February 28, 2020

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

FROM:     Octavio Castelo, Secretary
          County Committee

SUBJECT:  Regular Meeting of the County Committee-
          Wednesday, March 4, 2020

The next regular meeting of the County Committee will be held at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, March 4, 2020, 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 4, 2020.

If you have questions, please call me at (562) 922-6110.

AD/EH:ah
Attachments
AGENDA

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

Regular Meeting

Los Angeles County Office of Education
March 4 2020
9:30 a.m.

I Information
D Discussion
A Action

I. CALL TO ORDER – Chairperson Ms. Suzan Solomon

II. FLAG SALUTE – Ms. Solomon

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – Ms. Solomon I, D, A

The minutes of the January 8, 2020 regular meeting of the County Committee will be submitted for approval. (Enclosure 1)

IV ADMINISTRATION OF OATH OF OFFICE – Ms. Solomon

The County Committee Chairperson will administer the oath of office to the newly-elected County Committee Member in the Third Supervisorial District.
V. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – EXISTING LITIGATION

(Paragraph (1) of Subdivision (d) of Government Code Section 54956.9)

Glendale Unified School District v. Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization, et al., Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Los Angeles Central District, Case No. 19STCP04704.

This case involves challenges to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process conducted in relation to a petition before the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization to transfer certain territory from the Glendale Unified School District (USD) to the La Canada USD.

VI. PRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC – Secretary Mr. Octavio Castelo

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

VII. COMMUNICATIONS – Mr. Castelo

The Secretary will review any pertinent informational correspondence.

VIII. PETITION TO IMPLEMENT TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING IN THE GLENDORA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (USD) – Mr. Castelo

The Secretary will introduce a petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting in the Glendora USD. (Enclosure 2)

IX. PETITION TO IMPLEMENT TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING IN THE ROWLAND USD – Mr. Castelo

The Secretary will introduce a petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting in the Rowland USD. (Enclosure 3)
X. PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORY FROM THE I, D, A 
TORRANCE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (USD) TO THE 
PALOS VERDES PENINSULA USD – Mr. Castelo

The Secretary will present a study on the joint districts’ petition to 
transfer twenty-nine parcels of territory from the Torrance USD to the 
Palos Verdes Peninsula USD, after which the County Committee may 
vote on the petition. (Enclosure 4)

XI. PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORIES BETWEEN THE I, D, A 
SULPHUR SPRINGS UNION SD AND THE SAUGUS UNION 
SD – Mr. Castelo

The Secretary will provide an update on the petition to transfer 
territories between the Sulphur Springs Union SD and the Saugus 
Union SD.

XII. UPDATE ON PETITION TO FORM A MALIBU USD FROM I, D, A 
TERRITORY WITHIN THE SANTA MONICA-MALIBU USD 
- Mr. Castelo

At its January 2020 meeting, an update was presented by the City of 
Malibu and the Santa Monica-Malibu USD. The parties will present 
further updates to the County Committee on the status of their 
negotiations at a future meeting.

XIII. PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORY FROM THE I, D, A 
GLENDALE USD TO THE LA CANADA USD – Mr. Castelo

The Secretary will provide an update on the matter to the County 
Committee.

XIV. UPDATE ON REVIEW OF COUNTY COMMITTEE I, D, A 
POLICIES – Ms. Solomon

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

XV. UPDATE ON THE CALIFORNIA VOTING RIGHTS ACT I, D, A 
(CVRA), TRUSTEE AREA AND ELECTION ISSUES – Mr. 
Castelo

The Secretary will provide an update on CVRA activities and election 
changes in Los Angeles County.
XVI. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE – Mr. Castelo

The Secretary will provide an update on legislation that staff is following. (Enclosure 5)

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

The Secretary will provide an update on school district reorganization proposals affecting the Los Angeles USD. (“Summary of Los Angeles USD Reorganization Proposals”). (Enclosure 6)

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

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 7)

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

XX. ADJOURNMENT
UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF THE
LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION
Regular Meeting
January 8, 2020

The Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) met on Wednesday, January 8, 2020 at the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) in Downey. The meeting was called to order at 9:37 a.m., by Ms. Maria Calix.

**Members Present**
- Heidi Ashcraft
- Maria Calix
- Charles Davis
- Cherise Moore
- John Nunez
- Frank Ogaz
- John Quintanilla
- Susan T. Solomon

**Members Absent**
- Frank Bostrom
- AJ Willmer
- Barry Snell

**Staff Present**
- Keith D. Crafton, Secretary
- Octavio Castelo, Staff
- Dr. Allison Deegan, Staff
- Michelle Cervera, County Counsel
- Eric Hass, Staff
- Anna Heredia, Staff
- Diane Tayag, Staff
- Victoria Bernstein, Staff

Chairperson Ms. Maria Calix called the meeting to order.

Call to Order

Mr. Octavio Castelo led the flag salute.

Flag Salute

It was **MOVED** by Mr. Frank Ogaz and **SECONDED** by Dr. Cherise Moore that the minutes of the regular meeting held on November 6, 2019, be approved with one correction. Motion carried, votes are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Heidi Ashcraft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Maria Calix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Cherise Moore</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approval of the Regular Meeting Minutes of November 6, 2019 and special meeting on November 14, 2019.

It was **MOVED** by Mr. John Nunez and **SECONDED** by Mr. Ogaz that the minutes of the special meeting held on November 14, 2019. Motion carried, votes are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Heidi Ashcraft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Maria Calix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Cherise Moore</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Ms. Susan T. Solomon | Abstain |         |         |         |
Secretary Keith D. Crafton stated the results of the County Committee’s annual election:

Mr. Charles Davis was elected in the Second Supervisorial District. Mr. Davis is a current member of the Compton Unified School District board and a former City Clerk in the City of Compton.

Mr. Barry Snell was elected in the Third Supervisorial District. Mr. Snell is a current member of the Santa Monica Community College District board and is a CPA.

Ms. Suzan Solomon was reelected in the Fifth Supervisorial District. She is a current member of the Newhall School District board and serves in a statewide PTA position.

Mr. John Quintanilla was elected for the At-Large position. Mr. Quintanilla is currently a member of the Rosemead School District board and works in health care.

It was MOVED by Mr. Ogaz to approve Ms. Suzan T. Solomon as the Committee Chairperson, seconded by Dr. Moore. Motion carried, votes are as follows:

| Ms. Heidi Ashcraft | Yes | Mr. John Nunez | Yes |
| Ms. Maria Calix | Yes | Mr. Frank Ogaz | Yes |
| Dr. Cherise Moore | Yes | Ms. Susan T. Solomon | Yes |

It was MOVED by Ms. Solomon to approve Mr. Bostrom as the Committee Vice-Chairperson, seconded by Dr. Moore. Motion carried, votes are as follows:

| Ms. Heidi Ashcraft | Yes | Mr. John Nunez | Yes |
| Ms. Maria Calix | Yes | Mr. Frank Ogaz | Yes |
| Dr. Cherise Moore | Yes | Ms. Susan T. Solomon | Yes |

Chairperson Calix administered the oath of office to newly elected members with the exception of Mr. Barry Snell who was not present.

Secretary Crafton stated that two members of the public will be addressing the Committee: Scott Tracy and Nick Karapetian.

Secretary Crafton stated that there are several articles pertaining to CVRA and other issues related to petitions.
Secretary Crafton stated the public hearing for this petition was held in the Los Nietos School District on November 20, 2019. The district will have an opportunity to present information to the County Committee followed by a presentation by staff of a feasibility report.

Representatives from Los Nietos SD made a presentation.

Dr. Allison Deegan presented the feasibility report.

Mr. Charles Davis made a motion to approve the Petition to Implement Trustee Areas and Trustee Area Voting in the Los Nietos School District, seconded by Ms. Calix. Motion carried, votes are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Heidi Aschcraft</td>
<td>Mr. John Nunez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Maria Calix</td>
<td>Mr. Frank Ogaz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Charles Davis</td>
<td>Mr. John Quintanilla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Cherise Moore</td>
<td>Ms. Suzan T. Solomon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. Moore made a motion to approve the area map as presented, seconded by Ms. Calix, motion carried, votes are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Heidi Aschcraft</td>
<td>Mr. John Nunez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Maria Calix</td>
<td>Mr. Frank Ogaz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Charles Davis</td>
<td>Mr. John Quintanilla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Cherise Moore</td>
<td>Ms. Suzan T. Solomon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secretary Crafton stated the public hearing for this petition was held on November 19, 2019. The district will have an opportunity to present information to the County Committee and followed by a presentation by staff of a feasibility report.

Representatives from East Whittier City SD made a presentation.

Mr. Eric Hass presented the feasibility report.

Mr. Nunez made a motion to approve the petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting, seconded by Ms. Maria Calix, motion carried, votes are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Heidi Aschcraft</td>
<td>Mr. John Nunez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Maria Calix</td>
<td>Mr. Frank Ogaz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Charles Davis</td>
<td>Mr. John Quintanilla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Cherise Moore</td>
<td>Ms. Suzan T. Solomon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Nunez made a motion to approve the area map as presented, seconded by Mr. Davis, motion carried, votes are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Heidi Aschcraft</td>
<td>Mr. John Nunez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Maria Calix</td>
<td>Mr. Frank Ogaz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Charles Davis</td>
<td>Mr. John Quintanilla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Cherise Moore</td>
<td>Ms. Suzan T. Solomon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff will work with the district to convey the approved map to the Registrar-Recorder. The district’s trustee areas will be implemented at their next election.
Secretary Crafton stated that public hearings were held in both the Torrance USD and the Palos Verdes USD on October 16, 2019. Staff has commenced a feasibility study and will present it at the next County Committee meeting. After hearing the feasibility study and presentations from the impacted districts, the County Committee will take a preliminary vote.

Secretary Crafton stated the petition was preliminarily approved by the County Committee on September 4, 2019. Staff has solicited environmental consultants to conduct the CEQA study.

Secretary Crafton stated that at the November 6, 2019 meeting, the Committee requested that representatives of the impacted districts return to provide an update on their negotiations.

Ms. Christine Wood, attorney for the City of Malibu, and David Soldani, representing Santa Monica-Malibu USD addressed the Committee, the update is that they are continuing to negotiate.

No formal report was given, Mr. Bostrom was not present to report.

Secretary Crafton stated there has been significant activity locally and around the state relating to CVRA.

Mr. Eric Hass reported City of Malibu has received a demand letter to move to trustee areas.

Mr. Hass stated SB 212, introduced by Senator Ben Allen was vetoed on October 13 by Governor Newsome.

Mr. Hass stated SB 585 is inactive at this time. Staff is communicating with Pam Gibbs for updates on this bill.

Secretary Crafton stated there are no updates.
Secretary Crafton stated there are no updates.

Secretary Crafton congratulated Ms. Suzan Solomon being given this year’s Ferd Kiesel Memorial Distinguished Service Award from the Association of California School Administrators. This prestigious award is in recognition for Ms. Solomon’s decades of service to local, regional and statewide educational agencies and organizations.

Secretary Crafton also recognized the service of Ms. Susan Andriacchi by gifting her a plaque for her service. Dr. Ted Edmiston was not present to receive his plaque of recognition.

It was moved by Mr. Nunez to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Davis, meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m. Motion carried, votes are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Heidi Ashcraft</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mr. John Nunez</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Maria Calix</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mr. Frank Ogaz</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Charles Davis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mr. John Quintanilla</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Cherise Moore</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ms. Suzan Solomon</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION NO. 7

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE GLENDORA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT ADOPTING A TRUSTEE AREA MAP AND INITIATING A PROPOSAL TO THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION TO ADOPT BY-TRUSTEE AREA ELECTIONS

WHEREAS, members of the Board of Education of the Glendora Unified School District ("School District" or "District") are currently elected in "at-large" elections, i.e., elections in which "each governing board member [is] elected by the registered voters of the entire school district" in accordance with the provisions of Education Code section 5030(a); and

WHEREAS, the District's Board members are elected in even numbered years and serve staggered, four-year terms such that the next election for two Board members is scheduled for 2020, with the remaining board members scheduled for election in 2022; and

WHEREAS, on September 9, 2019, the Board adopted its Resolution No. 2 and took action to move from an at-large election system to a by-trustee area election system for District Board members; and

WHEREAS, as required by Elections Code section 10010(a)(1), on October 14, 2019, and October 28, 2019, the Superintendent, on behalf of the District, held public hearings to review and solicit input on the composition of the maps and the sequence of elections; and

WHEREAS, as required by Elections Code section 10010(a)(2) on December 9, 2019 and January 13, 2020, the Board held public hearings to review and solicit input on the different map options; and

WHEREAS, California Education Code §§ 5019 and 5030 authorize the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization ("County Committee"), upon application from a school district's governing board, to change the method of election in a school district under its jurisdiction.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Board of Education of the Glendora Unified School District as follows:

1. The above recitals are true and correct.

2. The Board hereby approves the by-trustee area map(s) set forth in Exhibit A.
3. The Board hereby recommends that the proposed sequence of elections shall be the same as the current sequence of elections so that trustee areas 4 and 5 as identified in Exhibit B be assigned for election in 2020, with the remaining trustee areas be assigned for election in 2022.

4. The District Superintendent/designee are hereby authorized and directed to take any other actions necessary to effectuate the purposes of this resolution, including submission of the required application to the County Committee.

ADOPTED, SIGNED, and APPROVED this 13th day of January 2020.

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE
GLENDORA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

By: ____________________________
   Elizabeth Reuter, Board President

By: ____________________________
   Robin Merkley, Board Clerk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Pop</strong></td>
<td>7,414</td>
<td>7,478</td>
<td>7,653</td>
<td>7,508</td>
<td>7,517</td>
<td>37,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from ideal</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Deviation</td>
<td>-1.36%</td>
<td>-0.51%</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>-0.11%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>3.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hip</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian-American</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5,406</td>
<td>5,165</td>
<td>5,583</td>
<td>5,811</td>
<td>4,916</td>
<td>26,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hip</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian/Pac-Isl</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4,802</td>
<td>4,913</td>
<td>4,224</td>
<td>5,376</td>
<td>4,938</td>
<td>23,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hip</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Spanish-Surname</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian-Surname</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Filipino-Surname</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White est.</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,182</td>
<td>3,221</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>3,708</td>
<td>2,274</td>
<td>14,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hip</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Spanish-Surname</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian-Surname</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Filipino-Surname</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White est.</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,827</td>
<td>4,035</td>
<td>3,267</td>
<td>4,340</td>
<td>2,923</td>
<td>18,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Latino est.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hispanic-Surname</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian-Surname</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Filipino-Surname</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH White est.</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NH Black est.</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACS Pop. Est.</strong></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,584</td>
<td>7,572</td>
<td>8,095</td>
<td>7,720</td>
<td>7,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>aged-19</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>age20-60</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>age60+</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigration</strong></td>
<td>immigrants</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>naturals</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other lang</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Fluency</strong></td>
<td>speaks Eng. &quot;Less than Very Well&quot;</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education (among those age 25+)</strong></td>
<td>hs-grad</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bachelor</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>graduate-degree</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child in Household</strong></td>
<td>child-under18</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pet of Pop. Age 16+</strong></td>
<td>employed</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household Income</strong></td>
<td>income 0-25k</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>income 25-50k</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>income 50-75k</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>income 75-200k</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>income 200k+</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Stats</strong></td>
<td>single family</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>multi-family</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rented</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>owned</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total population data from the 2010 Decennial Census.

Source-based Voter Registration and Turnout data from the California Voter Data Base.

Latino voter registration and turnout data are Spanish surname counts adjusted using Census Population Department intercensal estimates. NH White and NH Black registration and voter counts estimated by NCC. Citizen Voting Age Pop., Age, Immigrants, and other demographics from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey and Special Tabulation 5-year data.
RESOLUTION NO. SO-19-20:11

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

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

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

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

WHEREAS, In a by-trustee area system of election, candidates for the District’s Board of Education (the “Board”) must reside within a specific geographic subarea of the District called a “trustee area” and candidates are elected only by the voters of that trustee area; and

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

WHEREAS, the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization ("Committee") has indicated that it will initiate this process on behalf of the District at the District’s request, and will consider any recommendation on specific trustee areas made by the District; and

WHEREAS, District staff and consultants have conducted public hearings for map input as required by law, prepared proposed trustee area plans and recommendations (the “Plans”) that were presented to the public at the District’s Regular Board Meeting on October 10, 2019, and October 24, 2019, and thereafter posted the Plans on the District’s website for further input; and

WHEREAS, Pursuant to Elections Code section 10010, the District held properly noticed public hearings regarding the proposed trustee area plans on November 14, 2019, and December 12, 2019; and

WHEREAS, The Board’s philosophy will continue to be that board members represent the entire school district, not just their trustee area, and that board members shall act in the best interest of the entire school district, and;

WHEREAS, the Board has considered all public input and comment on the Scenarios; and
WHEREAS, the Board has adopted Scenario 3 and hereby recommends Scenario 3 to the Committee for its consideration based upon the findings, analysis and recommendations contained in the report attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit "A"; and

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Board of Education of the Rowland Unified School District as follows:

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

ADOPTED, SIGNED AND APPROVED this 23rd day of January, 2020.

[Signature]
President of the Board of Education for the
Rowland Unified School District

I, Angelena M. Pride, Clerk of the Board of Education of the Rowland Unified School District, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Board of Education of said District at a meeting of said Board held on the 23rd day of January, 2020, and that it was so adopted by the following vote:

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

[Signature]
Clerk of the Board of Education of the
Rowland Unified School District
### Total Population (2016 Census)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trustee Area</th>
<th>Trustee Area 1</th>
<th>Trustee Area 2</th>
<th>Trustee Area 3</th>
<th>Trustee Area 4</th>
<th>Trustee Area 5</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>21,398</td>
<td>21,428</td>
<td>21,137</td>
<td>21,129</td>
<td>22,411</td>
<td>5.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Variance</td>
<td>-1.45%</td>
<td>-1.35%</td>
<td>-1.65%</td>
<td>-2.26%</td>
<td>3.18%</td>
<td>8.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>7,605</td>
<td>13,663</td>
<td>14,512</td>
<td>7,382</td>
<td>5,092</td>
<td>6.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,779</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>2,489</td>
<td>1.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/</td>
<td>0.83%</td>
<td>5.15%</td>
<td>5.43%</td>
<td>9.56%</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4,75%</td>
<td>2,94%</td>
<td>1,17%</td>
<td>1,52%</td>
<td>1,72%</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>18,498</td>
<td>3,724</td>
<td>3,927</td>
<td>11,018</td>
<td>13,822</td>
<td>6.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Population 15 and Over (2016 Census)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trustee Area</th>
<th>Trustee Area 1</th>
<th>Trustee Area 2</th>
<th>Trustee Area 3</th>
<th>Trustee Area 4</th>
<th>Trustee Area 5</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>16,760</td>
<td>15,829</td>
<td>16,416</td>
<td>15,717</td>
<td>15,13</td>
<td>1.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Variance</td>
<td>-0.52%</td>
<td>-4.92%</td>
<td>-1.38%</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
<td>4.45%</td>
<td>5.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>5,286</td>
<td>9,387</td>
<td>9,864</td>
<td>5,166</td>
<td>3,781</td>
<td>4.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>31,90%</td>
<td>39,31%</td>
<td>60,99%</td>
<td>30,78%</td>
<td>20,94%</td>
<td>20.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/</td>
<td>9,39%</td>
<td>6,19%</td>
<td>6,96%</td>
<td>1,77%</td>
<td>2,346</td>
<td>2.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>5,09%</td>
<td>3,30%</td>
<td>1,35%</td>
<td>1,61%</td>
<td>1,76%</td>
<td>1.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>8,529</td>
<td>4,723</td>
<td>3,102</td>
<td>9,215</td>
<td>11,077</td>
<td>11.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td>0.96%</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trustee Area</th>
<th>Trustee Area 1</th>
<th>Trustee Area 2</th>
<th>Trustee Area 3</th>
<th>Trustee Area 4</th>
<th>Trustee Area 5</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>14,148</td>
<td>12,122</td>
<td>10,051</td>
<td>12,720</td>
<td>16,203</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Variance</td>
<td>6.08%</td>
<td>4.08%</td>
<td>8.23%</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>22.17%</td>
<td>22.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>4,413</td>
<td>6,664</td>
<td>6,703</td>
<td>3,519</td>
<td>3,728</td>
<td>3.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>31.94%</td>
<td>54.34%</td>
<td>61.77%</td>
<td>25.24%</td>
<td>23.01%</td>
<td>23.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/</td>
<td>9.03%</td>
<td>10.23%</td>
<td>7.81%</td>
<td>15.56%</td>
<td>14.80%</td>
<td>14.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>6.63%</td>
<td>5.27%</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
<td>2.23%</td>
<td>2.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7,261</td>
<td>3,956</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td>6,701</td>
<td>9,383</td>
<td>9,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>51.32%</td>
<td>32.45%</td>
<td>29.03%</td>
<td>51.87%</td>
<td>57.91%</td>
<td>57.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>2.23%</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On May 15, 2019, the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) received a petition pursuant to Education Code (EC) §35700(d) to transfer certain territory from the Torrance Unified School (USD) to the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD. The request was submitted by both the Torrance USD and Palos Verdes Peninsula USD governing boards. The territory in question consists of approximately 29 parcels, all of which are residential, all currently within the Torrance USD, as highlighted in the map included in the petition (Attachment A).

The petition was presented to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) on September 4, 2019. Pursuant to EC §35705, two public hearings were conducted in the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD and in the Torrance USD, both on October 16, 2019.

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

As indicated in the following report, County Committee staff’s analysis of this petition indicates that the proposal to transfer certain territory from the Torrance USD to the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD would substantially meet all of the nine conditions. The information in this report was developed through discussions and meetings with the impacted parties and numerous members of the public, as well as the review of relevant materials submitted to the County Committee and to the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE).

**Staff's recommendation is that the Committee approve this petition to transfer territory.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Adequacy in number of students.</td>
<td>Substantially Met</td>
<td>Each of the impacted districts would continue to maintain enrollment of at least 1,501 students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Community identity.</td>
<td>Substantially Met</td>
<td>There is evidence that the subject territory has at least the same community identity with the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD as it does with the Torrance USD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Equitable division of assets and liabilities.</td>
<td>Substantially Met</td>
<td>Reorganization would not require a division of assets or liabilities and would not negatively impact either district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Will not promote ethnic discrimination or segregation.</td>
<td>Substantially Met</td>
<td>Reorganization would not affect student enrollment or attendance significantly in any of the impacted districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Will not substantially increase costs to the state.</td>
<td>Substantially Met</td>
<td>Reorganization would not impact state funding significantly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Will not significantly disrupt educational programs in either district.</td>
<td>Substantially Met</td>
<td>Reorganization would not require substantial changes to educational program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Will not result in a significant increase in school housing costs.</td>
<td>Substantially Met</td>
<td>Reorganization would not impact school housing costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Proposal is not primarily designed to substantially increase property values.</td>
<td>Substantially Met</td>
<td>While property values will likely go up as a result of the proposed transfer, there is no evidence that a desire to increase property values is the primary motive for the reorganization request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Will not affect the fiscal management or status of the affected districts.</td>
<td>Substantially Met</td>
<td>Reorganization would not lead to a significant impact to either districts’ fiscal management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

On May 15, 2019, the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) received a petition pursuant to Education Code (EC) §35700(d) to transfer certain territory from the Torrance Unified School District (USD) to the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD. The request was submitted by both of the governing boards of the Torrance USD and the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD. The territory in question consists of approximately 29 homes, all currently within the Torrance USD, as highlighted in the map included in the petition (Attachment A).

At its regular meeting on September 4, 2019, the petition was presented to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee). Pursuant to EC §35705, two public hearings were conducted, in the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD and in the Torrance USD, both on October 16, 2019. In addition to the public hearings, the County Committee received additional materials from both districts.

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

III. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL AREA

The proposed transfer area consists of approximately 29 parcels, all located within a new gated housing development in the Torrance USD. This area borders the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD, and the remainder of the parcels in this new housing development are all within that district. Construction is currently underway on the homes in this development. Attachment A contains a map of the area proposed for transfer.

IV. DESCRIPTION OF IMPACTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

TORRANCE USD

The Torrance USD serves K-12 students in an area bordered by Lawndale, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Palos Verdes Estates, Rolling Hills Estates, Lomita, Carson and Gardena. The district operates 17 elementary schools, eight middle schools, four high schools, one continuation high school, one alternative high school, and three adult school campuses. The 2018-19 student enrollment for the Torrance USD was 23,394, according to the California Department of Education (CDE). The area supported by the Torrance USD is a diverse suburban area with both single-family housing and multi-family housing, surrounded by many robust commercial and recreation areas.

PALOS VERDES PENINSULA USD

The Palos Verdes Peninsula USD serves K-12 students in an area bordered by Torrance, Walteria, Lomita, Harbor City, San Pedro and Los Angeles. The district operates 10 K-5 elementary schools, three intermediate middle schools, three high schools and an adult school. The 2018-19 student enrollment for the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD was 11,217, according to the CDE. The area
supported by the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD is a suburban/rural area with single-family housing, and some multi-family housing, surrounded by many robust commercial areas, with significant recreation areas. It also includes a large area of ocean front.

V. PETITIONERS’ RATIONALE

The rationale for petitioning for the transfer of territory as stated by Torrance USD and the Palos Verdes USD is that all other parcels in the housing development currently are located within the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD; to develop homes where only 29 parcels (located at the very back of the gated development) are not in the same school district would be disadvantageous to the new community. The developer of the property has already agreed to a mitigation agreement to cover any of the costs related to the transfer, for both districts.

VI. POSITIONS OF THE GOVERNING BOARDS

TORRANCE USD and PALOS VERDES PENINSULA USD

At its regular meeting on August 6, 2018, the Torrance USD Governing Board adopted Resolution No. 04-18/19 (Attachment B) supporting the petition to transfer territory from the Torrance USD to the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD. At its regular meeting on September 26, 2018, the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD governing board adopted Resolution No. 7-2018/19 (Attachment C) supporting the petition as well.

At the public hearings held on October 16, 2019 in Torrance USD and Palos Verdes Peninsula USD, representatives from both districts’ leadership and governing boards, as well as professionals that have guided this process, expressed strong support for the proposal.

VII. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Parcels. The petition area is located within territory in the City of Rolling Hills Estates and the Torrance USD. Per the developer’s disclosures, the petition area contains approximately 29 parcels, all of which are intended to contain single family homes. Some of the home sites have been completed already. This area has been part of the Torrance USD since the school district’s formation in 1936. Most cities in Los Angeles County cross school district lines, and nearly all school districts include territory from multiple cities, with some also including unincorporated territory in the county. For example, the ABC USD includes territory from seven different cities. Likewise, the City of Temple City includes territory from four different school districts. School district boundaries and city boundaries are rarely coterminal in Los Angeles County.

Petition Area Enrollment. According to information submitted by the Torrance USD and the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD, there is not yet any enrollment from the petition areas as the homes are not yet completed or, if completed, not yet occupied. Neither district expressed any concerns about the ability to house any and all students who eventually enroll from the petition area, nor any concern about the loss of the potential enrollment following approval of the transfer.

Permit Process and Agreements. Both the Torrance USD and the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD stated in materials submitted to the County Committee and at public hearings that they would facilitate the permit process for students in the petition area seeking to transfer out of the Torrance USD into the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD during the period that any may occupy the area prior
to the final approval of the transfer. The developer stated that all prospective purchasers are being made aware that the transfer has been proposed and, following its approval, these homes will move from the Torrance USD to the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD.

VIII. ANALYSIS OF MANDATED CONDITIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

The County Committee may vote to approve a proposal to transfer territory when the conditions contained in EC §35753(a)(1) through (10) are substantially met. However, the Education Code does not mandate that the County Committee approve petitions where any, a majority or all of the conditions are substantially met. Likewise, the Education Code does not mandate that the County Committee deny a petition where all, many or some of the conditions are not substantially met. The Education Code provides the County Committee with broad authority to analyze factors it deems relevant and to assign to those factors the requisite weight they choose to determine how to vote on the petitions that come before it.

The County Committee has the option to disapprove a proposal to transfer territory even when the conditions are substantially met, if it determines that the proposal is not in the best overall interests of those affected; if there is no compelling reason for a change; if the proposal will not improve the effectiveness and/or the efficiency of the delivery of educational services to students; or for any other reason(s) the County Committee deems relevant.

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

CONDITION 1

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

The County Committee may approve a proposal for reorganization of districts if the new district is adequate in terms of the number of students enrolled. Section 18573(a)(1)(a) of Title V, California Administrative Code (CAC), specifies that a unified district must have a projected enrollment of at least 1,501 students.

FINDINGS

According to the CDE, the 2018-19 student enrollment for the Torrance USD was 23,394, and for the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD was 11,217.
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Because the petition area will potentially contain so few students, given that it contains only 29 home sites, compared to the total enrollments of the impacted districts, approval of this proposal would not substantially reduce the number of students enrolled in the Torrance USD. In addition, should the petition be approved, the permanent transfer of all of the potential petition area students to the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD, once they occupy the property and enroll, would not negatively impact the enrollment at the Torrance USD to the point that it would not maintain a minimum enrollment above 1,501 students, the standard for a unified school district. Therefore, it is recommended that the County Committee deem this condition to be substantially met.

CONDITION 2

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

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

FINDINGS

The petition area, historically a part of the Torrance USD, borders the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD and is part of the City of Rolling Hills Estates. The petitioning districts and the property developer have provided information about how the petition area is situated within the larger development. These 29 parcels, within a larger gated community, are at the back end of the area. They are the only parcels not currently within the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD (with the exception of five other parcels currently located within the Los Angeles USD, which are part of a separate petition process). In the area where the petition parcels are located, there is no access out of the gated development, so they are isolated from parcels that they border technically because those bordering parcels are elevated and not accessible from the gated community. It is logical that these parcels are a part of the community they are geographically located in (especially in light of the gated configuration), now that the new development is under construction. However, they also share substantial community identity with the Torrance USD, as do any parcels that are on the border of any school districts. Much of the bordering districts’ areas are indistinguishable from each other. However, these 29 parcels are isolated from their bordering community due to the gated configuration of the new property development, rendering them with significantly greater community identity with their Palos Verdes Peninsula USD neighbors.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Residents of the petition area, like all residents of Los Angeles County, likely share a strong community identity with their locality in general (including the cities of Palos Verdes Peninsula and neighboring City of Torrance and other surrounding areas), as well as with whatever school district their children are enrolled in, because that is where they live near. Because the petition
area neighborhood borders a number of districts and cities, community identity becomes an amalgam rather than a specific, definable sentiment or status. It is reasonable to like or feel a part of any broader locality when one lives in or near any border. It is clear that the petitioning districts believe that the community identity with the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD will be sufficiently strong as both districts support the transfer of territory.

Petitions to transfer territory are requests for changes to permanent boundaries. They should only be undertaken based on evidence of a compelling reason to make such changes related to educational reasons and guided by the mandated nine conditions of review. Given the configuration of these 29 parcels within the new housing development, there is a compelling reason to support this transfer in order to preserve the community identity of this new community neighborhood.

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

**CONDITION 3**

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

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

**FINDINGS**

**Real Property**

No real or personal public school property of the Torrance USD is located within the boundaries of the area proposed for transfer.

**Bonded Indebtedness and Tax Rate**

EC §35575 states that “[w]hen territory is taken from one school district and annexed to another school district and the area transferred contains no public school property or buildings, the territory shall drop any liability for outstanding bonded indebtedness in the district of which it was formerly a part [Torrance USD] and shall automatically assume its proportionate share of the outstanding bonded indebtedness of the district of which it becomes a part [Palos Verdes Peninsula USD].” Since there are no school facilities and/or property located in the area proposed for transfer, the bonded indebtedness provisions of EC §35575 would apply.

Any territory transferred from Torrance USD into Palos Verdes Peninsula USD would inherit the bonded indebtedness of Palos Verdes Peninsula USD. The influx of new territory and new ratepayers would necessarily lower the cost of existing bonded indebtedness to individual property owners within Palos Verdes Peninsula USD as it would enlarge the pool of property available to cover the bonds. Subsequently, any property owners within Torrance USD would remain
responsible for the current bonded indebtedness and would have to pay those obligations from a smaller pool of property owners if the transfer removed those homes in the petition area into Palos Verdes Peninsula USD.

**Student Body Funds**

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

**CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

Because no school facilities are located within the transfer area and no students currently reside in the petition area, a division of property, funds or obligations (except bonded indebtedness) of the school districts would not be required should this proposal be approved.

Pursuant to EC §35736, all property, funds, and obligations, other than real property and bonded indebtedness, shall be divided pro rata between the districts based on the number of affected students as a percentage of the Torrance USD’s total student population in order to result in an equitable division of the property, funds, and obligations of the districts. In this petition, those calculations are complicated by differing perceptions among the impacted districts and parties. The Torrance USD stated that the transfer would place it at a fiscal disadvantage due to loss of assessed valuation and enrollment-based student funds, and that these factors are the rationale for its lack of support for the petition.

The Palos Verdes Peninsula USD stated that it supported the petition, and would not be disadvantaged in terms of loss of enrollment-based funding or loss of assessed valuation. However, Palos Verdes Peninsula USD stated in both public hearings that it would be negatively impacted fiscally if it were required to house all of the students residing in the petition area immediately, as would be required under the Education Code should the transfer be approved. This issue will be discussed in greater detail under Conditions 5 and 9. Therefore, given the uncertainty surrounding the financial impact to the districts should the petition be approved, it is recommended that the County Committee deem this condition to be not substantially met.
CONDITION 4

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

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

"To determine whether the new districts will promote racial or ethnic discrimination or segregation, the effects of the following factors will be considered:

The current number and percentage of pupils in each racial and ethnic group in the affected districts and schools in the affected districts, compared with the number and percentage of pupils in each racial and ethnic group in the affected districts and schools in the affected districts, if the proposal or petition is approved.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table 2 below displays the 2018-19 district-wide student enrollment by racial/ethnic categories for the Torrance USD as provided by the CDE. As shown, the district’s enrollment is comprised of 21% White students, 31% Hispanic students, 29% Asian students (Asian, Pacific Islander or Filipino), and 4% African American students (not accounting for non-reporting students and those declaring two or more ethnicities).

**TABLE 2**
Torrance USD Racial/Ethnic Distribution*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>American Indian or Alaska Native</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>Pacific Islander</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
<th>Not Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Torrance Unified</td>
<td>23,394</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>1,464,002</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>6,186,278</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 3 below displays the 2018-19 district-wide student enrollment by racial/ethnic categories for the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD as provided by the CDE. As shown, the district’s enrollment is comprised of 45% White students, 28% Asian students (Asian, Pacific Islander or Filipino), 13% Hispanic students and 2% African American students (not accounting for non-reporting students and those declaring two or more ethnicities).
TABLE 3
Palos Verdes Peninsula USD Racial/Ethnic Distribution*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>American Indian or Alaska Native</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Filipinos</th>
<th>Hispanics or Latino</th>
<th>Pacific Islander</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
<th>Not Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified</td>
<td>11,217</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>1,464,002</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>6,186,278</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Both school districts have a majority of students reporting as non-White (Asian, Hispanic or African American), as an aggregate percentage. The balance of ethnicity in each of the districts is similar in that they are both diverse, but Palos Verdes Peninsula USD has a larger group of White Students, at 45%. Both districts have significant populations of Asian and Hispanic students, and very low numbers of African American, Filipino, Pacific Islander or American Indian/Alaskan Native students. It is projected that, should the petition be approved, it would not shift the racial/ethnic balance of either district substantially, even when all of the potential petition area students enroll in Palos Verdes Peninsula USD, given the small number of homes involved. There is no evidence that there is any ethnic or racial motive for petitioning for this transfer of territory.

If the petition is approved, all of the students in the petition area would be added to totals for the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD (except for those students who choose to enroll in Torrance USD, via permit, if approved and those who choose educational options other than Palos Verdes Peninsula USD, such as charter or private schools). The resulting new enrollment total would not alter the ethnic/racial makeup of the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD, nor would the loss of those students alter the ethnic/racial makeup of the Torrance USD.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The potential shift of the students from the petition area within the Torrance USD to the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD would not have a discernable impact on the ethnic or racial distribution of either district. Because there are so few potential students, given that the transfer involves 29 parcels, and the districts have similar ethnic/racial makeups, percentage distribution across ethnic categories would remain very similar for both following transfer resulting from approval of this petition. It is concluded that the proposed petition, if approved, would not promote racial or ethnic
discrimination in any of the impacted school districts. Therefore, it is recommended that the
County Committee deem this condition to be substantially met.

CONDITION 5

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

This petition area contains 29 parcels of land, currently undergoing development into single family
homes in a gated community. The Torrance USD has stated that the loss of any funds based on
the loss of this potential enrollment (from any students who move into these homes) has been fully
compensated by the developer fees the district received.

FINDINGS

The potential loss of enrollment-based funding to the Torrance USD is not significant, according
to the district. No new school facilities will need to be built in the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD
to accommodate any students who move into the petition area once the homes are built.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Should this proposal be approved, no additional facilities would be required by the Palos Verdes
Peninsula USD, thus there would be no additional cost to the state. Funding based on enrollment
that would be lost to the Torrance USD has already been compensated for via developer fees.
Therefore, it is recommended that the County Committee deem this condition to be substantially
met.

CONDITION 6

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

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

FINDINGS

Because both districts support the transfer of territory, they have already asserted that it would not
trigger any disruption of the educational plans of either one. No students from the petition area
are currently enrolled in the Torrance USD (because the homes are not yet completed). The
addition of any students into the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD from the 29 parcels in question would not disrupt the educational programs of the district, according to their presentations.

Staff did not find any legitimate assessment that spoke to academic insufficiency in any of the schools in Torrance USD nor in Palos Verdes Peninsula USD. The educational programs on offer from both the Torrance USD and the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD, at all of their schools, are within or exceed state requirements and guidelines and many have achieved significant acclaim.

It is assumed that, following a transfer, each district would continue to provide an educational program appropriate for the students they serve.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

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

CONDITION 7

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

FINDINGS

As stated above, the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD informed the County Committee during the two public hearings held in connection with this petition that it could house all of the petition area students who might enroll following the completion of the development of the 29 parcels targeted for transfer from Torrance USD. Thus, there would be no increased facilities costs associated with this proposal.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Because of the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD’s ability to accommodate all of the potential petition area students following approval of this petition and completion of the housing development, there would be no increased facilities-related costs to the state. Therefore, it is recommended that the County Committee deem this condition to be substantially met.
CONDITION 8

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

By policy, to evaluate this condition, the County Committee should analyze the rationale presented in the petition for transfer. In addition, if the proposed reorganization creates a significant change in local property values, the County Committee should consider whether increasing property values is the primary reason for the petition.

FINDINGS

The complete rationale for the petition to transfer territory, as stated by the petitioning school districts, is included in the petition (Attachment A). Nothing in the petition language (comprised of each district’s supporting board resolution) indicated a motive to increase real estate values. While staff cannot determine with certainty what the petitioners’ motives are for the petition beyond their stated intent, the developer stated at both public hearings that there would be no price disparity among the parcels developed in the housing community based on school district assignment. He stated that there were price disparities among the parcels based on size and views. Thus there is no evidence that there is a real estate motive to increase property values through the transfer of territory. In addition, because both impacted districts agreed to the transfer and stated that they are satisfied with the financial compensation paid to each in the form of developer’s fees, staff has no concerns about unrevealed motives behind this petition.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

EC §35753(a)(8) does not state that transfers should be denied if property value increases are projected. This section states that a proposal may be approved if “...the proposed reorganization is primarily designed for purposes other than to significantly increase property values...” [emphasis added.]

It can be reasonably projected that purchasers of the parcels intended for transfer could benefit from an increase in housing values should the petition be approved (and their homes be zoned within the Palos Verdes Peninsula USD), but there is no evidence that a significant increase in property values represents the primary motive for the petition. Therefore, it is recommended that the County Committee deem this condition to be substantially met.
CONDITION 9

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

By policy, the County Committee should consider financial trends of the affected districts and revenue gains and/or losses that may result from the proposed reorganization. This information will be used to evaluate the proposal’s effect on the viability of the reorganized districts to operate educational programs and to assess any negative impact to the fiscal management or status of the reorganized district(s).

FINDINGS

Based on the number of small number of parcels intended for transfer, the Torrance USD has stated that it has been duly compensated via developer’s fees for any potential loss of enrollment from any students who move into the transfer area, or loss of bonding capacity or assessed valuation. Likewise, Palos Verdes Peninsula USD also received developer’s fees that it deems adequate.

Any significant fiscal impacts are mitigated by the districts’ joint agreement to submit this petition. Staff was careful to evaluate whether each district, and its board, felt that the compensation was fair. Staff was assured that this was the case. Each of these competent educational entities are entitled to make such assessments about their own fiscal health and projections, and the well-respected financial advisors they hired to examine them in greater detail indicate that this petition would not injure either districts if it is approved. Further, the ability of each district to maintain a statutory reserve for economic uncertainties would not be affected should the proposal be approved.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

It is concluded that this transfer would not negatively affect the fiscal management or status of both of the affected districts. Therefore, it is recommended that the County Committee deem this condition to be substantially met.

IX. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

After examining an extensive amount of data related to this reorganization petition, both provided by or gathered by the relevant parties and from local or state sources and public events, staff finds that all nine of the conditions have been substantially met.

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

In light of the significant authority vested in the County Committee by the EC, staff has examined the implications of both approval and denial of the current petition. The implications relate to the deep agreement among the petitioning districts that this transfer is good for both of them, they have been duly compensated, and they will not be injured in any way.

**Staff recommends that the petition be approved.** There need to make the permanent boundary change represented by this transfer of territory petition is supported by both of the impacted districts. There are no community members or current students living in the transfer area to weigh in. The developer/owner of the properties supports the transfer.

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

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

ATTACHMENTS
TORRANCE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
RESOLUTION NO. AS-04-18/19

PALOS VERDES PENINSULA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
RESOLUTION NO. ___

PETITION TO INITIATE PROCESS FOR AUTHORIZING
THE TRANSFER OF TERRITORY
FROM THE TORRANCE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT TO
THE PALOS VERDES PENINSULA UNIFIED DISTRICT,
each of Los Angeles County

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

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

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

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

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. __________

PALOS VERDES PENINSULA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

RESOLUTION NO. 7-2018/19

PETITION TO INITIATE PROCESS FOR AUTHORIZING
THE TRANSFER OF TERRITORY
FROM THE TORRANCE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT TO
THE PALOS VERDES PENINSULA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,
each of Los Angeles County

PURSUANT TO Education Code Sections 5511(b) and 35700(d) the undersigned, constituting the majority of members of the Governing Board of the Torrance Unified School District; and the majority of members of the Governing Board of the Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District (collectively referred to as the "Districts"), hereby petition that a portion of the territory of Torrance Unified School District depicted on the attached Exhibit A, be transferred to the Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District.

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

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

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

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

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

APPROVED BY THE GOVERNING BOARD OF THE TORRANCE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

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

Linda Reid, President

Suzanne Seymour, Clerk

Anthony Collatos, Member

Barbara Lamy, Member

Richard Phillips, Member

(Date)

(Date)

(Date)

(Date)

(Date)

(Date)
**LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION (COUNTY COMMITTEE) LEGISLATIVE REVIEW – MARCH 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR:</th>
<th>INTRODUCTION DATE:</th>
<th>LAST ACTIVITY/DATE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senate Bill 585 / Wieckowski</td>
<td>02/22/19</td>
<td>02/03/20 – Bill returned to Senate Secretary for consideration of redrafting and resubmission.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESCRIPTION OF BILL**

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

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

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

**RECOMMENDED POSITION**

Staff recommends the following position:

- **Watch** Bill should be monitored by County Committee staff, but no action taken at this time.
- **Approve** County Committee supports the bill’s concept, but will not actively work for passage.
- **Support** County Committee actively supports the bill.
- **Oppose** County Committee actively opposes the bill.
- **Disapprove** County Committee disapproves of the bill’s concept, but will not actively oppose passage.
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. Octavio Castelo, Secretary to the County Committee at (562) 922-6110.
Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals

March 2020

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 21, 2020.

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

On July 10, 2019, Chadmar/Colfin Rolling Hills LLC submitted an owner petition to transfer five parcels of uninhabited territory from LAUSD to PVPUSD. At the September 4, 2019, regularly scheduled County Committee meeting, the petition was to be introduced to the County Committee. However, Chadmar’s new counsel, David Soldani, addressed the County Committee and requested that the petition be withdrawn at this time, and that it would be resubmitted in the near future.

Status: Petition temporarily withdrawn, to be resubmitted
Status Date: *September 18, 2019

RECENT INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last two years)

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Inner City USD / January 2020

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- LAUSD to Palos Verdes Peninsula USD / September 2019

* = indicates activity since last meeting

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

March 2020

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, 2020.

PETITION TO IMPLEMENT TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING IN THE GLENDORA USD

On January 17, 2020, the Glendora USD submitted a petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting within the district. The petition, in the form of a board resolution and an adopted trustee area map, will be introduced to the County Committee, and a public hearing will be scheduled in the district.

Status: Petition to be introduced
Status Date: *February 21, 2020

PETITION TO IMPLEMENT TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING IN THE ROWLAND USD

On January 24, 2020, the Rowland USD submitted a petition to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting within the district. The petition, in the form of a board resolution and an adopted trustee area map, will be introduced to the County Committee, and a public hearing will be scheduled in the district.

Status: Petition to be introduced
Status Date: *February 21, 2020
PETITION TO TRANSFER TERRITORY FROM TORRANCE USD TO PALOS VERDES PENINSULA USD (PVPUSD)

On June 3, 2019, the Torrance USD and PVPUSD submitted a joint petition to transfer twenty-nine parcels from Torrance USD to PVPUSD. The petition was introduced to the County Committee at its regularly scheduled meeting on September 4, 2019, and public hearings were held in each school district on October 16, 2019. A feasibility study will be conducted which will be presented to the County Committee.

Status: Feasibility study being conducted
Status Date: *February 21, 2020

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

On March 6, 2019, the Sulphur Springs Union School District (SD) submitted their final board resolution as part of a series of resolutions spanning the past eleven years, culminating in the formal introduction of a petition to transfer (exchange) certain parcels between Sulphur Springs Union SD and Saugus Union SD. Public hearings were held in each district on May 2, 2019, both of which are within the William S. Hart Union High School District (HSD). A feasibility study was conducted, and was presented to the County Committee at its regularly scheduled meeting on September 4, 2019. The committee then preliminarily approved the petition so that the committee’s own environmental study may be conducted, as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The petition shall be held until its CEQA study is concluded and a CEQA public hearing is conducted, after which the committee will reconvene to provide a final vote on the matter.

Status: CEQA study to be conducted
Status Date: *February 21, 2020

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 again at the March 6, 2019 meeting. On May 10, 2019, staff met with the district to ascertain the status of its ongoing study and analyses. The parties to the petition returned to the committee on September 4, 2019, October 2, 2019, November 6, 2019, and January 8, 2020 to provide updates on their studies.

Status: Preliminary public hearing to be scheduled, pending negotiations
Status Date: *February 21, 2020

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

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

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

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

In the fall 2017, staff concluded the Request For Proposal (RFP) process, evaluated vendors, and selected an environmental consultant, for whom a contract was agreed upon. The environmental analysis concluded with the report’s comment period spanning August 30 – September 18, 2018. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Public Hearing convened on October 3, 2018, at the County Committee’s regular scheduled meeting.
The County Committee continued to review the petition. On February 20, 2019, they received a request from Dr. Kelly King, Interim Superintendent of the Glendale USD, to delay final review so that she may become familiar with the relevant issues following her recent appointment. In February 2019, staff received a request from the chief petitioners that the final review of the petition not take place at the April 3, 2019 meeting because that date falls during spring break and may impact participation by the public. In April 2019, the chief petitioners requested the June meeting date be changed due to coinciding with the school year ending, which would affect some parents from attending the meeting.

At the October 2, 2019 regularly scheduled meeting, the County Committee voted to accept the CEQA findings, and conducted a final vote to approve the petition, but did not approve the election area, pending the review of different election area scenarios. At the November 6, 2019, regularly scheduled meeting, the County Committee further discussed election area factors and requested additional election area maps to be reviewed at the January 8, 2020 meeting. Before the January meeting, however, litigation commenced which halted the County Committee’s process.

Status: Litigation pending
Status Date: *February 21, 2020

**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 forwarded the administrative record and oral recordings of the proceedings to the California Department of Education, who provided an update on January 21, 2020, that the appeal will likely be heard no sooner than Summer of 2020, pending the receipt of additional materials in Spring 2020, and barring additional scheduling challenges.

Status: Future ballot measure preparations suspended until appeal process concludes
Status Date: *January 23, 2020

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

On July 23, 2015, LACOE received a request for a petition from chief petitioner Mr. Seth Jacobson, a community member who is a Malibu resident. Mr. Jacobson, along with two other chief petitioners, wants to form a separate Malibu USD from territory within the boundaries of the existing Santa Monica-Malibu USD. Prior to the submission of any signed petitions related to this request, the City of Malibu submitted its own petition to form a Malibu USD, which was discussed earlier in this update document.

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

Status: Petitioners in negotiation.
Status Date: March 18, 2016
PETITION TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN WITHIN THE POMONA USD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Status:** Petition in circulation.
**Status Date:** February 21, 2008
FORMATION—LA MIRADA USD (CURRENTLY LIES WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE NORWALK – LA MIRADA USD)

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

Unification Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Azusa USD to Glendora USD/October 2016

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Malibu USD (Santa Monica-Malibu USD)/January 2020

Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

- El Monte City SD / August 2017
- El Monte Union HSD / May 2019
- Garvey SD / September 2019
- *Hughes-Elizabeth Lakes Union ESD / February 2020
- Pomona USD / July 2019
- South Pasadena USD / January 2020
- Torrance USD / July 2018
- Walnut USD / May 2016

* = indicates activity since last meeting

This document was prepared by staff to the County Committee.