rearrange the boundaries of the wards to provide for representation in accordance with population and geographic factors or may abolish the wards. If the wards are abolished, members of the governing board may also be elected at large using ranked choice voting.

SEC. 10. Section 5032 is added to the Education Code, to read:

5032. (a) If a school district or community college district authorizes the use of ranked choice voting pursuant to Section 5010, before that method is used in any election, a county elections official may certify to the governing board of the district, the county board of supervisors, and the county superintendent of schools who have jurisdiction over the election that the county lacks the technological capacity to conduct elections by this method. The elections official shall provide this certification at least 7 days, and not more than 60 days, before the later of 113 days before the election or the first day on which a declaration of candidacy may be filed.

(b) If a county elections official provides a certification pursuant to subdivision (a), the district shall conduct its next election in the same manner as its most recent election was conducted.

SEC. 11. Section 5096 is added to the Education Code, to read:

5096. A special election to fill one or more vacancies with ranked choice voting and an election to elect one or more other members of the governing board of the school district or
community college district to full terms using ranked choice voting
that are held on the same day shall be consolidated into a single
contest if the board is elected at large or the contests to be
consolidated are for members elected by or from the same trustee
area.

SEC. 12. Section 25001 is added to the Government Code, to
read:

25001. (a) Notwithstanding any other law, a county board of
supervisors may adopt, or a resident of the county may propose
by initiative, a proposal to elect an officer of the county by ranked
choice voting. The proposal shall specify which county officers
shall be elected by this method and whether they shall be elected
at large or by or from district, as applicable.

(b) A proposal pursuant to subdivision (a) shall apply
prospectively only and shall not become operative unless it is
submitted to the electors of the county at a regularly scheduled
election and a majority of the votes cast on the question favor the
adoption of the proposal.

(c) A proposal enacted pursuant to this section shall only be
amended or repealed in the manner described in subdivisions (a)
and (b).

(d) A county officer elected to a full term by ranked choice
voting shall only be elected in a general election held in November
of an even-numbered year.

(e) This section does not authorize a county to elect members
at large if it is required by a court order or judgment to elect its
members by or from district.

SEC. 13. Section 25040 of the Government Code is amended
to read:

25040. Each member of the board of supervisors shall be
elected by the district which he that the member represents, and
not at large, except if one of the following is true: in

(a) The election is held in any county in which supervisorial
districts have not been established by law or ordinance, and in
which supervisors were on May 17, 1907, required to be elected
at large, but from particular wards, the members shall be elected
at large and without regard to residence:

(b) Members are elected at large by ranked choice voting
pursuant to Section 25001.
SEC. 14. Section 25061 of the Government Code is amended to read:
25061. (a) The election of a supervisor to fill the vacancy for the unexpired term shall be held at the next general election, unless the term expires on the first Monday after January 1st succeeding the election.
(b) A special election to fill one or more vacancies with ranked choice voting and an election to elect one or more other members of the board of supervisors to full terms using ranked choice voting that are held on the same day shall be consolidated into a single contest if the board of supervisors is elected at large or the contests to be consolidated are for members elected by or from the same district.

SEC. 15. Article 4 (commencing with Section 34910) is added to Chapter 4 of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 4 of the Government Code, to read:

Article 4. Election of City Officers by Ranked Choice Voting

34910. (a) A municipal legislative body may submit to the registered voters an ordinance providing for the election of an officer of the city by ranked choice voting. The ordinance may also be qualified for the ballot by means of an initiative measure in accordance with Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 9200) of Division 9 of the Elections Code. The ordinance shall specify which city officers shall be elected by this method and whether they shall be elected at large or by or from district, as applicable. An ordinance adopted pursuant to this subdivision shall apply prospectively only and shall not become operative unless it is submitted to the electors of the city at a regularly scheduled election and a majority of the votes cast on the question favor the adoption of the proposal.
(b) If a legislative body is elected by ranked choice voting, the following apply:
(1) The legislative body may have an odd number of members greater than five, even if the members are elected at large.
(2) A member’s term of office shall be four years.
(c) An ordinance enacted pursuant to this section shall only be amended or repealed in the manner described in subdivision (a).
(d) This section applies both to cities with an elective mayor and cities with a city manager form of government.

(e) This section does not authorize a city to elect members at large if it is required by a court order or judgment to elect its members by or from district.

(f) A city officer elected to a full term by ranked choice voting shall only be elected in a general election held in November of an even-numbered year.

34911. If a special election to fill one or more vacancies with ranked choice voting is held on the same day as an election to elect one or more other members of the legislative body to full terms using ranked choice voting, those election contests shall be consolidated into a single contest, provided that the legislative body is elected at large or the contests to be consolidated are for members elected by or from the same district.
Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals

March 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 February 20, 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

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

March 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 February 21, 2019.

WHITTIER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT (HSD) PETITION TO IMPLEMENT TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING

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, will be presented to the County Committee at its March 6, 2019 regular meeting. Following that presentation, a public hearing will be scheduled in the district and staff will commence a feasibility study on the petition.

Status: Petition to be introduced, followed by a public hearing to be scheduled
Status Date: February 20, 2019

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

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

Status: Preliminary public hearing to be scheduled, pending negotiations
Status Date: February 20, 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 continues 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
March 6, 2019 Regular Meeting of the County Committee
February 21, 2019
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spring break and may impact participation by the public. Staff will provide an update at the
March 6, 2019 regular meeting of the County Committee.

*Status: County Committee conducting further review of petition and materials
Status Date: February 20, 2019

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

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

On October 15, 2014, the chief petitioners submitted signed petitions for review. On October 15, 2014, staff conveyed the signed petitions to the Registrar-Recorder for signature verification. On November 6, 2014, staff received notice from the Registrar-Recorder there were insufficient signatures to move the petition forward. Staff notified the chief petitioners, who elected to gather additional signatures. On December 4, 2014, the chief petitioners submitted additional signatures, which were submitted to the Registrar-Recorder on December 5, 2014 for signature verification. On December 22, 2014, the Registrar Recorder notified staff that the additional signatures were validated, and the petition had sufficient signatures to move forward.

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

On October 5, 2016, the Lawndale SD filed a Notice of Appeal with the County Committee, and on October 18, 2016, submitted their rationale and evidence for the appeal of the County
Committee’s decision. Staff has forwarded the administrative record and oral recordings of the proceedings to the California Department of Education, who will prepare the matter to go before the California State Board of Education 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: May 26, 2015

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

On January 17, 2006, LACOE received a request for a petition from chief petitioners Ms. Maurice Morse, Ms. Shirlee Smith, and Mr. Bruce Wasson, three community members who are residents of the area known as Altadena. The chief petitioners want to form an Altadena USD from territory within the boundaries of the Pasadena USD. The petition request was returned to the chief petitioners on January 20, 2006, because it lacked an adequate description of the area pursuant to EC §35700.3.

On February 10, 2006, LACOE received a revised request for a petition. Staff reviewed the request and forwarded a draft petition to County Counsel on February 22, 2006, for a legal compliance review regarding format and content. We received notification on March 6, 2006, from County Counsel informing us that the draft petition was legally acceptable.

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

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

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

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

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

Status: Petition insufficient; chief petitioners may gather additional signatures.
Status Date: December 5, 2011

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

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

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

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

Unification Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None
Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Azusa USD to Glendora USD/October 2016
- *Saugus Union SD and Sulphur Springs Union SD/February 2019

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

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

Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

- El Monte City SD / August 2017
- El Monte Union HSD / March 2016
- Torrance USD / July 2018
- Walnut USD / May 2016

* = indicates activity since last meeting

This document was prepared by staff to the County Committee.
Petition to transfer territory from Glendale USD to La Canada USD

The following three pages are correspondence received from residents in February 2019
Members of Los Angeles County
Committee on School District Organization
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242-2890
Crafton.Keith@lacoe.edu

Jan. 2019

Dear County Committee Members,

I am a resident of the City of ________________, and I am submitting formal comments in opposition to the proposed transfer of the Territory from Glendale Unified School District to the La Canada Unified School District.

I oppose the Territory Transfer because it is clear that the primary motivation behind the transfer is money. There is a lot of information out there about how the property owners in La Canada will benefit the most from this transfer because their property values are going to skyrocket. Who wouldn’t sign a petition for that type of windfall?

Not only will the property owners enjoy a windfall from their increased property values, but they also will not be required to pay the property taxes associated with the Glendale Unified bond debt that we all voted for. Their burden will be unfairly shifted to us, the remaining Glendale Unified residents. This transfer will undoubtedly cause our property taxes to increase.

I also oppose the Territory Transfer because there has been no demonstrated academic need for this to occur. I personally know many people who have been through the Glendale Unified School District and have come out very successful. The Glendale Unified School District does a terrific job of preparing students for college, for the military, and for other fields and careers. The Glendale Unified School District exemplifies excellence.

Further, it is also known that if the transfer takes place, the Glendale Unified School District and its residents will be left to pick up the costs of the transfer. This would be inherently unfair since it is not Glendale or its residents who initiated or supported this transfer. For this reason, and all of the above, I oppose this transfer.

Keep GUSD whole!

Sincerely,

Kalpana David
Members of Los Angeles County
Committee on School District Organization
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242-2890
Crafton_Keith@lacoe.edu

2nd Jan, 2019

Dear County Committee Members,

I am a resident of the City of Glendale, and I am submitting formal comments in opposition to the proposed transfer of the Territory from Glendale Unified School District to the La Canada Unified School District.

I oppose the Territory Transfer because it is clear that the primary motivation behind the transfer is money. There is a lot of information out there about how the property owners in La Canada will benefit the most from this transfer because their property values are going to skyrocket. Who wouldn’t sign a petition for that type of windfall?

Not only will the property owners enjoy a windfall from their increased property values, but they also will not be required to pay the property taxes associated with the Glendale Unified bond debt that we all voted for. Their burden will be unfairly shifted to us, the remaining Glendale Unified residents. This transfer will undoubtedly cause our property taxes to increase.

I also oppose the Territory Transfer because there has been no demonstrated academic need for this to occur. I personally know many people who have been through the Glendale Unified School District and have come out very successful. The Glendale Unified School District does a terrific job of preparing students for college, for the military, and for other fields and careers. The Glendale Unified School District exemplifies excellence.

Further, it is also known that if the transfer takes place, the Glendale Unified School District and its residents will be left to pick up the costs of the transfer. This would be inherently unfair since it is not Glendale or its residents who initiated or supported this transfer. For this reason, and all of the above, I oppose this transfer.

Keep GUSD whole!

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]
Members of Los Angeles County
Committee on School District Organization
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242-2890
Crafton Keith@lacos.edu

23rd Jan, 2019

Dear County Committee Members,

We are aware of the Committee’s preliminary decision to remove children from their local schools and transfer them across town to an LCF school. A decision that appears to be made at the request of a very small group of individuals, most of whom don’t even have children that attend the local schools in the immediate area being impacted.

To be crystal clear, if we had wanted to send our children to a school out of the area, we would simply have applied for enrollment to a different school. As residents, we chose where we live and hopefully where our children could attend a school close by. Now that choice has been ripped from us with what appears to be no consideration of the effect on and disruption to our daily lives. We are certain you are aware that coordinating school attendance, afterschool activities and other events, along with work schedules can be difficult under the best of circumstances. Now it’s more of a nightmare.

The biggest burden will be on the young teens from our area, who will need to get up even earlier to travel to the Middle and High Schools. Was the debate over school start times and their impact on school performance, depression, physical health, and the like, even addressed? The CDC, American Academy of Pediatrics and American Academy of Sleep Medicine have all weighed in on the topic, so do you expect our children to be the LCF experimental subjects?

Please don’t forget the cost of the new $149 million LCF bond measure to pay for all the upgrades of the schools our children will be forced to go to. The schools aren’t even ready to properly take care of their current student population and will be further burdened by the influx of even more students. Among those new students are a significant number of minority children who will no longer have the available ESL dual language programs provided under the Glendale Unified schools. Across the board the change in schools does far more harm than good for the students being relocated. Where is the fair treatment for the students impacted in all of this?

You have placed the burden on the wrong individuals. The people that live in the Territory knew the identity of the schools when they chose to move there. If they are no longer happy with the situation, then they should move — not our children.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[ OCR: Mr. A. O. C. o. L. ]