January 29, 2013

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

FROM: Keith D. Crafton, Secretary
County Committee

SUBJECT: Cancellation of the February 6, 2013, Regular Meeting
of the County Committee

The regular meeting of the County Committee scheduled for **Wednesday, February 6, 2013**, has been **CANCELLED**. The next regular meeting is scheduled for **Wednesday, March 6, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.**

The following is an update of relevant information as of January 29, 2013.

**Staff Activities**

- On February 1, 2013, staff will participate in the quarterly meeting of the statewide Secretaries to County Committees group. The meeting will cover school district organization activities around the state, as well as updates on the California Voting Rights Act.

**Newspaper Articles**

- A January 4, 2013, article from the **San Diego Union-Tribune** - “Escondido close to settling voting rights lawsuit.” (Attachment 1)

- A January 4, 2013, article from the **Press Enterprise** - “CORONA-NORCO: Latino areas voted Hispanic in schools race.” (Attachment 2)

- A January 10, 2013, article from the **PASADENA SUN** - “Pasadena Unified school board candidates talk budget at union-organized forum.” (Attachment 3)
• A January 12, 2013, article from the Press-Telegram - “Push is on to end at-large elections for ABC, Bellflower school boards.” (Attachment 4)

• A January 15, 2013, article from the Northwest Public Radio - “Round Two For Washington Voting Rights Act.” (Attachment 5)

Legislative Review

Attached is a review of pending legislation related to school district organization. (Attachment 6)

School District Organization Proposals

Updated versions of the following two documents are provided for your information:

• “Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals.” (Attachment 7)

• “Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals (excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District).” (Attachment 8)

Please call me at (562) 922-6144 if you have any questions or concerns.

KDC/AD:ah
San Diego Union-Tribune

Escondido close to settling voting rights lawsuit

By David Garrick 3:04 p.m. Jan. 4, 2013

ESCONDIDO — An attorney for Escondido said Friday that he’s optimistic the city will soon agree to a legal settlement that would make it the first city in North County to elect council members by geographic district.

The lawyer, John Ramirez, told a Vista Superior Court judge that he was encouraged by a formal offer submitted two weeks ago by those who filed a voting rights lawsuit against the city.

The lawsuit, submitted in December 2011 on behalf of five Latino residents, argues Escondido’s at-large citywide elections violate the California Voting Rights Act by discriminating against Latinos.

The proposed settlement calls for Escondido to use San Diego’s method for drawing the boundaries of election districts. That method calls for the districts to be drawn by a seven-member independent commission, which a three-judge panel would appoint.

Escondido officials have previously said they would prefer to have the city’s 144,000 residents have a say, and that the boundaries should be created based on demographic studies, community debate and public hearings.

But Ramirez said Friday he was “quite hopeful” that the offer from the plaintiffs would lead to a settlement. However, the Escondido council, which would need to approve any settlement, had been unable to discuss it because it hasn’t met since Dec. 19, Ramirez said.

Jim Finberg, a San Francisco attorney who filed the voting rights lawsuit, agreed Friday that settlement talks had accelerated recently.

“We agree on the most important thing, that the city will convert from at-large elections to district elections,” he said. “But there are a number of details that need to be resolved about the process.”

Finberg successfully lobbied Judge Earl Maas on Friday to set a trial date because the pressure of a trial date typically encourages both sides to compromise, Finberg said.

Maas suspended the case June 1 after the Escondido council agreed to include a switch to election districts in a charter city ballot measure. But on Nov. 6, nearly 53 percent of voters rejected the measure, which would also have increased Escondido’s independence from the state by making it a charter city.
Ramirez persuaded Maas to delay the trial, initially scheduled for July 26, to Jan. 3, 2014. Ramirez said an earlier trial date might force both sides to split their focus between settlement talks and gathering evidence.

Maas agreed. “This gives you plenty of time to talk, but also sets a specific date,” he said.

Attorneys for both sides are scheduled to return to court March 15 to update Maas on the status of talks. The judge said he might appoint a mediator at that time if progress has been elusive.

After Friday’s hearing, Finberg said “a topic of discussion” in the talks has been whether Escondido would have four council members elected by district and continue to have the mayor elected by the entire city.

Finberg said other options had been discussed, but didn’t provide details.

In addition, he said part of any settlement would be the fees he would receive for the case. He said the settlement offer included the formula he wanted to use, but no specific amount.

Modesto, which Finberg sued successfully for voting rights violations five years ago, paid $3 million in attorney fees. Finberg said Friday that Escondido would pay far less if a settlement is reached quickly, because the Modesto case included a full trial and an appeal.

© Copyright 2013 The San Diego Union-Tribune, LLC. An MLIM LLC Company. All rights reserved.
The Press Enterprise

CORONA-NORCO: Latino areas voted Hispanic in schools race

STAFF WRITER
Published: January 04, 2013; 07:27 PM

The recent Corona-Norco school board election proved to be a good testing ground to study whether minorities are underrepresented on the board because of the way its elections are structured.

The November Corona-Norco Unified School District board election was the first in recent years in which a Latino candidate ran. A Press-Enterprise analysis of the race's voting patterns suggests Latinos could be at a disadvantage in elections where candidates run across an entire district rather than in parts of the district.

Precinct results showed that Latino candidate Mary Ybarra did better in areas where voting-age Latinos were more concentrated.

Ybarra, who lost the election, captured about 23 percent of all votes in precincts where voting-age Latinos made up 50 percent or more of the population. As the number of voting-age Latinos decreased, so did her votes.

School district officials say they don't think minorities are disenfranchised and are changing the election system to avoid a lawsuit. That change would re-structure elections to prevent racially polarized voting.

"The fact that we are proceeding with trustee areas really eliminates that risk," Assistant Superintendent Tom Pike said of a potential suit.

Last month, Corona-Norco joined school districts around the state and Riverside County that are converting from at-large districts — in which school board candidates run across a whole district — to trustee area elections in which they run in and represent a particular geographic or trustee area.

The motivator for many of the districts is to avoid lawsuits for violating the California Voting Rights Act, passed by state lawmakers in 2002. That law prohibits at-large elections when they hinder the ability of a "protected class" of people, such as Latinos, to elect candidates from their community.
Some blame at-large elections for disenfranchising Latino voters at the local level because Latino candidates often cannot win across a whole city or district. When districts are divided into smaller areas, Latino or other minority communities can elect a representative from their own neighborhoods, supporters say.

Corona-Norco school officials said they see no evidence that minority voters lack the ability to elect a board member that represents them, though only one Latino has served on the board, in the 1960s and 1970s. Today, minorities make up the majority of students in the district.

In the November election, Ybarra lost to the three incumbents, two who are white and one who is Filipino.

Whites account for about 31 percent of the district’s more than 53,000 students. Latinos comprise about half of the enrollment, followed by black, Asian and other groups.

The numbers reflect the Latino population in Corona, which grew from 35 percent to almost 46 percent from 2000 to 2010.

The support Ybarra saw among Latino-heavy precincts also benefited another candidate.

Incumbent Jose Lalas, who is Filipino but has a Spanish surname, received about 35 percent of votes in areas where voting-age Latinos made up 50 percent or more of the population. That number dipped to roughly 28 percent in areas where voting-age Latinos were 25 percent or less.

The remaining two candidates, who are white, showed the reverse trend. They did better in areas with fewer voting-age Latinos. Michell Skipworth received about 20 percent of votes in precincts where voting-age Latinos comprised 50 percent or more of the population. Cathy Sciortino averaged 21 percent.

They seized more votes, each about 28 percent, when voting-age Latinos dropped to 25 percent or less.

Civil rights attorney Robert Rubin, who helped craft the state voting rights law and has been involved in many cases related to it, said he had been analyzing similar voting patterns in the Corona-Norco district.
“That’s pretty good evidence of racially polarized voting,” Rubin said, noting that he found similar results. “We had very serious concerns.”

But the numbers need additional study and community surveys to determine if racially polarized voting exists, he said.

A previous analysis by The Press-Enterprise of three statewide non-partisan races also suggested racially polarized voting.

The school board voted last month to convert to trustee areas. Lalas criticized the decision in previous discussions, saying the district should make the change if the new system better serves students and improves education. The threat of litigation should not drive decisions, he said.

Also contributing to this report: Staff writer Jim Miller, jmill@pe.com
Pasadena Unified school board candidates talk budget at union-organized forum

January 10, 2013

Pasadena Unified school board candidates who gathered Tuesday for the first political forum of the March 5 election season weighed in on a range of budget issues facing the district, particularly the event's organizers: union members.

The forum was organized by unions representing teachers, administrators, custodians, clerical staff and other public school employees — organizations that are all expected to announce their endorsements in the coming weeks. Eight of the 10 candidates running for four seats attended the event.

The questions focused on the potential for layoffs and other cuts as future board members grapple with up to $12 million in expected budget reductions for the next school year.

Proposals include laying off 30 elementary school teachers, up to 24 custodians and 20 teachers who assist in developing curriculum and serving English language learners, according to the district.

School librarians and elementary school music programs are also on the chopping block.

Candidates also spoke about balancing the needs of constituents in newly created voter districts with improving public schools as a whole. School board races were citywide contests until voters last year approved new election rules intended to increase diversity among board candidates.

Four of seven school board seats are up for grabs in March.

Incumbent board member Scott Phelps is being challenged by attorney Luis Carlos Ayala for a West Pasadena seat; incumbent Elizabeth Pomeroy is facing Pasadena Youth Center Executive Director Stella Murga in the city's center; and Kim Kenne, also an incumbent, is being challenged by retired teacher Hermond Dean Cooper in West Altadena.

Four candidates are competing for an open seat in Northwest Pasadena.

Businessman Tyrone Hampton Jr. and Los Angeles Unified School District elementary school teacher Ruben Hueso attended the forum. Foster parent Deidra Duncan and Guillermo Arce, a deputy district director for the Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services, were absent.

Arce said he received short notice of the forum and had a prior commitment.

Hampton Jr. said he would look at cutting administrators and contractors before laying off custodians, teaching aides and other lower-wage support staff.
Hueso said he would draw the line at laying off teachers.

"I want to protect students from the chaos of laying off teachers [and] increases in class size," he said.

Phelps said officials have tried to evenly spread previous cuts but have been forced to adjust to declining student enrollment.

He also said board members must take responsibility for families who do not live in their voter districts because large numbers of students attend campuses outside their neighborhoods.

Candidates roundly rejected use of standardized test scores as a primary factor in teacher evaluations — a major policy sticking point for unions across the state. Most candidates were vocal in their agreement that officials should encourage teachers to prioritize a range of classroom activities and various measures of student achievement.

"I don't want students to be experts on bubbling in," Ayala said.

-- Joe Piasecki, Times Community News

Follow Joe Piasecki on Twitter: @joepiasecki

Copyright © 2013 Pasadena Sun
ABC Unified encompasses all or part of six cities, but every one of the school district's board members resides in Cerritos.

A group of area residents is hoping to change that and other perceived inequities of representation there and in the neighboring Bellflower Unified School District.

The residents are petitioning district officials to switch from an at-large voting system to a district voting system to better represent the population.

The push reflects a growing trend as school districts, college boards and cities across the state scramble to switch from at-large voting to electoral districts in response to public pressure and threats of lawsuits under the California Voting Rights Act.

In November, four out of five incumbents for the Cerritos College Board of Trustees were swept out of office under a new trustee district voting system. The change brought a historic face of diversity to the Norwalk-based board with three Latina representatives.

Cerritos activist Charles Ara hopes to duplicate that change in local school boards.

Ara, who has formed an independent school district reorganization committee and is circulating a petition to gather support, said the ABC Unified and Bellflower school boards do not fairly represent the area's large Latino population, nor do they reflect the cities they serve.

ABC Unified represents the cities of Cerritos, Hawaiian Gardens, Artesia and portions of Lakewood, Norwalk and Long Beach. However, Ara noted that all seven school board members reside in Cerritos.

"In order for us to have fairness and equality, that needs to be broken up," Ara said.

In Bellflower Unified, an area with a large Latino population -- its base in the city of Bellflower is over 50 percent Latino -- just one school board member is Latino, Ara said. More than 60 percent of students in the district are Latino, according to state statistics.

Bellflower Unified Superintendent Brian Jacobs said in an email to the Press-Telegram that the district has discussed the issue of switching to district-area voting and has prepared a study for the California School Boards Association.
ABC Unified School Board President Celia Spitzer said the district in 2011 conducted an extensive demographic study and determined that the voting system wasn't polarized along racial or ethnic lines.

"It was an extensive analysis looking back all the way to 1981, and the conclusion was that there was no evidence of racially polarized voting," Spitzer said, adding that the district does not plan to change its voting system.

While ABC Unified does have a disproportionate number of Cerritos residents on the school board, Spitzer, a board member since 1999, noted that the California Voting Rights Act is designed for racial discrimination and does not address voting disparities along geographic lines.

"The issue doesn't really apply here in ABC Unified," she said.

Signed by Gov. Gray Davis in 2002, the California Voting Rights Act prohibits local governments from holding at-large elections -- in which the whole community elects members of a governing body -- if that system impairs the ability of minority groups to elect candidates of their choice.

School boards and cities can be found liable if lawyers can prove the voting is polarized along racial lines.

The law gained strength in 2007 when the California Supreme Court deemed it constitutional following a claim from the city of Modesto that the act inherently favored people of color.

Armed with 2010 census data, lawyers across the state have targeted governing bodies who may be in violation, essentially changing the face of local elections.

The majority of California school boards use at-large voting, as do many small cities. In district elections, candidates can run only in the district in which they live.

Since 2009, 70 school boards that have applied with the state Board of Education to switch to elections by district, according to California Watch, an independent center for investigative reporting. Most of them are located in Fresno, Kings, Madera and Tulare counties.

Southern California cities and school boards that have voted to make the switch include the city of Compton, Pasadena Unified and Downey Unified.

Ara said he'll continue to ask the Los Angeles County Board of Education to review the districts for evidence of violations under the California Voting Rights Act.

In 2011, Ara was one of three Latino residents who filed a lawsuit against Cerritos College stating the Board of Trustees was in violation of the Voting Rights Act. The college in December 2011 adopted a new plan to create seven trustee areas, and the lawsuit was later settled out of court.
The two other plaintiffs, Carmen Avalos and Leonard Zuniga, ran for seats on the board in November. Zuniga lost to incumbent Robert Arthur, while Avalos won in her newly designated district.

School board diversity

The ethnic breakdown of the cities served by Bellflower Unified and ABC Unified school districts:

ARTE VIA
Population: 16,522
Asian: 37.1%
Hispanic or Latino: 35.8%
White: 21.3%

BELLFLOWER
Population: 76,616
Hispanic or Latino: 52.3%
White: 19.5%
Black: 14%

CERRITOS
Population: 49,041
Asian: 61.9%
White: 16.6%
Hispanic or Latino: 12%

HAWAIIAN GARDENS
Population: 14,254
Hispanic or Latino: 77.2%
Asian: 10.6%
White: 7.3%

LAKEWOOD
Population: 80,048
White: 40.9%
Hispanic: 30.1%
Asian: 16.4%

LONG BEACH
Population: 462,257
Hispanic or Latino: 40.8%
White: 29.4%
Black: 13.5%
NORWALK
Population: 105,549
Hispanic or Latino: 70.1%
White: 12.3%
Asian: 12%

kelly.puente@presstelegram.com
562-714-2181
twitter.com/kellypuentept
Round Two For Washington Voting Rights Act

January 15, 2013, by Liz Jones

Do people vote based on race? That’s a question the Washington Legislature will likely tackle this session. Supporters of a state Voting Rights Act plan to push the measure again this year.

It would aim to strengthen minority representation in places with a large population of Latinos or other racial groups. KUOW’s Liz Jones reports.

Supporters of a Washington State Voting Rights Act point to voting trends on the east side of the Cascades. In the 10 most heavily Latino counties there, Latinos are a third of the population. But they only hold 4 percent of the elected offices.

University of Washington Professor Matt Barreto specializes on issues of ethnicity and race. He says Washington has one of the lowest levels of minority representation in country. He likens it to the civil right era in the South.

Barreto: “There were cities in Alabama and Mississippi in the 1950s and 60s that were 80 percent Black and had no Blacks on the City Council. We have that same thing with Latinos in central and eastern Washington in the year and 2013. And I think people need to think about that. How did that happen? What system have we created that allows that to happen.”

Barreto says these lopsided outcomes are a symptom of at-large elections, where candidates run citywide or in an entire school district. He says if areas are broken up into smaller districts, the people elected would more closely mirror their constituents.

People can already challenge local voting systems in federal court. But supporters say a state law would make the process much faster and cheaper.

Dennis Meyers is with the California School Board Association. That state passed a voting rights act about a decade ago. Meyers says one big downside a financial burden on some school districts. Some have faced six-figure legal fees if they’re out of compliance.

Meyers: “It really doesn’t matter what size your school district is. It’s going to have an impact and it creates quite a shock and quite a stir in the community.”

An attorney who helped write Washington’s act says they tried to improve on California’s model. He says the act aims to avoid or greatly reduce any legal costs for local governments.

Last session in Olympia, the Voting Rights Act passed out of committee. But it failed to get vote on the House floor.

Copyright 2013 Northwest Public Radio
InsideBayArea.com

Santa Clara County School Board used wrong map, illegally seated member, DA says

By Sharon Noguchi snoguchi@mercurynews. com
Posted: 01/18/2013 06:34:30 PM PST
Updated: 01/21/2013 11:31:56 AM PST

SAN JOSE -- The Santa Clara County Board of Education used the wrong boundary map when it chose its newest trustee, Darcie Green, and should hold an election to fill the seat, the county district attorney has said.

Because it based eligibility on the newly drawn trustee-area lines -- updated after the 2010 Census -- Green's appointment is null and void, District Attorney Jeff Rosen wrote in a letter to county Superintendent of Schools Xavier De La Torre. Rosen advised the County Office of Education to call an election to fill the seat.

"Someone made a mistake," said deputy district attorney John Chase.

An election could cost anywhere from $617,500 to $1.07 million, according to Elma Rosas of the Santa Clara County Registrar of Voters.

Last fall, in filling the seat vacated by the resignation of Craig Mann, the board's attorneys advised that it could choose whether to use the old or the new boundaries of Mann's district, Trustee Area 6, said Joseph Di Salvo, who was board president at the time.

"We had broad discretion to determine which of the two to use," Di Salvo said. He said the board's attorneys at the Lozano Smith law firm of Monterey offered the advice.

The seven county school board members each represent an area of the county. Last February boundary lines were redrawn to balance the numbers of constituents in each district, and Mann's Area 6 was broadly reconfigured to include roughly the areas covered by the Alum Rock, Mount Pleasant and Franklin-McKinley school districts.

Attorney Lou Lozano declined to comment on the issue. He has advised the board to discuss Rosen's letter in closed session, because of a threat of a lawsuit, he said. Interviews of trustee applicants and votes on appointments by law must take place in open session. The board has placed the matter on its agenda for Wednesday.

Lozano said he didn't remember discussing the boundary line issue with the board. And he also didn't remember whether he attended the Oct. 17 meeting when the board interviewed the five applicants and chose Green.

Rosen's letter was the result of two complaints his office received about Green's appointment. Chase would not name those who complained.
The district attorney contends that the law requires "that any vacancy occurring in the middle of a term of office be filled using the geographical boundaries that existed at the outset of the term."
The letter, dated Jan. 9, cited advice from the Secretary of State and the governor's office in filling recent vacancies in elected offices in Madera and Butte counties.

The letter also warns that if the County Office of Education fails to act, the attorney general or a private party may sue to remove Green and order an election.

The second-place applicant for Mann's seat, Javier Gonzalez, expressed surprise and said that he wouldn't be eligible to run for the seat if vacated because he, too, lives outside the old Trustee Area 6.

Another candidate, Anita Sunseri, a former school principal, also was taken aback to hear about the DA's letter.

Frank Biehl, who sat on the committee that redrew the Board of Education trustee area, said, "I'm flabbergasted." He thought the new boundaries went into effect immediately after they were adopted in February.

If the attorney general, the ultimate arbiter in the issue, agrees with Rosen's office, it would be yet another embarrassing and costly decision linked to legal advice given the Santa Clara County Office of Education. The school board has sued ex-Superintendent Charles Weis over his refusal to repay a housing loan, which allowed him not to make any payments until he left office. And the board is trying to renegotiate the same generous deal it extended to De La Torre -- terms which board members have said they didn't know existed in the contract.

Green herself said that she'll follow the advice of the school board's attorney. She said she had sought the appointment based on the new boundary lines. "It was very, very clear there was a new Trustee Area 6. Otherwise I wouldn't have applied."

She said that if an election is called, she wouldn't rule out moving and running to get her seat back. "I have to really think about that," she said, but "I'm open to do anything."

Contact Sharon Noguchi at 408-271-3775. Follow her at Twitter.com/NoguchiOnK12.
LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION  
(COUNTY COMMITTEE) 
LEGISLATIVE REVIEW-FEBRUARY 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR:</th>
<th>INTRODUCTION DATE:</th>
<th>LAST ACTIVITY/DATE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senate Bill 41/Wright</td>
<td>12/12/12</td>
<td>01/10/13: Referred to Committee on Education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DESCRIPTION OF BILL
This bill serves as clean-up legislation clarifying a provision from prior legislation authorizing the creation of the Wiseburn Unified School District (USD). Specifically, the bill removes a provision in the original legislation aimed at revising the revenue limit computation process for the new Wiseburn USD (when formed). The prior legislation would have required a revenue limit to be computed utilizing a blended formula including the revenue limit for both the Wiseburn SD and the Centinela Valley Union High SD. Upon the removal of that provision via this bill, the revenue limit for the new Wiseburn USD will be calculated as mandated for all unifications.

POTENTIAL IMPACT OF BILL ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE, SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION PROCESS AND/OR LOS ANGELES COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS
As this bill refines processes already approved through prior legislation, it will have no additional impact on the County Committee, the school district organization process or any local districts beyond those already impacted by the Wiseburn unification.

RECOMMENDED POSITION
Staff recommends the following position:

- **Watch**  Bill should be monitored by County Committee staff, but no action taken at this time.
- **Approve**  County Committee supports the bill’s concept, but will not actively work for passage.
- **Support**  County Committee actively supports the bill.
- **Oppose**  County Committee actively opposes the bill.
- **Disapprove**  County Committee disapproves of the bill’s concept, but will not actively oppose passage.

AMENDMENTS REQUIRED
If staff’s recommended position is based on the need for amendments to the bill language, suggested alternative language is attached.

CORRESPONDENCE REQUIRED
If staff’s recommended position is based on the need for correspondence to the bill’s author, the Governor or other governmental officials, a draft of suggested language is attached.

Please direct all comments to Mr. Keith D. Crafton, Secretary to the County Committee, at (562) 922-6144.
Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals

February 2013

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 January 23, 2013.

PROPOSAL TO TRANSFER CERTAIN TERRITORY FROM THE COMPTON USD TO THE LOS ANGELES USD

Status: Final petition submission pending.

Status Date: June 26, 2007

OTHER INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last six months)

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Inner City Unified School District/July 2012

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None

* Indicates update from previous summary.
Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals  
(Excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District)  

February 2013

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals (exclusive of those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District (USD) that were at various stages in the school district reorganization process as of January 23, 2013.

FORMATION—WISEBURN USD (CURRENTLY LIES WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE CENTINELA VALLEY UNION HIGH SD)

On May 16, 2001, the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) received a request from the Citizens for a Wiseburn Unified School District organization to prepare a petition (25 percent of the registered voters) proposing to form a Wiseburn USD from existing territory of the Wiseburn SD. The proposed formation territory currently lies within the boundaries of the Centinela Valley Union High SD (UHSD). The petition was provided to the chief petitioners on June 20, 2001.

On November 9, 2001, the chief petitioners submitted a signed petition to the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools (County Superintendent) to determine if the petition was sufficient and signed as required by law pursuant to Education Code (EC) §35700(a). In accordance with EC §35704, the County Superintendent found the petition to be sufficient and signed as required by law on December 4, 2001. On December 5, 2001, the petition was presented to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) at its regular meeting and transmitted to the State Board of Education (SBE). Pursuant to EC §35705, a public hearing was conducted within the Wiseburn SD and Centinela Valley UHSD on January 23, 2002, at Richard Henry Dana Middle School in the Wiseburn SD.

At its regular meeting on March 6, 2002, the County Committee was presented with a preliminary feasibility report concerning this proposal. The final feasibility report was presented to the County Committee at its regular meeting on May 1, 2002. At that meeting, the County Committee recommended approval and took action to recommend approval of the proposal to the SBE to form a Wiseburn USD from the existing boundaries of the Wiseburn SD within the Centinela Valley UHSD. The County Committee further recommended that the election area be the entire Centinela Valley UHSD.

The County Committee’s plans and recommendations were transmitted to the SBE and the California Department of Education (CDE) on June 18, 2002. On June 19, 2003, the CDE requested additional statistical information from the impacted districts and notified LACOE staff that the petition would be heard in November 2003.

On September 2, 2003, the CDE notified LACOE that the petition hearing before the SBE would be delayed until January 7-8, 2004. The CDE cited budget constraints and staff cutbacks as reasons for the hearing delay. On December 1, 2003, the CDE notified LACOE of a second delay for the petition hearing before the SBE, postponing it until March 10-11, 2004. The CDE cited current state fiscal circumstances as the reason for the further delay. On January 21, 2004, the CDE notified LACOE of a third delay for the petition hearing before the SBE, postponing it until May 12-13, 2004. On April 16, 2004, the CDE notified LACOE that the petition hearing would be held on May 13, 2004.

* Indicates update from previous summary.
On April 27, 2004, LACOE received a copy of the CDE’s final feasibility study. On April 29, 2004, LACOE received notice from the CDE that the petition hearing had been delayed indefinitely at the request of the Wiseburn SD. Subsequently, the Wiseburn SD requested that the SBE hear the petition, along with its request for two waivers. A hearing was scheduled for July 7, 2004. On July 7, 2004, staff was notified by the CDE that Centinela Valley UHSD requested a delay in review by the SBE. Wiseburn SD agreed to withdraw its petition for consideration before the SBE to accommodate additional review requested by Centinela Valley UHSD. Subsequent to granting this delay, legal counsel to Wiseburn SD and Centinela Valley UHSD presented additional information (at the CDE’s request) regarding the legality of Wiseburn SD residents maintaining responsibility to pay Centinela Valley UHSD’s tax obligations following any unification of a Wiseburn SD.

On August 31, 2004, staff received notice that Ms. Karen Steentofte, Chief Counsel for the SBE, recommended that certain waivers submitted with the Wiseburn SD petition could be determined by the SBE at the time of the hearing. Subsequently, the CDE rescheduled the petition to be heard before the SBE on September 9, 2004.

On September 9, 2004, staff attended the SBE hearing. CDE staff recommended that the SBE adopt the proposal approving the petition to form a Wiseburn USD and to set the election area as the area of the Wiseburn SD only on the condition that the property owners within the Wiseburn SD retain current levels of responsibility for repayment of existing bonded indebtedness of the Centinela Valley UHSD upon successful formation of a Wiseburn USD. The SBE voted unanimously to approve the proposal and established that territory within the Wiseburn SD be the area of election. Statutory requirements provided that, following approval by the SBE, an election shall be called on the next available regular election date (March 8, 2005) in the territory determined by the SBE.

On October 19, 2004, at the direction of the SBE, the County Superintendent forwarded an order for special election to the Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk’s (Registrar-Recorder) office, to be held in conjunction with the March 8, 2005, regular election. A ballot measure to approve or disapprove the formation of a Wiseburn USD and to elect a governing board was to be placed before the electorate. The election was scheduled to be held within the boundaries of the proposed Wiseburn USD. If the matter had received approval at that election, the new district would have been scheduled to become effective July 1, 2006.

On November 1, 2004, staff received a copy of a lawsuit filed by the Centinela Valley UHSD against the SBE, seeking to vacate approval of Wiseburn SD’s petition to unify based on lack of compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regulations. On November 18, 2004, staff received a copy of a second lawsuit filed in this matter, citing flaws in the legality of the SBE’s decisions and naming additional parties, including the County Committee, as defendants in the matter. The Centinela Valley UHSD, Wiseburn SD, and SBE began negotiations to delay the election in order to revisit the issues underlying the petition and subsequent lawsuits. The SBE requested that the County Superintendent delay the election to allow for this negotiation process to run its course. Staff consulted with the Office of the Los Angeles County Counsel (County Counsel) and was advised that neither the County Superintendent nor the SBE could order a delay of the election.

* Indicates update from previous summary.
On Friday, December 10, 2004, in the case of Centinela Valley UHSD (Petitioners) vs. the SBE, the Los Angeles Superior Court (Court) issued a preliminary injunction barring the conduct of the March 8, 2005, scheduled election regarding the formation of the Wiseburn USD. The Petitioners also contacted the Court and requested that the Motion for Preliminary Injunction (Injunction) scheduled for December 13, 2004, vs. the County Committee and County Superintendent, be taken off the calendar. The Petitioners stated that they would consult with the Court’s clerk to re-schedule. This action was taken because the Petitioners received the Injunction that day. A hearing on the motion was scheduled for March 30, 2005. Staff received notice from County Counsel that both the County Committee and the County Superintendent were dropped as parties to the lawsuit in which they were named.

On January 6, 2005, County Counsel met with the County Committee in closed session to discuss the lawsuit. Later at the same meeting, Dr. Don Brann, then Superintendent of Wiseburn SD, appeared before the County Committee to inform them that the SBE would withdraw its approval of the petition, pending a negotiation with Petitioners and attorneys for Centinela Valley UHSD. On January 13, 2005, the CDE withdrew its recommendation to the SBE to approve the Wiseburn USD petition and order the election to be conducted within the territory of the Wiseburn SD. Staff at the CDE informed LACOE staff that they intended to redo the review process related to CEQA and to return the petition to the SBE for action at a later time (not to the County Committee). Subsequently, the SBE rescinded its previous approval of the Wiseburn SD’s unification petition.

On March 13, 2007, the California Department of General Services issued a Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), under CEQA. The CDE held a CEQA scoping hearing on March 28, 2007, within the Wiseburn SD. Staff attended this meeting. A comment period was set by the SBE for March 13, 2007, to April 12, 2007. On April 24, 2007, staff was notified by the SBE that the CEQA comment period had been extended to May 15, 2007, due to a request made at the scoping hearing.

On July 7, 2008, staff received a copy of the draft EIR from Terry A. Hayes Associates LLC, prepared on behalf of the CDE, which is the lead agency for CEQA reviews and thus responsible for completing any environmental review. A comment period for the draft EIR was opened from July 7, 2008, to August 21, 2008. A public hearing on the EIR was held on July 22, 2008, in the Wiseburn SD.

On April 15, 2009, staff provided follow-up information to the CDE regarding the financial status of the Centinela Valley UHSD. The CDE included this material in its updated feasibility study for the SBE.

On October 22, 2009, the CDE notified LACOE that the petition hearing before the SBE was scheduled for the SBE’s January 7-8, 2010, meeting. On December 8, 2009, the CDE notified LACOE that the petition hearing before the SBE would not be heard until March 11, 2010. On January 6, 2010, the CDE notified LACOE that the petition would not be heard until some time in July 2010. On March 25, 2010, the CDE notified LACOE that the petition would be heard at the May 12-13, 2010, meeting of the SBE. On April 30, 2010, the CDE issued its revised feasibility study on the Wiseburn SD unification petition. On May 3, 2010, the Wiseburn SD requested that the SBE remove the review of the petition from its May 2010 agenda. Presently,
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there is no date set for this petition to be reviewed by the SBE. The EIR contained in the revised petition has not yet been adopted by the SBE.

On July 23, 2010, Superintendents from the Wiseburn, Hawthorne, Lennox, and Lawndale SDs submitted a request to the County Superintendent to host a joint meeting where they could discuss a local solution to the school district organization issues within the area. The first of these meetings took place on August 19, 2010, with representatives from the four districts in attendance, along with the County Superintendent and LACOE staff serving as facilitators and observers.

On September 16, 2010, LACOE was notified of a change in the chief petitioner for this petition. Mr. Daniel Juarez was replaced by Ms. Shavonda Webber Christmas as one of the chief petitioners for the Wiseburn SD unification petition.

On October 5, 2010, the Superintendent for the Wiseburn SD contacted LACOE to request additional assistance to facilitate a meeting among all five of the impacted school districts (the Centinela Valley UHSD, Hawthorne, Lawndale, Lennox, and Wiseburn SDs), this time including the Centinela Valley UHSD. The second joint meeting, at which all five districts were in attendance, was held on December 9, 2010. At that meeting, district representatives discussed the history of school district organization efforts within the region and agreed to meet again at a later time for further discussion. A LACOE staff member facilitated this meeting.

On January 11, 2011, staff was notified that a third meeting was scheduled among the five districts in the region. On February 25, 2011, staff met with representatives of the Wiseburn SD to discuss the petition status.

On March 17, 2011, all five districts attended another regional meeting at the Hawthorne SD. LACOE staff attended to observe and facilitate. At that meeting, representatives from the Wiseburn SD discussed the possibility of a legislative solution, whereby Wiseburn SD would unify and allow all of its commercial property to continue to be assessed within the Centinela Valley UHSD. They also discussed the option of Wiseburn SD residents continuing to pay on any outstanding debt obligations to the Centinela Valley UHSD.

On April 4, 2011, LACOE received a copy of draft legislation proposed by Wiseburn SD, which was circulated to all five districts via e-mail from Wiseburn SD’s Superintendent, Mr. Tom Johnstone. Staff discussed this proposed legislation with the County Committee at its April 6, 2011, regular meeting. The County Committee directed staff to prepare correspondence to each of the five impacted districts to convey its concerns about the length of time that has elapsed since the original petition and initial approval by the SBE.

On May 9, 2011, staff received a copy of a letter from attorneys for the Centinela Valley UHSD to the Wiseburn SD stating that Centinela Valley UHSD was not in agreement on the proposed legislation and would require any future proposal to be put before all of the voters in the impacted districts (meaning all four feeders and Centinela Valley UHSD), and not just before voters from the Wiseburn SD. The five districts scheduled another regional meeting for May 19, 2011, but it was cancelled due to scheduling conflicts. It is anticipated that another regional meeting will be scheduled and that it will be facilitated by LACOE staff.

* Indicates update from previous summary.
On June 22, 2011, County Committee Chairperson Mr. John Nunez, sent a letter on behalf of the County Committee to the Superintendents of the Centinela UHSD, Hawthorne, Lawndale, Lennox, and Wiseburn SDs, alerting them to concerns about the progress of the petition process. The County Committee requested replies from all districts before August 1, 2011, on how they intended to proceed related to the petition to form a Wiseburn USD.

On July 6, 2011, representatives from the Centinela UHSD, Hawthorne, Lawndale, Lennox, and Wiseburn SDs, addressed the County Committee at its regular meeting. The representatives discussed their role in the process to review the unification petition, related some history of the region and the petition, discussed issues that the districts have been working on together (such as curriculum articulation), and their intent to supply the County Committee with formal responses to its queries by August 1, 2011. Several district representatives and their attorneys alluded to discrepancies in County Committee minutes, activity summaries, and in the letter sent in June 2011, and stated that they intended to correct the record as they see it when they respond by August 1, 2011.

On August 3, 2011, the County Committee received a written response from the Centinela Valley UHSD, dated July 25, 2011. That response addressed several of the issues raised by the County Committee’s prior letter and referred to the information provided by district representatives in person to the County Committee at its July 6, 2011, meeting. On July 26, 2011, the County Committee received written responses from Hawthorne, Lawndale, and Lennox SDs. On August 23, 2011, the County Committee received a written response from the Wiseburn SD. These responses reiterated the positions presented at the July County Committee meeting, including Wiseburn SD’s intention to move forward with a legislative solution.

On August 26, 2011, representatives from all districts (including administrative staff and governing board members), supported by their legal and legislative advisors, met to discuss Wiseburn SD’s legislative solution. A representative from the County Committee and several LACOE staff members also attended. This meeting, held at the offices of the Centinela Valley UHSD, was aimed at furthering discussion on a regional solution.

At this meeting, many longstanding issues were discussed, including student achievement, fiscal issues, the primacy of soliciting input from all voters in the broader region, and the individual concerns of all districts. During this discussion, the group discussed Wiseburn SD’s legislative proposal, which would form a Wiseburn USD. That new unified district would retain its current K-8 assessed valuation and Wiseburn residents would continue to be obligated to pay any currently issued outstanding bond obligations owed to the Centinela Valley UHSD. However, the assessed valuation for the current high school district would be retained by Centinela Valley UHSD (91 percent) after the new Wiseburn USD is formed. The group reiterated the importance of voter input on all stages of this process, should it move forward. At the conclusion of the meeting, representatives from all of the districts agreed to discuss the proposal with their respective full governing boards and report back to the group in October.

On October 7, 2011, staff was notified by representatives of the Wiseburn SD that the Hawthorne, Lawndale, and Lennox SDs had communicated to Wiseburn SD that their boards have decided not to participate in any additional regional meetings, and that they were not in
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favor of the unification proposals reviewed to date (including the proposed legislation circulated
by the Wiseburn SD). The three districts submitted an October 19, 2011, letter to the County
Committee reiterating this decision. During the following week (October 10-14, 2011), staff was
notified by representatives of the Wiseburn SD and the Centinela Valley UHSD that they are
continuing to hold discussions regarding a proposed agreement and possible legislation
supporting unification. Staff requested that district or board representatives communicate any
agreements and/or decisions in writing to the County Committee and to LACOE.

On January 6 and 10, 2012, staff discussed developments with representatives from the
Wiseburn SD and the Centinela Valley UHSD. District representatives stated that discussions
about legislative solutions were ongoing and that they would update the County Committee at
the March 2012 meeting.

On February 17, 2012, LACOE received a copy of a February 7, 2012, letter, issued jointly by
the Superintendents of the Hawthorne and Lawndale SDs, which was addressed to the boards of
the Wiseburn SD and the Centinela Valley UHSD. The letter stated that neither Hawthorne nor
Lawndale SD was in agreement with the proposed legislation and pending joint powers
agreement among the Wiseburn SD and the Centinela Valley UHSD. The letter raised concerns
about distribution of potential revenue sharing under the proposed legislation and agreement.

At the March 6, 2012, meeting, Wiseburn SD Superintendent Dr. Tom Johnston addressed the
County Committee and explained the status of the district’s negotiations on legislation with the
Centinela Valley UHSD. Dr. Johnston stated that no agreement was finalized at this point and
that he would keep staff informed. Dr. Ellen Dougherty, Superintendent of the Lawndale SD,
also addressed the County Committee. She stated that her district had not been included in the
negotiations and was not supportive of them if critical concerns of the feeder districts could not
be addressed. The County Committee reviewed several documents, including recent drafts of the
legislation and rationale behind it, as well as the response of the Wiseburn SD to the prior letter
circulated by the other feeder districts in opposition of any legislative plan that does not include
them and provide for an area-wide approval vote.

The County Committee also discussed the viability of the CEQA study already completed, which
has not yet been formally adopted by the SBE. The committee directed staff to draft a letter to
the SBE requesting that the CEQA study be adopted before its viability is no longer valid. The
County Committee also requested updates from the impacted districts as they continue their
negotiations on the legislative solution and on intra-area relations.

At the May 2, 2012, County Committee meeting, representatives from the Centinela Valley
UHSD, Hawthorne, Lawndale, and Wiseburn SDs were present to provide an update on the
petition and negotiations among the districts. The County Committee was informed that the
Lennox SD Superintendent was unavailable to attend meeting. The districts stated that they had
pursued further negotiations across several all-hands meetings and had reached two agreements
in principal. The agreements would provide for the creation of a Joint Powers Authority (JPA)
entity to collect and distribute parcel tax funds among the districts, and the other JPA would
relate to the formation of a Wiseburn USD and reallocation of bonded indebtedness and assessed
valuation among Wiseburn SD and Centinela Valley Union HSD. These agreements would
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require specific legislation, as proposed earlier this year. District representatives stated that all of their boards had already approved the agreements or were scheduled to do so that week.

Given the update, the County Committee discussed delaying sending a letter to the SBE to request an adoption of the EIR and to place the Wiseburn USD petition on an upcoming agenda. Prior to the June 6, 2012 County Committee meeting, all five districts reported the approval by their boards of the development of the relevant JPAs.

On June 11, 2012, Senate Bill 477 was amended by Senator Rod Wright to address the petition to create a Wiseburn USD. The bill language sought to create a Wiseburn USD (pending approval by the voters who currently reside within the Wiseburn SD), along with the creation of a revenue sharing JPA as described above. The Wiseburn SD requested that the County Committee submit a letter to the SBE expressing support of the pending local solution and legislation.

The amended version of SB 477 passed both the Senate and the Assembly. On September 28, 2012, the Governor signed the bill. He included a signing message advising the parties to introduce clean-up legislation that addresses concerns about the revenue limit formula for the new Wiseburn USD included in the legislation, as well as the commitment that the Centinela Valley Union HSD is supportive of the limited election area for the unification vote.

At the October 3, 2012 regular meeting, representatives from all five impacted districts appeared before the County Committee at its invitation. They provided an update on the clean-up legislation, how they are working together to develop articulation processes, and their commitment to continue to build on their local solution so that all districts and their students thrive. They alerted the County Committee to the fact that the JPA called the Local Classrooms Funding Authority (LCFA), which was formed upon approval by the boards of all five of the local districts, placed its first parcel tax measure on the November 6, 2012 ballot. The County Committee agreed to send a letter of support to the SBE, which was distributed on October 23, 2012.

On November 6, 2012, the LCFA ballot initiative was passed by voters from the five impacted districts. The Wiseburn SD is currently in discussions with the CDE regarding adoption of the CEQA report.

On December 5, 2012, staff met with representatives of the Wiseburn SD and their environmental consultants, Terry A. Hayes and Associates, along with a representative from the CDE, to review the procedures needed to facilitate the SBE’s adoption of the EIR previously developed for the Wiseburn unification petition. The environmental consultants will follow CEQA procedures and advise all parties on the steps necessary to align the adoption of the EIR with the SBE’s review of the unification petition.

On December 12, 2012, SB 41 was introduced to clean up the revenue limit aspect of the original legislation approving the Wiseburn unification. If passed, this urgency bill would take effect immediately and would allow for the unification petition to be agendized by the SBE. In light of this legislation, staff is working with LACOE financial staff to develop the blended revenue limit for the Wiseburn USD (when formed), in consultation with the CDE. Staff is also assisting
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LACOE financial staff in the gathering of documents the CDE requested related to the Wiseburn SD and the Centinela Valley UHSD.

At the January 9, 2013, meeting of the County Committee, the committee discussed its continued support for the Wiseburn Unification and directed staff to review the options for communicating that support to the SBE prior to their consideration of the matter (currently expected to be in May 2013).

*Status: Petition on hold at the SBE; Centinela Valley UHSD, and Hawthorne, Lawndale, Lennox, and Wiseburn SDs participating in LCFA JPA; legislation to facilitate formation of the Wiseburn USD signed by the Governor; process to adopt EIR underway with CDE; clean-up legislation introduced December 12, 2012.

Status Date: January 23, 2013

PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN, ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUSTEE AREAS, AND THE REQUIREMENT OF TRUSTEE AREA VOTING, WITHIN THE POMONA USD

On June 6, 2012, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §5019 and §5020 to increase the number of trustees from five to seven, to establish trustee areas, and to require trustee area voting within the Pomona USD. The request was submitted by chief petitioner, Mr. John Mendoza. The petition was forwarded to County Counsel to determine the legal compliance of format and content. On June 19, 2012, County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient; staff returned the petition to the chief petitioner on June 20, 2012, for circulation.

Please note that this is a separate petition, distinct from the other petitions requested by Mr. Mendoza, requesting some of the same changes within the Pomona USD (the addition of two governing board members and the creation of trustee areas). It was submitted under EC §5019 and §5020 and requires valid signatures from ten percent of the registered voters within the petition area (approximately 6,100 signatures in the case of the Pomona USD, based on the most recent count of registered voters). If valid and certified by the County Committee, this petition would trigger a ballot initiative (as opposed to a reference report and vote by the County Committee).

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: June 20, 2012

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
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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 that 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 will need to collect approximately 7,000 valid signatures in order 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 that 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, staffs 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.

Status: Petition insufficient; chief petitioners may gather additional signatures.

Status Date: December 5, 2011

PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUSTEE AREAS WITHIN THE POMONA USD

On July 13, 2009, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §5019 and §5020 to increase the number of trustees from five to seven and to establish trustee areas within the Pomona USD. The request was submitted by chief petitioner Mr. Mendoza. The petition was
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forwarded to County Counsel to determine its legal compliance regarding format and content. On August 7, 2009, County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient. Staff returned the petition to the chief petitioner on August 11, 2009, for circulation.

Please note that this is a separate petition, distinct from the other petitions requested by Mr. Mendoza, and requests some of the same changes within the Pomona USD (the addition of two governing board members and the creation of trustee areas). It was submitted under EC §5019 and §5020 and requires valid signatures from ten percent of the registered voters within the petition area (approximately 7,000 signatures in the case of the Pomona USD). If valid and certified by the County Committee, this petition would trigger a ballot initiative (as opposed to a reference report and vote by the County Committee).

**Status:** Petition in circulation.  
**Status Date:** August 20, 2009

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

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

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

**Status:** Petition in circulation.  
**Status Date:** May 11, 2007

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

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

**PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN WITHIN THE POMONA USD, RETAINING THE AT-LARGE VOTING METHOD**

**Status:** Petition in circulation.  
**Status Date:** January 17, 2007

**PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN, THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUSTEE AREAS, AND THE REQUIREMENT OF TRUSTEE AREA VOTING WITHIN THE MOUNT SAN ANTONIO CCD**

**Status:** Petition in circulation.  
**Status Date:** October 2, 2006
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PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUSTEE AREAS WITHIN THE POMONA USD

Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: April 11, 2006

PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN, THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUSTEE AREAS, AND THE REQUIREMENT OF TRUSTEE AREA VOTING WITHIN THE MOUNT SAN ANTONIO CCD

Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: April 11, 2006

PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN WITHIN THE MOUNT SAN ANTONIO CCD

Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: July 21, 2003

PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN WITHIN THE POMONA USD

Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: June 16, 2003

PROPOSAL TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN, TO ESTABLISH TRUSTEE AREAS, AND TO REQUIRE THAT EACH GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER RESIDE IN AND BE ELECTED BY THE REGISTERED VOTERS OF EACH PARTICULAR TRUSTEE AREA WITHIN THE MOUNT SAN ANTONIO CCD

Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: August 20, 2001

RECENT INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION

Unification Proposals/Last Activity Date
- Malibu USD (Santa Monica-Malibu USD)/November 2011

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date
- Temple City USD to Arcadia USD/March 2012

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date
- None
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Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

* • ABC USD/January 2013

* Indicates update from previous summary.