

Community Trustee Area Districting (CTAD) Committee

589 W. Fremont Ave., Sunnyvale, CA 94087

www.fuhsd.org/ctad

Regular Meeting Minutes

*****Please note that because the last CTAD meeting was held on April 8, these minutes will not be officially approved by the CTAD committee.*****

Monday, April 8, 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 March 11 Committee Meeting

J.R. Fruen made a motion to approve the March 11 minutes. Angela Hixson seconded the motion. The meeting minutes were unanimously approved by the CTAD members in attendance.

3. Communications

3.1 Public Communications: Community member Yan Tan stated that she did not like Maps 5, 6 or 7. She said the Sunnyvale community is underrepresented and this would lead to a breakup of the union. She wanted to ensure that the Homestead High School community has equal representation and asked that it not be split into more than two areas.

Yuying Mei, a parent from Homestead High School, said she strongly disagreed with Maps 5 through 7. She advocated for the map that is labeled as Yan's alternative proposal. She said the other maps have been divisive and creating polarization in the community.

Bruce Miao, an HHS parent, stated that Homestead is the heart of the community and that more students deserve adequate representation. He stated his support for Yan's map to follow the current school boundaries.

Community member Ravi Gupta stated they are supporting Yan's plan and asked that the committee look at it from community of interest point of view. They said that areas of attendance must be a critical community of interest since this is a high school district. They said that Yan's map modifies Scenario 7. They stated that outreach has been lacking in their community.

Qin Lei, a Homestead parent, stated that Yan's plan meets common districting requirements very well, with the attendance boundaries as communities of interest. They said that Yan's map makes sure the HHS community is kept together with a HHS majority.

Allen Yang, a future Homestead parent, stated that the outreach process was not done well and his neighbors had never heard about this process. He stated that HHS would like equal representation.

Community member Ray Xu stated that he understood that people have different opinions in this process, and that many of those opinions are conflicting with each other. He stated that whatever principles the committee uses to balance the areas, to please do that evenly across the district. He stated that he understood that with the population balancing requirement it is not always possible, but that the committee should try.

Community member Susan Salop stated that she had been following this process since December and thanked the CTAD committee. She stated that three things have become apparent to her: the FUHSD Board of Trustees decided to move to this process to avoid

lawsuits, etc., the North Sunnyvale area has historically not been represented, and thus North Sunnyvale should be prioritized in Cycle 1 - 2024 as it has never had a trustee. She stated there is lots of talent in North Sunnyvale.

Community member Christina Zhang stated that she appreciated everyone being here to hear the community's voices. She said the reason she moved to the HHS community was for her children. She said that the community shares common interests and culture and she asked the committee to think about the HHS community together.

Community member Ying Liu said they didn't know about this plan until recently. They stated their objection to scenarios 5, 6 and 7 and that they support Yan's map.

Community member and alum Jannie Zhong advocated for Yan's plan. She said that the CVRA is meant to avoid dilution of minority votes and that Maps 5, 6 and 7 move HHS families into other trustee areas where other schools have more families.

Carol Gao, parent of a HHS alum, stated that the HHS community needs their voice to be heard. She said that the current options divide the HHS community and HHS loses the majority representation. She stated her support for Yan's map.

Wendy Xiang, a parent at Cherry Chase and Sunnyvale Middle schools, stated she just became aware of the process last week. She asked why one of the priorities is around keeping middle schools together when this is a high school district mapping process. She stated her support for Yan's map.

Mei Yang, parent of a son who graduated from HHS and a daughter starting next year, said they weren't aware of this process until very recently. They oppose Maps 5, 6 and 7 because they divide the HHS community into three or four trustee areas and stated that they feel this is unfair as other schools are divided less. They support Yan's map.

Ben-Li Sheu, HHS parent and 17-year Sunnyvale resident, stated that many in the HHS community are concerned about Scenarios 5, 6 and 7 as they divide HHS into multiple trustee areas. He stated he wants a trustee who can fully represent the HHS voice if there is a conflict of interest. He stated his support of Yan's map.

Emily Ng, HHS parent and 18-year Sunnyvale resident, stated her concerns about the existing map scenarios for the reasons stated by other parents. She strongly suggested that the CTAD consider Yan's map.

Wenyi Feng, from the HHS neighborhood, stated that they were one of many angry parents because the maps chop HHS into many pieces. They stated that today is the opportunity for the HHS voices to be heard. They thanked Yan for making a thoughtful map.

Jennifer Lung, a Cherry Chase parent, stated that she is against Maps 5, 6 and 7. She said that the maps assume that people that go to Cherry Chase and Sunnyvale Middle want to stay together. She said there were no meetings at Cumberland or Cherry Chase, and one table at Sunnyvale Back to School night. She said that Homestead would like to stay together as a community.

Jennifer Griffin, a graduate of HHS, stated that she lives in Rancho Rinconada which wasn't part of the City of Cupertino until 2000. She stated her concerns about CVRA affecting CUSD. She stated that Rancho Rinconada is split in Map 6 with no rhyme or reason. She stated that Liang Chao, Cupertino City councilmember, pointed this out.

Chunfeng Hao, a CHS parent, stated that they support Map 6, as it is the only map keeping their area aligned with the current high school attendance boundary. They support this map with Sequencing Option B.

3.2: CTAD Committee Members:

Committee members Wesley Chen, Sid Jain, Chemba Ranganathan and Julia Zhao provided an update on their meeting at Calabazas Library Meeting. Wesley shared that there continues to be polarized opinions, but that attendance areas have to be divided somewhat to make the maps work within the requirements. He stated his hope that the community can understand this and the fact that there are strict laws that govern this process. Julia stated that although there are polarized feelings in the community, the thing that there seems to be in common is that everyone wants their trustee area to be aligned with their school attendance area.

Committee members Bill Wilson and David Fung held a meeting with some community members from the Monta Vista area. They stated that one thing that was good about the committee publishing a set of maps was that it created a lot of feedback. The community members they met with liked Map 6 and Option B for sequencing, but they noted there are a lot of strong opinions. Bill stated that this reminded him that the role of the committee is to provide input to the Board rather than make decisions and that the committee members need to do their best to give them the material to do that effectively. David shared that what came across as particularly important to this group was the sequencing, especially with the current circumstances of the Board. There was a question from this group about how sequencing would affect their representation. He stated that it was a difficult process to start with 25 maps and narrow them down to two or three options. He stated that he would like to come back to a discussion of whether the final options presented to the Board should be ranked as they were last time.

Committee member Angela Hixson shared that the districtwide webinar went well. She shared that there was clearly a divide with some groups strongly in favor of Map 5, others in favor of Map 6, etc.

Committee member Chemba Ranganathan shared she held a meeting with some community members from the Montclair and West Valley areas who had reached out to her through Next Door and who stated that there was no outreach for the HHS area. These community members don't like how the maps split the HHS community.

Committee members Rommy Kushner and Angela Hixson attended the San Miguel PTA meeting. There were questions about the process and the maps, and concern with how the new maps had lost some the Hispanic CVAP percentage – going from 28.4% to 27.7%. Angela explained that even if you add more neighborhoods to that map, you wouldn't just be adding to the Hispanic CVAP, but also adding other parts of the population and this might actually have the effect of dropping the overall Hispanic CVAP percentage.

Committee member Kei Sato held a meeting with HHS parents, the focus of which was on the desire for their community not to be broken up into too many areas. They felt that if it was going to be broken up this way, then that should be the same for the other schools. He also shared their feedback that they don't view the elementary and middle schools as communities of interest.

Committee Chair Doug Kunz and committee member David Fung attended a virtual meeting with Homestead community members. Doug shared that the point was made, that regardless of whether it is viewed as advantage or disadvantage to have multiple trustee areas as part of your school attendance area, that this principle had not been applied equally across the district map scenarios. He also stated that there were reactive meetings held at MVHS and LHS, but that with the benefit of hindsight should more meetings have been held at other schools later in the process. David Fung stated that the committee tried many ways of doing outreach, with varying levels of success.

Superintendent Clark stated that throughout the process staff and the committee have heard from many of our schools about wanting to follow school boundaries for the Trustee Area maps. He stated that the demographers ran a map like that at the start of the process and the variance was over 100%. He also stated that the Board of Trustees did ask for map with school attendance boundaries divided between multiple areas to have a broader vision of the district. He stated it is good practice, and our district's practice, for trustees to act in best interest of the whole district, and that this is something the district wants to maintain in the future.

Committee member Wesley Chen echoed what Doug and Dave mentioned about the sharing of information in different parts of the community.

3.3: District Staff: Staff member Melisa Wonch stated that while Map Scenarios 1 through 4 were up for several months, there were only 100 survey responses. However, with the second set of maps, there were more than 2,000 survey responses in just three weeks. In this second round, there was more actionable feedback.

Melisa stated that there was lots of feedback on the map submitted by Yan and that our demographer had done some work on that during public comment so that the committee would be able to review that at the appropriate point in the agenda.

4. Review of Community Feedback

Staff member Melisa Wonch asked the committee how they wanted to look at the feedback received which would be used to refine the maps. She shared the following feedback that was shared by the Board at the Map Hearing on March 20, 2024:

- Request to lower the variance on Scenario 5. A target of 5% was suggested.
- The issue of school closure was mentioned, specifically the layers of the attendance boundaries in CUSD where schools were recently closed. Melisa stated that staff did not plan to make changes to this layer and would leave the elementary schools as labeled because the families who would have attended these schools are given a choice of where to attend, rather than being absorbed by a specific school.
- A question was raised about whether Scenario 6 had a third option for sequencing (i.e. Areas 3 and 5 in 2024)? Melisa shared a written response from legal counsel regarding why a third option wasn't presented at the meeting:

"In summary, after the 2026 election all five trustee areas will have a trustee elected by/living in each area. However, as a function of the staggered elections, the fact that Scenario 5 has three areas without existing trustees who will serve through 2026, and that there are only two elections in 2024, means that at least one trustee area will be without a resident trustee between 2024 and 2026. In determining which two areas should hold elections in 2024, the Board will need to first give special consideration to the purpose of the CVRA, enhancing the ability of protected classes to influence district elections, followed by consideration of the preferences expressed by members of the districts and any other factors. At that later stage, it may also consider the location of current incumbents and the benefits of continuity on the Board."

Committee member David Fung stated that a list of alternative maps was not available to the community ahead of time. He said that while this work may have been done in response to the various pieces of feedback submitted by the community, he wondered if this is allowable as a committee. Melisa stated that the maps were part of the feedback within the emails received by the community.

Melisa reviewed the major takeaways from the two rounds of feedback. In the first round of feedback, the themes were around school attendance boundaries, neighborhoods, small cities, and the area farthest from the school site/transportation challenges. In the second round of feedback, the themes included keeping the LHS attendance area in one trustee area that does not include another high school's physical location, sequencing area 3 in 2024, sequencing area 5 in 2024, the Hispanic/Latino CVAP differences between various maps, not splitting the Homestead High School attendance area into multiple trustee areas, and not splitting Rancho Rinconada between multiple trustee areas and keeping that neighborhood with Cupertino High School.

Committee member Julia Zhao added that CHS is divided between two trustee areas, and the community wants to make sure they have a reasonable majority in one area.

Melisa reiterated what had been previously stated by several committee members about the fact that attendance areas will have to be split up to some degree due to the attendance boundaries not being equal in population, size, shape, and compactness.

Committee member Angela Hixson stated that there was also feedback about Area 2 being chosen to be in the first cycle in 2024. Melisa stated that she left this out because legally it needs to go in 2024. Angela also referenced that there was feedback about wanting to keep the split of Sunnyvale that is shown in Scenarios 5, 6 and 7.

Committee member Rommy Kushner stated that there is also concern that this split of Sunnyvale brings down the Hispanic/Latino CVAP.

Committee member Julia Zhao stated that there has been feedback about the current lack of trustees in San Jose and Saratoga.

Melisa clarified that Area 2 isn't getting special consideration because they haven't had a trustee in the past, but because they have a high percentage of a protected class under the CVRA.

Committee member Taek Kim stated that while this feedback is not directly related to the maps, there has been feedback about delaying the process and that he wants to

make sure those voices are being heard. Melisa stated that that feedback does not fall under the purview of the CTAD and should be directed to the Board of Trustees.

Melisa shared that she wanted the committee to go through these themes and break them down further. She reminded the group that it is not possible to do all things in one map. It will be necessary to list what each map does and give the Board options. The committee can talk about the pros and cons of having a singular trustee vs. having a trustee area cover multiple school areas. Each school boundary is different in size, compactness, population, etc. For instance, Lynbrook is very small and compact so it is harder to divide up, but then there are some very long and large boundaries that will have to be divided up to make the maps work with the required criteria. She stated there is an inherent challenge in trying to apply the same rule across all the school communities.

Committee member David Fung reiterated that part of the problem is the radical difference between school boundaries. He stated that the district has gone to great lengths not to change school boundaries, but that this presents a problem in responding to some of the community feedback around aligning trustee areas with the school boundaries. He stated that he was in favor of having multiple school attendance areas within a trustee area, but that the district layout makes that hard.

Committee member Bill Wilson stated that school board members have historically thought of themselves as representing the entire district and that it should be the district's goal to keep that going. He stated he felt this would be easier if trustee areas cover a few schools.

Committee member Angela Hixson stated that the committee must look realistically at the district population, with HHS and FHS as the biggest schools. She pointed out that FHS is also split into multiple trustee areas.

Committee member Taek Kim stated that he could understand why people would want to have one school per boundary. He stated that the committee is limited in what it can do because of the population balance requirement and other legal requirements.

Committee member Wesley Chen stated that he generally supports having trustees representing multiple schools, but suggested that the committee might strive for each trustee area to have one high school that is dominant in that area.

Committee member Chemba Ranganathan said that the understanding of and consideration of communities of interest is different depending on the area, so it is difficult to make everything uniform across the district in a map.

Superintendent Clark paused the conversation about community feedback to report that the demographer had informed him that the map submitted by Yan and supported by some of the HHS community members in attendance at the meeting did not have three Asian majority CVAP areas.

Committee member Sid Jain said that in the first round of feedback there seemed to be a big push to get the cities aligned as much as possible, but that that feedback seemed to lessen this in the second round.

Staff member Melisa Wonch stated that there was also feedback around balancing the priority of maintaining the highest Hispanic CVAP possible in Area 2 with the other concerns raised by residents in North Sunnyvale. She stated that staff had received some feedback and questions about why only one option for how Sunnyvale was split was presented in Maps 5 through 7 and that she wanted the committee to discuss whether another option should be looked at for the Board to consider.

Melisa also stated that sequencing will have to be confirmed with legal counsel after the meeting, but that she would do a rough estimate on any maps decided upon.

Committee member Julia Zhao question referenced the various communities of interest as related to school boundaries – elementary, middle and high school, and asked what is the priority for the group, since it can't all be achieved.

Committee member Kei Sato stated that he is thinking of the feedback as being additive, not taking away from the earlier feedback.

Committee member Angela Hixson stated that the more people get involved with the mapmaking, the more they see the importance of elementary and middle schools boundaries are.

Committee member J.R. Fruen stated that the more people look at this process, the more they see the challenges the committee has.

Committee member David Fung stated that it was interesting when going through 25 maps at the previous meeting, the preference for middle school boundaries was more viewable/apparent than elementary schools. He stated that because high school attendance boundaries on their own are not a usable criteria, but when you subdivide this, middle schools might be the happy medium.

Staff member Melisa Wonch stated that the committee might flip the lens they are using and look at it as each trustee area having multiple school attendance boundaries it each, vs. coming at it from attendance boundary lens.

5. Map Refinement

Staff member Melisa Wonch asked the group to share their goals for the final maps:

- At least one map option with at least two attendance areas per trustee area
- More uniformity - apply the same rules across the district if possible, with two attendance boundaries per area
 - It was noted that it likely cannot be even across the district, but could be two or three per area. Melisa stated that there has to be some flexibility. We hear the community saying that one school shouldn't be split up in four areas, while another is all in one.
 - Maintaining three Asian majority CVAP districts
 - Maintaining at least 27% Hispanic CVAP in Area 2
 - Melisa reminded the group that the CVAP is based on a five-year rolling average. Committee member Angela Hixson stated that she understood this, but that knowing what is possible to reach, she felt the committee should hold ourselves to that number even if it is a higher standard than what is required. Committee member Sid Jain stated he didn't think there should be a specific number. Melisa recommended the criteria be maintaining a high Hispanic/Latino CVAP, with a range between 27.7-28.4%.

Melisa asked if the committee wanted to have a map where each high school has a majority in each trustee area. Committee members Wesley Chen and Julia Zhao both agreed this was part of the community feedback they heard. Committee member Kei Sato asked what the impact would be on the Board working together in the best interest of the district if everyone has their own dominant school. Wesley asked the question if there was a better way to proceed. Committee member J.R. Fruen stated that part of the committee's mandate is to aggregate the views of the public and that there has been a theme where each high school wants to feel clearly represented.

Committee member Heidi Suarez Espinosa stated her concern is around keeping as close to 28% Hispanic/Latino CVAP as possible. Committee member Rommy Kusher stated that this process is about what is best for all students at the end of the day, not about adult interests. She reiterated that there is a lot of disagreement in the survey results.

Committee member Bill Wilson provided some thoughts on the final work product. He stated that the group has seen that when you receive a lot of input, there are a lot of different opinions about what is best. He stated that this is a challenging process of

balancing different competing interests, and that this is what the Board is elected to do. He stated he believes that the committee's job is not so much to do that, but to gather and organize the input to help facilitate the Board's decision. He stated his opinion that the results of the committee's final meeting should ideally be a set of maps with no order or ranking. He stated he felt that that would produce a richer set of options than making a decision on the committee's favorite map. Committee Chair Doug Kunz agreed with Bill's comments. Committee member Sid Jain asked some clarifying questions around Bill's suggestion, since the committee had previously ranked the options in their first recommendation to the Board. Bill reiterated his feeling that since so much of the feedback has been contradictory, it would be a disservice to rank the options and not provide all the feedback evenly. Doug stated that he felt that any maps put forward by the committee should be maps that the committee would be comfortable having adopted by the Board. Committee member J.R. Fruen echoed Doug's comments. He also stated he felt that the group was now in a different stage of the process than we were at the last meeting. He stated the committee needed to respect the Board's role vs. its own. If the committee states too strongly a preference for one map over another, is the committee effectively trying to make the decision. Committee member Wesley Chen stated he was fine with not ranking the maps, but that the strengths and drawbacks of each map should be noted.

Staff member Melisa Wonch asked if the committee agreed to present the Board with all sequencing options if there are multiple options. The committee agreed to this. A question was asked about how the community would know what the sequencing was ahead of the meeting. Melisa reminded the committee that the maps and sequencing would have to be posted a week before the final map hearing on April 24.

Committee member Kei Sato asked if there should be a goal for the variance. Wesley stated that he felt the goalposts keep moving on this. The legal requirement is 10%, but there was Board feedback to reduce it to around 5%. Melisa reiterated that legally it just has to be under 10%.

Committee member David Fung stated he had questions on how some of the legal guidance provided around sequencing should be interpreted, particularly as related to Area 2. He stated he felt that the guidance was somewhat ambiguous since there are multiple protected classes in the district. Superintendent Clark stated that legal counsel had been asked directly if there was a sequencing option on Map 6 where Area 2 would not go in cycle 1 in 2024, and legal counsel did not recommend that as an option.

The committee took a break at 8:36 p.m. and returned at 8:53 p.m.

Once the map refinement goals were complete the group turned to look at how each map could be refined with the goals, community feedback, and criteria. The group started with Map 5. The community provided modification suggestions via email to reduce the variation in Map 5. Staff tried their best to provide these suggestions to the demographer ahead of the meeting to see if they were viable. Doing this onsite at the meeting would have been impossible within the time constraints of the evening.

Staff member Melisa Wonch discussed some changes to Scenario 5 (5a) to see if the demographer could bring down variance on Map 5 in response to the Board's and committee's feedback. Committee member Wesley Chen stated that one of the Asian majority CVAP areas is lost in this map. Committee member David Fung stated that in this map Area 5 became larger. Melisa asked if there were revisions the demographer could make during the meeting to address some of the issues.

The demographer discussed another possible alternative to Scenario 5 (5b), where every trustee area has two school boundaries within it. HHs is divided into four areas.

The demographer discussed additional alternatives to Scenario 5, including community feedback from emails (5C-5E).

While the demographer worked on a variation of Map 5 the group moved on to Map 6. There were clarification questions around Map 6, and it was clarified that Map 6 on the web app was the correct map to view. No feedback was given prior to the meeting for modifications to Map 6. At this time the group did not have any revisions for Map 6.

Staff member Melisa Wonch reviewed a possible revision to Map 7. While staff created a set of options for the committee ahead of time, the Homestead community presented a revised version at the meeting (7D). The demographer spent the first part of the meeting, putting this version through the mapping software. As the group reviewed the options, Committee member Julia Zhao pointed out that map 7A would only have two Asian majority CVAP areas. The demographer stated that all the variations of Map 7 so far were like this. The demographer continued to work on seeing what it would take make 7D balance with all of the criteria, including having three Asian majority CVAP trustee areas.

While the demographer went to work on 7D, Melisa moved on to the modification option labeled Map 8. She stated that part of 5A and some parts of the original scenarios (2-4) were used. Melisa asked the committee if they should give the Board multiple options for the Northern part of the district or if one option seemed appropriate.

Committee member Wesley Chen stated that he felt that dividing any school attendance area into four trustee areas was too much. Chair Doug Kunz agreed with this comment.

Chair Doug Kunz asked the group about the question Melisa was posing earlier about the Northern part of the district. Committee member Angela Hixson stated that there was value in giving the board options, but stated that she had concerns not just about the split of Homestead, but also regarding a possible east west split of the Lakewood and Ellis areas, since the committee and staff had received a lot of feedback about North Sunnyvale being a community of interest. She stated that an East/West split opens the strong possibility of both Sunnyvale trustees being from south of Evelyn. Committee member Rommy Kushner stated that she would lean towards giving the Board the option, and that they are the ones that are making the final choice. She stated that an East/West split increases the Hispanic/Latino CVAP and that community members have been asking for that to be kept as high as possible. Committee member Heidi Suarez Espinosa stated she shared Rommy's opinion about the East/West split option for Sunnyvale as it supports what they have heard in their conversations with the community. Committee member Wesley Chen asked if we could see what the East/West split looked like and staff member Melisa Wonch displayed the map. Committee member Angela Hixson stated that Maps 5 through 7 recommended by the CTAD all had the combo split, so the question is should we change that up to add an option with an East/West split. Committee Chair Doug Kunz stated that in the outreach he participated in North Sunnyvale, when the three different options were presented, people did tend to prefer the combination split. That is the feedback from Vargas and Bishop, which featured simultaneous translation, and also from Lakewood. At Columbia and Sunnyvale Community Services the preference was more split. Committee member Angela Hixson stated that she didn't know if she could say that there is a clear preference among the Hispanic community.

Committee Chair Doug Kunz stated he was wrestling with how to give the Board options that are actionable but not overwhelming. He stated that what he heard in North Sunnyvale was that there was general consensus but not unanimity. But he stated he felt the hybrid map was still what most people were favoring.

Committee member J.R. Fruen stated that he generally agreed that the committee is not trying to make everyone happy, and it doesn't feel like there was anyone who was upset with the North/South split. He stated he was not particularly interested to revisit that portion of the maps.

Staff member Melisa Wonch asked if by only providing one option for the Northern part of the district is the committee deciding for the board vs. giving them the option. Committee member Kei Sato stated he agreed, but that at some point there are going to

be too many permutations taken to the Board.

Staff member Melisa Wonch asked if the committee wanted to look more at refining Map 5. Committee member Angela Hixson asked if there is a variation of Map 5 that the CHS community is comfortable with. Committee member Wesley Chen said maybe variation 5C.

Several CTAD members gave additional suggestions on changes to Map 5. It was agreed the demographer would work on these suggestions during a brief break.

The committee returned from break at 9:57 p.m.

Superintendent Clark made a recommendation to move to public comment since people have been waiting and table the discussion, with a possible additional CTAD meeting.

Committee member Angela Hixson asked when this additional meeting would be.

The demographer noted that the results of the suggestions made before the break brought down the variance and kept the three Asian majority CVAP areas. *(Please note as shown later in the minutes, this was not accurate and the statement was latest corrected by the demographer. This is referenced as map 5F).*

Through a quick poll around the table, it was confirmed that the majority of the CTAD members would not be available on Friday April 12, which would be the only date that would work with the required timeline of posting the final set of maps by Wednesday, April 17. There was a consensus by show of hands for the committee to continue deliberating.

CTAD Chair Doug Kunz made a suggestion to address the HHS community's concerns in the southern part of the district. This could be considered revision 5F, which has a 5.7% variance and three majority Asian CVAP areas. Committee member David Fung stated that this map now has a very high variance in the Monta Vista area. The demographer mentioned that it is ok to have differences between the variances in trustee areas as long as total variance is less than 10%. Staff member Melisa Wonch asked if there was a suggestion on how to bring the areas closer together. Committee member Julia Zhao stated that the Monta Vista community told her they prefer to have a negative variance in their area because they feel like they have more voting power.

CTAD member David Fung asked a question about sequencing and stated this map would favor trustee area three going in 2024, but it was pointed out there is someone that would continue to provide representation to that area and the second criteria after

protected classes is where there are natural vacancies. David reiterated his earlier statements that he feels the sequencing guidance is not clear.

CTAD Chair Doug Kunz asked the committee to look at how their stated goals from earlier in the meeting match up against this map. Committee members shared the following:

- The map has at least two attendance areas per trustee area
- Seems to meet the fairness criteria
- Each trustee area has a prominent school
- Staff member Melisa Wonch asked if it met the compactness criteria. Carolyn stated there was justification for the areas where it might seem less compact, the reasoning just has to be explained.
- It maintains the three Asian majority CVAP areas, as well as a high Hispanic CVAP in area 2

Doug asked the committee if there were other variations of Map 5 that the committee wanted to work through, or do we want to move forward.

It was asked if Area 2 could be changed to include the Perry Park portion of Area 4.

As the demographer worked on the revisions, the group continued back to Scenario 6, it was asked if adjustments could be made to stop Rancho Rinconada from being split. Committee member Bill Wilson stated that people favored this map partially because they liked how the boundary is at Highway 85. Committee member J.R. suggested to put Rancho Rinconada into area 5 and moving Santa Clara into Area 1. The demographer stated that these adjustments will not be easily made in a group setting, but she would do her best.

The pros and cons of revision to Map 5, 5F, were discussed:

- Trustee areas 1, 3 and 5 have three school boundaries within them, and 2 and 4 have 2 school boundaries within them
- Each area has a predominant school – or a plurality of one school (but this does not always include the physical location of the school site)
- The variance has increased for Area 3
- There is a lower variance overall
- There are three Asian majority CVAP areas
- There is one sequencing option
- It keeps middle schools together in Sunnyvale as much as possible
- It reduces the HHS split across the areas, bringing it down to two areas
- It keeps neighborhoods that there was specific feedback on together
- There are no gaps in representation through the next two election cycles

-
-
- It splits South Sunnyvale middle school boundaries, the middle schools that are CUSD in Sunnyvale are split
 - It splits the southern part of the City of Sunnyvale
 - The Homestead dominant area would not actually contain the physical school campus. It was pointed out that this is challenging because of how HHS is at the very edge of its attendance boundary. It was also pointed out that this is the same for FHS.
 - It keeps all of the smaller cities together: Santa Clara, Saratoga, West San Jose and Los Altos

At this time, the demographer stated to the committee that there was an error in her calculations on variation 5F. The variance was not brought down, and in fact was 22%, above the allowable limit. She stated that the population in the small area that was moved from Area 1 into Area 3 was very dense. This map would not be legally compliant.

The committee reviewed the pros and cons of a revision of Map 6, map 6A, were discussed:

- It keeps more of south Sunnyvale together, both city-wise and in terms of elementary schools that belong to CUSD
- There is a representative gap for at least one trustee area for two years in election cycle (between 2024 and 2026)
- It splits Saratoga and Blue Hills
- The demographer stated that with this revision the variance is still under 10%, but the Asian majority in area 1 is now at 49%, losing one of the Asian majority CVAP areas

The committee discussed going back to look at 5C and making changes from there.

Committee member Angela Hixson made a suggestion to take map 5B, which had the lower variance and move that forward. There was verbal consensus.

The group at this point had 5B and no compliant modifications to 6. Staff member Melisa Wonch asked the committee if they are only giving one option for the Northern part of the district. Committee member Kei Sato stated that there is other feedback that has been received that we are not including in the maps. Committee member Sid Jain asked if this would change the variance. Committee member Rommy Kusher reiterated the feedback she had received in North Sunnyvale and her feeling that both options should be presented. Committee member Heidi Suarez Espinosa stated that when she and Rommy had a conversation with more than 30 people, they recommended an East/West division because the northern portion of the district has always felt abandoned by the district. These families have more difficulty sending their students to

school due to the closure of Sunnyvale high school. Committee member Angela Hixson stated that what she is hearing from Heidi's comments is that these community members concerns are related to being in the North. She reiterated her belief that this means the modified north/south combination split is the best for this community. She asked if the committee could rule out Map 7 and look at Map 8 instead. Staff member Melisa Wonch said she felt that because the community provided alternatives to Map 7, they should be considered. Committee member Kei Sato asked if we could table this discussion and look at Maps 7 and 8. Melisa stated Map 8 doesn't work due to having only two Asian majority CVAP trustee areas. Committee member Wesley Chen stated his feeling that Map 7 was the least positive. Melisa said that there have been variants of it that have been suggested though.

Looking at the variation on Map 7 submitted by Yan, it drops one of the Asian majority CVAP areas. The demographer worked on this map in the beginning of the meeting but she could not get the Asian majority up in Trustee Area 1 to reach 50%. Committee member Angela Hixson stated that even if adjustments could be made, this would now split Ellis and Vargas. Committee member Wesley Chen stated that Lynbrook would no longer be staying together. Committee member Sid Jain said that for this map to work, we would need to add Asian CVAP from Area 4, but would that cause other shifts. Angela asked what the goal of this map is. Melisa stated that it keeps HHS together more. Angela suggested that Map 7 be dropped from consideration. It was noted however that it would address the HHS community concern of having more of the high school attendance area in 4.

Committee members continued to give direction and suggestions to the demographer on variations of the various maps, however, their continued to be issues with either meeting the variance limit or losing an Asian majority CVAP area.

A request was made to go back to 5b and review what it does and doesn't do:

- Trustee areas 1, 3 and 5 have three schools boundaries in them, and 2 and 4 have 2
- Each area has predominant school – or a plurality of one school (but does not always include the physical location of the school site)
- The variance has increased on district 3
- There is a lower variance overall
- Maintains three Asian majority areas
- Sequencing has one option
- Keeps middle schools together in Sunnyvale
- Reduces the Homestead split to two trustee areas
- Neighborhoods that were specifically mentioned in feedback are kept together
- There are no gaps in representation through the election cycles
- It splits South Sunnyvale middle school boundaries- schools that are CUSD in Sunnyvale are split
- It splits southern part of the City of Sunnyvale

-
-
- The Homestead dominant area would not actually contain homestead high school location, with the same issue for Fremont HS
 - It keeps the smaller cities together: Santa Clara, Saratoga, West San Jose and Los Altos
 - It splits Lincoln and Garden Gate
 - It splits Kennedy and Lawson

Committee member Julia Zhao asked if the Board can make or recommend changes to the recommendations. Melisa stated that because the decision needs to be made by the Board on April 24 it may be helpful to have more options. Julia stated she would want to have all the possible options for the bottom if we have different tops. Angela stated that the bottom of 5 has potential problems with a different top.

The meeting was disrupted by members of the public at 12:31 p.m. after multiple previous disruptions throughout the meeting.

CTAD Chair Doug Kunz stated that the CTAD members were tasked with representing the entire district, not just the area they reside in. Committee member Kei Sato reiterated these comments to the public. Angela stated everyone wants something different and other groups from the community have asked for different things.

A decision was made at 12:45 p.m. to begin the remainder of the public comment.

Community member Annie, the mother of future Monta Vista students, expressed her support for Map 6 sequencing option B. She stated that Map 5 creates more problems than it solves and that she didn't want any variance of Map 5. She stated she wanted more information about the survey and email feedback results and that she appreciated the work of the committee.

Lynbrook parent Judy Wang thanked everyone for staying up so late. She said she was here to pray that Lynbrook won't be closed as she moved here for a stable environment for her kids.

Community member Hairong Gao said he wants alignment of the areas to HHS high school. He said his community was not reached until the end of March and he doesn't see who is speaking up for his community in this process. He said he didn't understand why middle and elementary attendance boundaries have replaced the criteria of high school boundaries in this process.

Jie Ruan said they support Map 6, which keeps to MV attendance boundary, with sequencing option B. They asked that the map survey be published.

Qing Su had left for the evening, and another community member spoke in their place expressing anger from HHS, and said the community feels they are being unfairly treated compared to other schools.

Lu Li, a HHS parent, said they hope the committee can keep HHS together, between Fremont Ave. and Highway 280 particularly.

Yan Huang, an HHS parent, wants to challenge the criteria she heard tonight regarding the mapping. She wants to know what is the criteria behind having three Asian majority CVAP areas.

HHS parent Archie Yuan said there are major problems with Maps 5 and 6 and they don't respect the boundary of Highway 280.

Wenguang Wang had gone home and someone else spoke in her place, stating that as a parent from CHS, they want to request that the final map should ensure CHS has its own trustee area aligned with the CHS attendance boundary as close as possible.

Ellen Zhao, parent of two HHS alums, said she supports Yan's proposal and plan. She said she is disappointed because she feels HHS doesn't have a representative for their community. She said this process is dividing the district.

Lynbrook resident Changdao Dong said that the CTAD members have been trying hard with outreach, but it is a very big district. He stated HHS parents only heard about this recently. He stated Map 5 did a fair job in the first part.

Community member Sarah (no last name given) said that she has been to three meetings and no one has pointed out that population and voter population has to match. She asked for the opportunity to have Yan work with the demographer to modify this plan, to give better representation to HHS and FHS.

Community member Min Yin thanked the CTAD members and said she has seen their hard work since last December. She reiterated that she is against the transition from At-Large to By-Trustee areas, but that if she had to pick a map, she is strongly against Map 6 because it will leave one area without trustee for two years.

Community member Tony Guan said that he and the HHS community have to yell to get their voices heard. He said that CTAD members told him they would pass on their concerns to the rest of the committee.

Community Long Jiao had left and someone else spoke in their place, stating that if the district is divided, during the year of its 100 year anniversary as a district, it is going to be broken up and destroyed.

Community member Aegean Le stated she was really happy that the HHS parents are here, but sad they just found out about this process. She said the whole process is rushed and should be postponed. She stated that she tried to tell people about it, but it was difficult. She said if a map has to be chosen, she supported Map 5, because number 6 will have a gap in representation.

James Huang, an HHS parent, said he wanted to voice concern and urge the committee to follow the published mapping criteria, including compactness and natural boundaries. He said his neighborhood in south Sunnyvale keeps moving back and forth many times in the different maps. He stated the whole Lynbrook area is not even contiguous or compact.

Wayne Liu had left and someone else spoke in their place, stating they were speaking for the students first and foremost. They called for equity of representation in this process. They said the HHS community want to be kept together as much as possible and for trustee areas to align to school attendance boundaries as much as possible.

Susan Gao, a HHS parent, said she was speaking for neighbors who could not attend. She said that right now Homestead is a perfect minority majority district, and that the voices of low income Caucasian and Hispanic people in their area need to be heard.

Public comment ended at 1:15 p.m.

6. Review & Approve Final Recommendation to the Board for April 24, 2024

Staff member Melisa Wonch stated that even with the demographer trying to make adjustments in real time during the meeting, we were not able to keep to the three majority Asian CVAP areas in the options 6B and 8 that were looked at by the committee this evening.

Committee Chair Doug Kunz stated that the committee has Maps 5B and 6 that could move forward. Committee member Wesley Chen made a motion to move forward with Map 5B and Map 6. Committee member J.R. seconded the motion.

Chair Doug Kunz asked if Wesley wanted to speak to his motion. Wesley stated that there were a long list of benefits and no representative gap for Map 5B. He stated that Map 6 was a good alternative for the Board, but it does have a representative gap. Committee member Angela Hixson thanked Melisa and Carolyn, the demographer for trying try to make the other scenarios work and stated it was unfortunate that we couldn't make them work tonight. Committee member Kei Sato stated his disappointment that HHS doesn't have more cohesion in the maps, but it seems that the

numbers didn't work and that he felt the group tried to do their best. Committee member David Fung thanked the staff and the committee for their work. He said he had mixed feelings about these maps, but that an important part of the work tonight was to help the Board understand what the committee was thinking, and that in that respect he was supportive of bringing these two maps forward even if they aren't perfect. He stated that in the process of gathering community there were a lot of things heard that didn't get covered here, but that the committee had made a genuine and honest effort.

Staff member Melisa Wonch reminded the committee that with these two map options there was still only one way that Sunnyvale was being divided.

Committee member Chemba Ranganathan stated she was sad that the group couldn't come up with more maps, but that these are the two maps that the committee could make work with the constraints.

Committee member Kei Sato asked if there was an option for the committee to think more about this. Committee member Angela Hixson stated that if the Board wants the map to be in place for the 2024 election, they need to make a decision this month. Committee member Sid Jain agreed with that assessment, and stated that a great deal of community feedback was collected in different forms.

Committee member Rommy Kushner stated that this has been a really interesting process, that everything is legal based off the census. She stated that in looking at the maps and feedback provided by the community, the committee worked together as a team. She stated that people attended the committee meetings and gave their point of view, but that not everyone will be happy.

Committee member J.R. Fruen thanked all the members of the committee, stated that this process was a lot to go through and that what some committee members went through today is probably not what they thought they were signing up for. He stated to the members of the public in attendance that they have the opportunity to continue their advocacy and that they might be more successful in the future if they don't interrupt the proceedings.

Committee member Julia Zhao thanked staff member Melisa Wonch and the demographer, Carolyn Scholl, for trying their best to make modifications to the maps during the meeting.

Committee member Bill Wilson reiterated the comments already made by other committee members. He echoed the comments about the way everyone on the committee has worked together to bring together all the input received. He stated the

various constraints were tough to work within and thanked his fellow committee members for serving the community well.

Committee Chair Doug Kunz thanked the committee and district staff for making this process possible. He thanked the community members that make up the district and participated in the process. He stated that it's been clear that this is an area where education is highly valued. He stated that was a challenging process, but that he has hope for the future, which has been heightened by the amount of civic engagement that has taken place.

Doug called for a vote on the motion made by Wesley Chen.

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

Wesley Chen – yes
JR Fruen – yes
David Fung – yes
Angela Hixson – yes
Sid Jain – yes
Doug Kunz – yes
Rommy Kushner – yes
Chemba Ranganathan – yes
Kei Sato – abstain
Heidy Suarez Espinosa – yes
Bill Wilson – yes
Julia Zhao – yes

The motion passed. (**Taek Kim left the meeting prior to the vote*)

7. Next Steps and Action Items

Staff member Melisa Wonch asked the group for volunteers to put together the presentation to the Board and to present at the map hearing on April 24, 2024. She thanked everyone for working on this process together and shared that it was a pleasure to meet and get to know everyone on the committee. Superintendent Clark also shared his gratitude with the committee.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:27 a.m.