



DEAN C. LOGAN  
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk

December 30, 2016

The Honorable Board of Supervisors  
County of Los Angeles  
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration  
500 West Temple Street  
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Supervisors:

**CONSOLIDATION ANALYSIS: PICO COUNTY WATER DISTRICT**

Based on the need to provide year-round election services to jurisdictions in Los Angeles County, the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk (RRCC) has conducted an initial analysis of potential consolidation scenarios for statewide general election cycles. With regard to direct voting system limitations, the RRCC has analyzed historical election and consolidation factors and their interactions as follows:

**Participating Jurisdictions** – This includes all jurisdictions that the RRCC is responsible for as well as jurisdictions that historically have only requested support services.

**Statewide/Countywide Offices and Ballot Measures** – This includes federal, congressional, state legislative, state constitutional, judicial, and county contests.

**Local Offices and Ballot Measures** – This includes regular and special office and measure contests for 88 cities, 100 school and community college districts, and over 50 special districts, agencies, and authorities.

**Candidate Participation** – This includes thousands of officeholder and non-incumbent candidates for all applicable two year, four year, and six year terms of office.

The initial analysis, conducted by a team of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and Election Operation supervisors, technicians, and clerks, involved creating two (2) super test elections using data from three (3) distinct election cycles (Primary, General, and Uniform District Election Law). The creation of test elections generated over 1,000 mock ballot groupings and unique super combinations of jurisdictions. Within each ballot group, analysts identified new/potential office and measure contests, their vote position requirements, their space requirements per page, and their space requirements per vote recording device assemblies and sample ballot booklets. For this particular analysis, the RRCC has also included data from an actual General Election.

**Pico County Water District**

<b>Test Election</b>	<b>Ballot Groupings</b>	<b>District Contests</b>	<b>Other Jurisdiction Contests</b>	<b>Vote Positions Per Page</b>	<b>Ballot Pages</b>
Nov. 2012	2	3	26	15 – 20	9 of 12
Nov. 2014	2	3	24	15 – 20	10 of 12
Nov. 2016	2	3	30	15 – 20	8 of 12

It is important to note that the greater the number of participating jurisdictions, contests, and vote positions per ballot grouping, the greater the number of pages in the official ballot. It is also important to note that, although the maximum number of official ballot pages is 12, the number of pages per ballot grouping rarely exceeds 9. This limit is in place to ensure that the remaining available space can accommodate late consolidations and unpredictably high numbers of candidates and statewide measures without jeopardizing the inclusion of local contests at the end of the official ballot.

Per recently adopted Board Policy 3.170, this type of analysis is utilized and implemented on a case-by-case basis in response to requests from jurisdictions and for purposes of recommending approval or denial of consolidation for municipalities, districts, agencies, authorities, and other jurisdiction types in accordance with the authority granted the County in the Elections Code.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The RRCC has analyzed the election and consolidation factors and circumstances unique to the Pico County Water District. Based on this analysis, the RRCC has determined that a November even year consolidation of the Pico County Water District would not surpass 75% of average ballot capacity and would not result in a voting system issue; therefore, approval of the request to consolidate is recommended.

Respectfully submitted,



DEAN C. LOGAN  
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk