

Community Trustee Area Districting (CTAD) Committee

589 W. Fremont Ave., Sunnyvale, CA 94087

www.fuhsd.org/ctad

Regular Meeting Minutes

Monday, March 11, 2024

District Office

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:03 p.m. by CTAD Chair Doug Kunz.

Attendee Name	Present	Absent	Late	Arrived
Wesley Chen	X			
Alan Dowdell	X			
J.R. Fruen	X			
David Fung	X			
Angela Hixson	X			
Sid Jain	X			
Doug Kunz	X			
Rommy Kushner	X			
Chemba Ranganathan	X			
Kei Sato	X			
Heidy Patricia Suarez Espinosa		X		
Bill Wilson	X			
Julia Zhao			X	
Taek Kim (Student)	X			
Kashish Mittal (Student)	X			
Sehej Singh (Student)		X		

2. Review and Approve Minutes from Feb. 5 Committee Meeting

Angela Hixson made a motion to approve the Feb. 5 minutes. Alan Dowdell seconded the motion. Twelve of the CTAD members in attendance approved the minutes. CTAD member J.R. Fruen abstained.

3. Communications

3.1 Public Communications: Community member Min Yin stated that there is no prompt feedback in the map submission tool that explains why a map is now considered not recommended and that this should be made clearer. She mentioned that it is not possible to make a trustee area that has majority Hispanic CVAP. She asked if this effort was really to benefit voters or to have pretty numbers.

3.2: CTAD Committee Members: CTAD members Angela Hixson and Kei Sato spoke about the two districtwide webinars, which had low attendance, but which were recorded and posted online for the community.

CTAD member Rommy Kushner shared a suggestion from a community meeting about using radio announcements or PSAs in the future. Rommy was asked if a North/South vs. East/West split was discussed in the meetings she attended, and she shared that there was a preference for a North/South split.

CTAD member Angela Hixson attended a Sunnyvale Rotary meeting with many longtime residents, who also had a strong preference for a North/South split. While they understand we have to use the census numbers, they feel that it is not completely representative of the community in the northern part of Sunnyvale and the District.

CTAD Chair Doug Kunz attended a Sunnyvale Democratic Club meeting. The community members who were in attendance also shared a preference for a North/South split. One of the community-submitted maps that was a hybrid between several of the scenarios was mentioned.

CTAD Chair Doug Kunz spoke at several different PTA meetings, including Kennedy. There was not a lot of feedback on the maps, but individuals were receptive to hearing about the process. San Miguel PTA passed out a survey, and there was consensus mostly on a North/South split or hybrid map.

CTAD Chair Doug Kunz also attended a meeting of the Sunnyvale neighborhood associations and they also had a preference for a North/South split.

CTAD member Angela Hixson attended a meeting at Columbia Middle School, where parents had an interesting discussion. She shared that emotionally most people want to do a North/South split, but that concerns were raised about fielding candidates.

CTAD member Kei Sato attended the Sunnyvale Middle School PTSA meeting, where – questions focused more on the sequencing and the desire to keep to the middle school boundaries.

CTAD member Sid Jain shared that he, along with several other CTAD members held more sessions on the mapping tool at the request of community members.

CTAD member Chemba Ranganathan shared that she spoke to many people in smaller groups, stopped people in the park, etc.

CTAD member J.R. Fruen shared that in his individual conversations, the average response is one of not much opinion at all.

CTAD chair Doug Kunz shared that at the Lakewood and Bishop PTA meetings there was a preference for a hybrid map that is based on the middle school boundaries.

3.3 District Staff: Staff member Rachel Zlotziver referred to the packet of recent feedback that was shared with the CTAD ahead of the meeting. While there has not been much additional actionable feedback, what has been received echoed the patterns we have already seen with nothing strikingly new. Superintendent Graham Clark shared that some of the feedback received continues to be on issues outside of the CTAD's purview, particularly around asking the Board of Trustees to delay this process.

4. Review Community Maps & Feedback to Select Focus Maps

Staff member Melisa Wonch stated that the group was now going to debrief the community feedback as a whole and that some analysis had already been done for our last Board map hearing. She shared that the group would take all the community-based maps and create groups of similar maps. A map could be placed in multiple groups depending on what the map represents. She shared that the maps had been color coded as follows: green is fully compliant, black is non-compliant, and yellow is not recommended, per legal counsel. She stated that she didn't want the group to discard the black and yellow maps yet, as the community has stated what the purpose is and we might still be able to take something meaningful from those comments as we reflect on what the community is saying. It is important that the community knows that we have taken every single map received and looked at it, even if it is not fully compliant. Our demographer Carolyn Scholl has moved some maps into compliance, but there could still be an issue that our legal counsel sees. The goal is to narrow down the maps to five or less. Melisa also stated that extra copies of each map and a reference book were available.

CTAD member Sid Jain asked a clarifying question about who Woolpert is. Melisa explained that our demographers, Cooperative Strategies, were recently acquired by Woolpert.

Melisa asked the CTAD members if they heard any themes over the last few months that

hadn't been captured so far.

CTAD member Wesley Chen stated that when looking at the sequencing summary, the maps fall into two groups of maps. One group is very definite, while the other group has multiple sequencing options. He stated he didn't understand why the group would consider the second group of maps at all as he felt it would be inviting opposition in the community. Melisa shared that staff wanted to present all the information to the committee, and that until we saw the maps we didn't know what all the options would be.

Legal counsel William Tunick addressed the question posed by CTAD member Wesley Chen that it would seem to be more efficient to look at sequencing first. William stated that while it is important to be efficient, the committee also needs to comply with the law. With the new rules of AB 764, there is a prohibition on choosing maps that favor incumbents. He stated that focusing first on the communities of interest and other factors, and then looking at the sequencing, is probably the right order. Melisa reiterated that we don't want to discount what our community has provided.

CTAD member Angela Hixson stated her feeling that the committee would risk major opposition if we don't consider every map and that she would like to consider all the maps first.

CTAD Chair Doug Kunz stated that the spirit of what the committee is doing is the best answer, not necessarily the fastest answer.

Staff member Melisa Wonch reiterated her question to the group about whether there are themes or patterns they have seen or heard, beyond the ones that have already been noted (high school attendance boundaries, city boundaries, neighborhood boundaries, distance between home/school transportation).

CTAD member Chemba Ranganathan shared her observation that people tended to only comment on the North or South portion of the district in the maps, not both.

Staff member Melisa Wonch stated that is something to keep in mind as we go through the maps, that perhaps the top of one map might make sense to pair with the bottom of a different map.

CTAD member Alan Dowdell asked a clarifying question about whether neighborhood boundaries are the same as middle/elementary boundaries. Melisa stated that they are different and that we may not be able to solve for both in the same map.

CTAD member Angela Hixson stated that the Lynbrook community wants to make sure that their attendance area is not split. Melisa stated that the Monta Vista area also provided similar feedback.

CTAD member Chemba Rangathan asked for clarification about the comments on the distance between home and school and transportation and how that is reflected in the maps. Melisa and Angela stated that that community would like to stay together and be treated as a community of interest

Staff member Melisa Wonch asked the committee if they feel that there is a priority between middle school and elementary boundaries. CTAD member Julia Zhao stated that she thinks keeping middle school boundaries together is the larger priority.

CTAD member Alan Dowdell stated that the group is trying to make decisions on the priority of different criteria, we have to recognize that what is more important to one person may not be as important to someone else. He suggested the group might want to run a process to weigh these priorities. Staff member Melisa Wonch clarified that this is the community's feedback not the CTAD feedback. For instance, over 100 emails were received regarding keeping to the high school boundaries, so we know that is one of the most important things to the community. As the committee groups the maps, in one group you could list the priorities of that map/group, but the priorities might be different for another map/group.

CTAD member Wesley Chen asked for more clarification on sequencing. Staff member Melisa Wonch asked if that discussion could be tabled until Item 5 on the agenda.

CTAD member Bill Wilson asked a question on the high school attendance boundaries, and if the community was asking for one trustee area to be aligned exactly to a high school attendance boundary. Melisa stated that we did ask the demographers to create this map and it was non-compliant, with a variance of around 120% variance. In addition, draft map Scenario 4 tried to keep to the school boundaries as much as possible. Melisa clarified that this feedback was heard mostly from the Southern part of the district. This echoes Chemba's earlier comments on what the northern part of the district is more focused on vs. what southern part of the district is more focused on.

CTAD member JR Fruen asked a question of legal counsel. For the two maps that were deemed non-compliant due to not being contiguous in the South-Eastern part of the district where San Jose comes to a thin point within the District – he asked what was the legal definition of an area being contiguous. Legal counsel, William Tunick answered with that it needed to be more than 1 point. The demographer on Zoom, Carolyn Scholl confirmed that the small area was just above 1 point. It was deemed that these two maps would be moved from non-complaint to complaint, but not recommended due to

other factors. Legal counsel stated that because the map was factoring in other criteria, such as keeping communities of interest together, the committee had justification for being so close to the 1 point limit.

CTAD member Julia Zhao asked if the criteria could be placed up on the screen. Melisa put it up on the screen for the committee to see, with the criteria as follows: contiguous, maintain communities of interest, city/census designated places, natural/artificial boundaries, compactness.

CTAD member Taek Kim stated that feeder schools have such an established connection between the parents and considering the feeder schools together as best we can might be helpful. Melisa stated that this should be covered in the theme of middle school boundaries.

CTAD member Julia Zhao stated that there is some feeling that Lynbrook can be in an area with part of the other attendance areas, it doesn't have to be strict boundary. Melisa stated that because of the size of Lynbrook, that area will have to share a trustee area with other parts of the district. CTAD member Wesley Chen reiterated Julia's comments and stated that he wasn't hearing any strong opposition to that. CTAD member Alan Dowdell clarified that the feedback is they don't want an actual other school campus in their area, but part of another school boundary would be ok.

CTAD member Alan Dowdell asked if there is a theme with a map where each area covers more than one boundary area. Melisa stated that we were asked by the Board to do that (Scenario 1), but we haven't really seen that request in the community feedback.

Staff member Melisa Wonch stated that we can look at various layers (feeder school boundaries, neighborhoods, etc.) with each map. The neighborhood layer may not be perfect, but we did the best we could with the information we had. Please let us know if there are adjustments that need to be made.

CTAD member Chemba Ranganathan had a question about income and incumbency. Melisa stated that we didn't have enough feedback on income to bring that to the top of our themes and we aren't allowed to consider incumbency.

Melisa asked everyone to get up and come to the board for discussion and grouping of the map. Discussion started around 7 p.m. and ended around 9 p.m. Maps were ultimately grouped into six focus groups. The focus maps, from the community-submitted maps, were tentatively decided to be Map H, Map K and a map combination of the top of Map K and the bottom of Map T.

5. Review Sequencing

Legal counsel William Tunick reviewed how the sequencing summary was created. The first piece of criteria is to look at where the highest CVAP numbers are for a protected group. The next piece of criteria is having trustees in all the areas as soon as possible, which is something we have also heard from the community.

Looking at the maps that the CTAD has tentatively decided upon as a recommendation, Map K sequencing is set for 2024, as Area 4 has the highest Asian CVAP and Area 5 has the highest Hispanic CVAP. This scenario is relatively straightforward. (**Please note that in the second set of draft map scenarios presented to the community on March 13, the trustee areas were renumbered and colored to be consistent with the original first set of draft map scenarios from October. The notes here are presented as how the community member submitted their map, not as they show up in Scenarios 5-7.)*)

In Map H, three areas currently do not have incumbents living in them. Area 4 has the highest CVAP. This creates more options for sequencing. Area 4 should go in 2024, but then there could be an option of 3 or 1 going in 2024. CTAD member Sid Jain asked if there is a preference in legal terms. William Tunick said there isn't necessarily a preference and either could be justifiable. *Please note that in the second set of draft map scenarios presented to the community on March 13, the trustee areas were renumbered and colored to be consistent with the original first set of draft map scenarios from October. The notes here are presented as how the community member submitted their map, not as they show up in Scenarios 5-7.)*

CTAD Chair Doug Kunz said that in Map H there are tradeoffs on the sequencing. On the one hand, having Area 3 up in 2024 immediately gives Lynbrook a trustee which would be responsive to community concerns the group has heard. On other hand, for continuity for board members, there is value in that. CTAD member Wesley Chen said it is difficult to decide which of those two things should be prioritized and suggested that it might be helpful for the Board to see both options.

CTAD member Angela Hixson echoed Wesley's point and asked if it was possible to give the Board both options on Map H. Staff responded that this would work.

William Tunick stated that on the combination map there also might be multiple sequencing options and that we would have to bring those back.

Staff member Melisa Wonch asked the committee if they wanted to propose both options H and K/T with both options on sequencing to the Board.

CTAD member Angela Hixson asked if the group might make one sequencing option for one map and a different one on another. Melisa sated she thought it would be ok to put both/all options on each.

The scenarios with sequencing are proposed as

- Map H with both sequencing options
- Map K – 2024 (4,5) and 2026 (1,2,3) – (**Please note that in the second set of draft map scenarios presented to the community on March 13, the trustee areas were renumbered and colored to be consistent with the original first set of draft map scenarios from October. The notes here are presented how the community member submitted their map, not as they show up in Scenarios 5-7.)*)
- Top of Map K and Bottom of Map T with all sequencing options

It was noted that maps will need to be cleaned up by the demographers, as the numbers correlating to each trustee area do not currently align in all the community-submitted maps.

6. Review and Approve Recommendation to the Board for March 20, 2024

Public comment: Community member Peter Liu thanked the CTAD committee for their hard work and a great job. He stated his preference for the T/K combination map.

Community member Aegean Lee thanked the CTAD committee for their hard work. She said it was nice to attend this meeting and see that everyone is working hard. She stated that the West San Jose community has only had three trustees and that they don't have anyone to speak for them. She stated that she wants to keep the community together. She disagrees with the bottom of Map K. She stated the community wants to have their own school and area, and it is not good to combine with the Cupertino area, which has lots of buildings coming with apartments. She stated that she preferred the bottom of Map T.

Community member Lily stated that she appreciated the help and effort in trying to compromise and meet the best interests of the district. She asked that Lynbrook be given a chance. She stated that she is against Map K, but that everything else looks good.

CTAD member Wesley Chen made a motion to recommend the following maps to the Board of Trustees in the order of preference of Map T/K, Map H and Map K. The motion was seconded by CTAD member Julia Zhao.

CTAD member Alan Dowdell asked for clarification on why Wesley preferred the T bottom map to Map H. Wesley stated because it resolves a sequencing issue. CTAD member JR Fruen also pointed out that it moves Rancho Rinconada back into the Cupertino area. CTAD member Sid Jain also stated that the elementary district boundaries better align in that map.

CTAD chair Doug Kunz stated that looking at Map K/T, the boundary goes along Fremont Avenue on one map, and on the other it goes up higher. Doug made a friendly amendment to make the border at Fremont High School all the way across in this combination map. The friendly amendment was accepted by CTAD member Wesley Chen.

Staff member Rachel Zlotziver took a roll call vote. The votes were as follows:

Wesley Chen - yes
Alan Dowdell - yes
JR Fruen - yes
David Fung - no
Angela Hixson - yes
Sid Jain - yes
Doug Kunz - yes
Rommy Kushner - yes
Chemba Ranganathan - yes
Kei Sato - yes
Bill Wilson - yes
Julia Zhao - yes
Taek Kim – yes
Kashish Mittal - yes

The motion passed.

7. Community Feedback Opportunities on Focus Maps

CTAD Chair Doug Kunz stated that the second round of feedback on the maps would now take place between March 13 through April 3. Options for feedback will include a survey and additional meetings. Staff member Melisa Wonch proposed that the committee members take this back out to the community in virtual meetings. She asked

for volunteers to put the next presentation together. It was agreed to have a districtwide webinar on Sunday, March 24. Others volunteered to hold in-person events.

Melisa reviewed the online survey. There was consensus in the group to move forward with the survey as presented.

CTAD member Angela Hixson asked for clarification that that group would be making a second recommendation to the Board. Melisa stated that the group would be making a second recommendation and would be reviewing all the feedback that comes in during the next few weeks. At the final CTAD meeting in April there will be an opportunity for the group to make any revisions in reaction to community feedback.

8. Next Steps and Action Items

This item was tabled as it was covered under Item 7.

9. Communications

9.1 Public Communications: Community member Elaine Manley, from the League of Women Voters, shared that it was fun to watch the committee members work. She stated her feeling that this was civil discourse at its finest, and that while there might have been a couple of bumps along the way, the group listened to the community and came together in their recommendation. She stated that they ended with some great maps and thanked the committee for its work.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.