March 25, 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 April 3, 2013, Regular Meeting
        of the County Committee

The regular meeting of the County Committee scheduled for Wednesday,
April 3, 2013, has been CANCELLED. The next regular meeting is
scheduled for Wednesday, May 1, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

The following is an update of relevant information as of March 18, 2013.

Staff Activities

• Staff continues development of the County Committee website and
  will provide updates at the next regular meeting.

• Staff is following up on several pending requests of the County
  Committee, including gathering information on possible alternative
  meeting times, drafting a communication to school board members
  regarding the California Voting Rights Act, and a communication to
  the State Board of Education regarding the proposed Wiseburn Unified
  School District.

Newspaper Articles

• A February 20, 2013, article from the San Jose Mercury News - “San
  Mateo County supes settle suit by agreeing to maybe change district
  boundaries.” (Attachment 1)

• A February 21, 2013, article from the Santa Clarita News – “Saugus
  Union Votes 4-1 in Support of Moving School Board Elections.”
  (Attachment 2)
• A February 28, 2013, article from the RECORDNET.COM – “SUPERINTENDENT PROPOSES MAPPED TRUSTEE AREAS.” (Attachment 3)

• A March 5, 2013, article from the Voiceofoc.org – “Anaheim’s Elections Advisory Committee Faces Problems.” (Attachment 4)

• A March 11, 2013, article from the latimes.com – “Abuse pollutes state environmental law: The California Environmental Quality Act, signed into law by Gov. Ronald Reagan, is being used for unintended purposes and needs fixing.” (Attachment 5)

• A March 12, 2013, article from the Orange County Register – “School district boundary changes face hurdles.” (Attachment 6)

• A March 14, 2013, article from the Pasadena Weekly – “Staying alive: Hampton and Hueso headed for PUSD District 3 runoff election next month.” (Attachment 7)

• A March 14, 2013, article from the Patterson Irrigator – “Latino group seeks changes to City council elections.” (Attachment 8)

Legislative Review

Attached is a review of pending legislation related to school district organization. (Attachment 9)

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 10)

• “Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals (excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District).” (Attachment 11)

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

KDC/AD:ah

Attachments
San Jose Mercury News

San Mateo County supes settle suit by agreeing to maybe change district boundaries

By Bonnie Eslinger Daily News Staff Writer San Jose Mercury News

Posted: 02/20/2013 08:30:02 PM PST
Updated: 02/20/2013 11:57:03 PM PST

Less than 17 months after San Mateo County supervisors blessed the new boundaries of their districts, the county announced Wednesday it would go back to the drawing board to settle a discrimination lawsuit.

The boundaries "weren't drawn with an eye toward compliance to the voting rights law," said Robert Rubin, a civil rights attorney and co-lead counsel for the six Asian and Latino residents who sued the county in April 2011. The plaintiffs alleged that the county's at-large system for electing supervisors diluted the voting power of Asian and Latino voters, in violation of the California Voting Rights Act.

"Fifty percent of the county is Asian or Latino and yet in the past 20 years there's been only one Latino elected and no Asians elected," Rubin said in a phone interview Wednesday.

Until Nov. 6, when 58.7 percent of voters approved a switch to district-only elections, San Mateo was the only county in California in which supervisors were chosen countywide.

In 2010, the board of supervisors rejected a recommendation that the question of district versus at-large elections be put on the ballot. The board asserted that the at-large system is superior because it makes supervisors more accountable to the whole county.

But as a trial date for the lawsuit approached, the supervisors backtracked last year and placed the question on the ballot after all.

In addition to possibly redrawing district boundaries, the county agreed as part of the settlement to pay an estimated $650,000 in attorneys' fees to the plaintiffs' lawyers, said Michael von Loewenfeldt, one of the lawyers hired by the county to fight the lawsuit.

Settling the lawsuit does not mean the county agrees that the at-large system was discriminatory, he said, adding that it just seemed to be the logical thing to do after voters chose to go with district elections. And it was a cheaper route than taking the case to trial, he added.
"It's in no way a concession that, before, anything was wrong; it just doesn't matter anymore," von Loewenfeldt said.

Under terms of the settlement, a nine-person redistricting committee comprised of public officials and private citizens will be selected by the board of supervisors.

The committee, which could include Supervisors Adrienne Tissier and Warren Slocum, will hold public meetings around the county to get feedback on where to draw the boundary lines. It will present recommended district boundaries to the full board Oct. 8, according to an announcement released by the county Wednesday. The aim is to have district lines clarified in time for the June 2015 election, when Supervisors Carole Groom and Don Horsley would either step down or run again.

Von Loewenfeldt said the county didn't agree to redraw the district lines, just to "review" them.

"There's no agreement that anything will change," he said. "The county will appoint an advisory committee that will analyze the boundaries."

Groom, who was board president in 2011, said she feels "very comfortable" that the current boundaries didn't fracture minority populations. At the time, she appointed Tissier and now-retired Supervisor Rose Jacobs Gibson to the ad-hoc committee overseeing the redistricting effort because they represented diverse districts. Neither supervisor voiced discrimination concerns, she said.

Board President Horsley, who helped negotiate the settlement with Groom and other officials, said the county has budgeted up to $100,000 to hire consultants and do community outreach about the redistricting. He said he doesn't anticipate major changes.

"It's hard to say," Horsley said. "I think they'll incrementally change a couple of streets here or there. I don't think it will be a dramatic shift."

Anyone interested in joining the committee can apply starting Monday by going online at www.smcgov.org/districtlines or picking up an application from the county manager's office on the first floor of 400 County Center, Redwood City.

Email Bonnie Eslinger at beslinger@dailynewsgroup.com; follow her at twitter.com/bonneieslinger.
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Santa Clarita News

Saugus Union Votes 4-1 In Support Of Moving School Board Elections

Thu, 02/21/2013 - 11:44am | Perry Smith

With a 4-1 vote, Saugus Union School District board members approved the moving their school elections from odd- to even-numbered years to line up with the general election Wednesday.

“IT’s a huge cost savings, and the intention is to cast a broader net of voters in Santa Clarita,” said board President Judy Umek.

The next step is for the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors to approve the move before it can become official.

In addition to saving the district tens of thousands of dollars in election costs, the change also addresses a potential issue that has been brought up in Antelope Valley, where Lancaster Mayor R. Rex Parris is suing the city of Palmdale, which has a school that bears his name, over the California Voters Rights Act.

Parris announced last month that he has signed on as co-counsel for a voting rights lawsuit brought against Palmdale over the California Voter Rights Act.

The CVRA is legislation that was signed into law in 2002, recently upheld as a constitutional extension of the Voter Rights Act of 1965.

The move is meant to help minority voters who sued over disenfranchisement with the electoral process, citing a lack of representation in elections.

The current board reflects the demographics of Saugus Union’s constituency, Umek said, but it was a proactive move.

“What we are doing is addressing the concern,” Umek said.

One of the concerns brought up by board member Stephen Winkler, who was the lone dissenting vote, was that it would lessen the attention to school elections.

“That was a concern that was brought up,” Umek said. “But we have a community that’s very involved in the education of their kids.

“I would say the percentage of voters that come out do not reflect the level of involvement of parents in our schools.”
The move, if approved, would also extend the terms of its current board members by a year.

Umeck, Paul De La Cerda and Doug Bryce are now up for election in 2014; Winkler and Rose Koscielny are now up for election in 2016.

Do you have a news tip? Call us at (661) 298-1220, Or drop us a line at community@hometownstation.com

Santa Clarita News
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STOCKTON - Lincoln Unified Superintendent Tom Uslan has presented a proposal to establish geographic trustee areas that, if adopted, would guarantee representation for citizens from throughout the school district. A vote on the proposal could be held in a little more than two months.

Currently, four of the five board members live west of Interstate 5 in the Brookside and Lincoln Village West neighborhoods, even though about 60 percent of district residents live east of the freeway.

According to U.S. Census Bureau data, Brookside and Lincoln Village West are more affluent and less diverse than the rest of the district.

Wednesday night, Uslan released a map outlining five proposed trustee areas, each with about 9,000 residents, 6,000 of voting age.

After Uslan's presentation, the board unanimously voted to hear public comment on the matter at the next three board meetings, with a possible vote at the May 8 meeting at Mable Barron Elementary.

If the proposed map is approved, the areas west of the freeway would be guaranteed two board members. Uslan said the map could still be "tinkered with."

"There is room for board input and public input in the coming weeks on what the map might look like," Uslan said.

Of the five largest unified school districts in San Joaquin County - Stockton, Lodi, Manteca, Tracy and Lincoln - only Lincoln and Tracy choose their board members in at-large elections.

In 2001, the California Voting Rights Act made school districts and other government entities that use at-large election systems vulnerable to legal attack. In some cases, lawsuits have cost school districts and other governments sizable sums of money.
Advocates for trustee areas argue it is a more democratic system than at-large elections. They say trustee areas can lead to greater diversity on government bodies and also make it less expensive for candidates to run for office.

Board members who spoke on the matter Wednesday were supportive of the proposal, though they said they believe all the current trustees do a good job representing the needs of all of the district's 8,000 students.

"Our board has always worked for every student in Lincoln Unified," board President Susan Lenz said. "I don't feel anyone because they live near a school has ever favored that school."

Trustee Don Ruhstaller added, "I think this is a good starting point. My concern is we all remember ... we have to continue representing every student."

If adopted, area voting would begin in 2014, the next regularly scheduled Lincoln elections. None of the current board members would be affected.

Contact reporter Roger Phillips at (209) 546-8299 or rphillips@recordnet.com. Visit his blog at recordnet.com/phillipsblog.
Anaheim's Elections Advisory Committee Faces Problems

By ADAM ELMAHREK

Anaheim’s Citizens Advisory Committee, assigned to recommend in less than three months potentially sweeping changes to the way City Council members are elected, is facing the abrupt resignations of three of its 10 voting members and withering criticism from its own chairwoman, raising questions about whether the committee can make a competent recommendation by its May 31 deadline.

Chairwoman Vivian Pham said city staff has refused to provide information relevant to forming council districts by ignoring her requests for specific speakers to present information. Latino activists and an American Civil Liberties Union lawsuit have demanded council districts to better represent Latinos.

"I feel that the presentations we have had are more fluff. I feel like they're distracting us from the real issue of districting," Pham said. "We can't make an informative decision because they won't give us the information."

Further complicating the committee's work, one of the new appointees, Keith Olesen, denounced "90 percent" of the committee and its chairwoman as "incompetent" on a neighborhood message board, according to a resident who spoke at the last committee meeting.

Olesen, who wrote the comments before he was appointed, also wrote that committee members have known from the start how they would vote at the end of the committee's seven-month study, echoing suspicions from Latino activists that the committee is rigged to ultimately reject council districts.
Olesen said he also doubts whether the committee can complete its work.

Finding an answer to the city's election problems is "certainly not practical, given the makeup of the committee and the subject at hand," Olesen said. "There is some question in people's minds as to what it is we're exactly doing."

The committee, which according to city spokeswoman Ruth Ruiz has so far cost city taxpayers $18,395, was created after the ACLU filed a lawsuit alleging that the city's at-large voting system violates the 2001 California Voting Rights Act by disenfranchising Latinos, who constitute more than half of the city's residents. None of the council members is Latino.

Activists argue that council districts, which would allow voters to vote only for candidates in their districts, would provide adequate Latino representation by ensuring that heavily Latino areas get their own council representatives.

The committee, which first met in October, was thought to be assigned to recommend potential electoral system changes so that residents could vote on them in the June 2014 primary election. A new electoral system could then be in place by the next council election in November 2014.

And although that is one option, Ruiz said, the committee can make recommendations that don't include an election system change, like methods to improve voter participation.

"This is a very proactive step the city has taken to bring in citizen engagement to study the electoral system," Ruiz said.

Yet since its inception, the committee's critics have denounced it as an underhanded method by the council majority to delay the implementation of council districts.

Latino activists and former Councilwoman Lorri Galloway, who along with Mayor Tom Tait voted for council districts, argued that because each council member made two appointments, the committee would be stacked 6 to 4 with a majority of members against the move.
"I don't think it has any validity," Amin David, president emeritus of Los Amigos of Orange County, the grassroots Latino group, and a plaintiff in the lawsuit, had said when the committee was formed. "It's structured by the City Council majority."

Tait had pushed to place the council districts issue on last November's general election ballot, but a three-member council majority rejected the move.

Members of the council majority — Kris Murray, Gail Eastman and then Councilman Harry Sidhu — hadn't said they were against council districts but had argued that activists were unclear about what they wanted in a such a system, such as the number of districts. Council elections needed in-depth study before a major election system change, they argued.

Murray appointed Olesen and Sandy Day, both vocal opponents of council districts, to replace two committee members who abruptly resigned six meetings and four months into the process because of scheduling conflicts, according to a city news release.

One other seat, which was vacated by Sidhu appointee Peter Argawal, remains open. Council members are scheduled Tuesday to consider forming a subcommittee to select Argawal's replacement.

Thursday's was the first meeting of Murray's appointees.

"Their [Day's and Olesen's] appointments are a slap in the face to the Hispanic residents of the city and the minorities of this city," resident Steve Perez said at the meeting. "They are obviously closed-minded to the goals of this committee."

Olesen wrote in his message board comments that the committee appointees were selected for specific agendas.

Perez read Olesen's writings into the record during last Thursday's committee meeting.

"Everyone who is appointed to this committee is appointed for a specific reason," Perez said, referring to Olesen's message board post, which was texted to Perez moments before he spoke by Save Anaheim blogger Jason Young. "They already know which way they are voting."

"I believe that is how this started, yeah," Olesen replied.
For Eric Altman, executive director of Orange County Communities Organized for Responsible Development, which has supported council districts, Olesen’s comments affirm that the results of the committee’s work are predetermined.

“From the beginning, council member Murray has claimed to have an open mind and to be looking for what is best for the people of Anaheim for this committee,” Altman said. “If her appointees have come into this process with preformed opinions, even though she claims not to have a preformed opinion, then I think that pretty much predicts the outcome.”

Altman and Olesen both said in interviews that if they were gambling types, they would bet on the results.

“Most people are going to get appointed to the committee mostly because they reflect the views of the person that appointed them. I don’t know if that’s a good or bad thing, it just makes sense,” Olesen said. “But who knows, somebody may come up with that one little gem that no one else though of … one of those eureka moments.”

As for his remarks about Pham and 90 percent of the committee members, Olesen said Pham shouldn’t be offended. He also said her handling of meetings as chairwoman has improved lately.

“If I was her, I wouldn’t care,” Olesen said. “For the same reason I wouldn’t care if people said something weird about me.”

Pham said that she would judge Olesen by his actions on the committee. “Unless they personally attack me, I’m not going to react to the statement,” she said.

According to Olesen, Murray monitors and sometimes responds to postings on the message board on which Olesen disparaged committee members and expressed his opinions about council districts.

Murray did not return a phone call seeking comment.

Tait wouldn’t address the committee’s problems directly but pointed out that he voted against forming the committee.
"It's the most fundamental question of how the people should be governed, and the best way to answer that question is through the ballot. And having districting or not is a relatively simple question," Tait said.

So far, committee members who have expressed opinions about council districts have followed the split council's fault line.

Gloria Ma'ae, an Eastman appointee, has said that Latinos have had plenty of representation because two past council members have been Latino. "Personally, I want too be represented as an individual, as a human being, as a resident, not just as a Latina," she said at a December committee meeting.

Ma'ae also sent an email to council members last July expressing opposition to council districts.

Pham, appointed by Tait, said she has been strategizing with Altman and others in favor of council districts.

Martin Lopez, a Galloway appointee, was one of the activists pushing for council districts before the committee was formed.

From the first meeting, Larry Larsen and Bill Dalati — the former a Galloway appointee, the latter appointed by Tait — tried to raise council districts as the most pertinent issue the committee is facing.

Meanwhile, committee members Anthony Armas, an Eastman appointee, and Vic Real, appointed by Sidhu, have been less forthcoming with their opinions or have yet to form any.

Real said he hasn't formed an opinion on council districts but acknowledges that other committee members were appointed with an agenda.

"I feel like I'm a college student reading a textbook, but I cannot take a test until I finish the textbook," Real said.

Altman said that despite its flaws and potentially fixed outcome, the committee remains the public's only process by which to express opinions on the city's elections system. So far, most public speakers have favored council districts, he said.
Nonetheless, Altman and Pham also argue that the committee appears to be a smoke screen, designed to stall progress on the lawsuit and the issue in general.

The committee has had presentations on the state's Voting Rights Act and information on geographic voting patterns in the 2010 election. But it has yet to receive more detailed information, such as an analysis of racially polarized voting patterns in the city.

This information would be critical to determining whether the ACLU lawsuit has merit, because it would show whether Latinos have consistently voted for the same candidates but have been unable to elect them.

In at least one instance, however, city staffers denied a request for that information, arguing that that solving the problems raised in the lawsuit doesn't fall under the purview of the committee's responsibilities.

Meanwhile, the city has filed court actions to postpone the lawsuit's proceedings, arguing that the committee's work could provide a remedy that would make the lawsuit moot.

It's this kind of circular logic that fuels conclusions dubious about the committee's true purpose, according to Pham and Altman.

"I do feel it's kind of a delaying tactic for the [council] majority to delay the lawsuit," Pham said.
Abuse pollutes state environmental law

The California Environmental Quality Act, signed into law by Gov. Ronald Reagan, is being used for unintended purposes and needs fixing.

George Skelton
Capitol Journal

1:15 AM PDT, March 11, 2013

SACRAMENTO — State Sen. Jerry Hill grew up in San Francisco and vividly remembers the rare suffocating days of late summer when the fog fled and people sweltered.

The city's natural air conditioner clicked off, temperatures soared into the 90s and — back then — the skies boiled into a toxic soup.

"There'd be four or five hot days, around 1963 and 1964, when I was playing high school football and the smog was so thick I couldn't run 10 yards without stopping and choking to get air," remembers Hill, 65, new chairman of the Senate Environmental Quality Committee.

"We've come a long way. The air is pretty much smog-free now. I don't want to weaken any of the [environmental] laws. A lot of people consider them a nuisance, but we're living longer and our quality of life is much better."

The San Mateo Democrat credits much of the improvement to the 43-year-old California Environmental Quality Act, or CEQA as it's called.

Yet, Hill readily acknowledges that CEQA — signed into law by Gov. Ronald Reagan — needs modernizing.

"We recognize there's a problem," he says, speaking for Sacramento Democrats. "Something should be done. There are so many interests that utilize CEQA for so many reasons. When something is used for other than its purpose, it dilutes its effectiveness for that purpose.

"We want to make it work more effectively and more timely, so as not to be a hindrance to [development] projects. We have to address these issues and not hide from them."
Hill wants to return CEQA to what it originally was: a check on environmental degradation. It gradually veered out of control as various interests learned to use the landmark law for their own non-environmental agendas.

It became, too often, a tool of business rivals trying to block competition, NIMBYs ("not in my back yard") attempting to thwart local projects and unions strong-arming developers for labor concessions.

Meanwhile, project delays dragged on for years, money was wasted on consultants and lawyers, and California burnished its reputation as a lousy place to do business.

Hill's views are particularly important because he was recently named by Senate leader Darrell Steinberg (D-Sacramento) to head the committee that will be a filter for CEQA legislation.

He replaced moderate Democrat Michael Rubio of Kern County, a strong advocate of CEQA reform. Rubio suddenly resigned, citing family reasons, to head Chevron Corp.'s lobbying operation in Sacramento.

Turns out Rubio had questionable financial ties to an executive with another oil outfit, San Joaquin Refining Co. The watchdog Fair Political Practices Commission is looking into it.

Rubio had been the great hope of CEQA reformers. And some privately were disappointed that Hill, a liberal with environmental leanings, was chosen as his successor. The committee already was stacked with environmentalists.

But Hill, a former city councilman and county supervisor, represents Silicon Valley, which is pushing hard for a CEQA overhaul. So the political pendulum may not have shifted very far left.

"We were thrilled at the choice of Jerry Hill," says Carl Guardino, head of the Silicon Valley Leadership Group, part of a business-oriented CEQA reform coalition. He said Steinberg and Hill have assured him that "they want to do something bold, not modest."

Gov. Jerry Brown also wants to do something, although it's not clear what because he hasn't proposed anything. He has characterized reforming CEQA as "the Lord's work." But he seems to be waiting for the Lord to do it.

Brown and Democratic legislators are leery of ticking off labor, their biggest financial benefactor and, therefore, the strongest influence in Sacramento.

Labor is the principal protector — along with environmental organizations—of the CEQA status quo.

So why not just buy off labor with a backroom deal and get on with reforming CEQA — get on with development and job-creation? Require that any private construction project that falls under CEQA regulation have a labor agreement.
That would be illegal under federal law, says Jennifer Hernandez of San Francisco, a CEQA attorney usually on the developer's side.

But labor is pretty good at bargaining. Surely it could work out some CEQA compromise.

If not, Democrats should dunk right over their behemoth patron, to use a basketball analogy. Should, but inconceivable.

Many union leaders deny there's even a problem.

"We just see another cry by business for deregulation," says Robbie Hunter, president of the State Building and Construction Trades Council of California. "The history of deregulation the last 20 years has been horrible."

Change advocates insist they're not trying to weaken environmental regulations — just trying to stop them from being misused for non-environmental purposes.

One union leader — Daniel Curtin, director of the California Conference of Carpenters — candidly asserts: "Everybody has to stop abusing CEQA. It's abused by business, it's abused by unions, it's abused by anti-development people, it's abused by NIMBYs."

Steinberg recently introduced legislation offering a framework for modest reform.

Among other things, it would encourage "infill" developments, reducing urban sprawl. It would expedite the CEQA process for green projects, such as renewable energy and transportation. It would streamline court paperwork and prohibit so-called "late hits" by project opponents.

"I'm getting it from both ends," Steinberg told me, reporting that neither side is particularly pleased. "But people have to decide whether they want to fix the problem or be partisan warriors."

Maybe too many people benefit from the abuse. Maybe the policy is too complex and the politics too perilous for the Legislature. If so, there's no hope — unless the governor starts doing the Lord's work.

gorge.skelton@latimes.com
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School district boundary changes face hurdles

By ASHER KLEIN
ORANGE COUNTY REGISTER

A boundary change could be in the works for the Newport-Mesa Unified School District, if a luxury apartment developer manages to persuade two school districts and a county commission to go along.

The 1,244-unit Uptown Newport Village project was discussed at the most recent meetings of the Newport Beach City Council and the school district board. The project site is in the northern-most part of Newport Beach, near John Wayne Airport, but the land is in the Santa Ana Unified School District.

Developer Bill Shopoff said his company is pushing to have the development and the land south of it moved into the Newport-Mesa district in the four to six years it’ll take to complete the first phase of the project. Shopoff said discussions with SAUSD haven’t been fruitful.

“We’ve spent a year and a half, two years with them and we’re not seeing the movement we’d like to see. We will take action to go elsewhere,” Shopoff said, adding, “that doesn’t mean we’re going to get what we want.”

Santa Ana Unified School District includes parts of Newport Beach, Irvine and Costa Mesa near John Wayne Airport. Shopoff’s development, planned for the area around 4311 Jamboree Road, is in the attendance area of Santa Ana Unified’s Century High School. If it is moved to Newport-Mesa, it likely will be included in Corona del Mar High’s attendance area, district officials said.

The last time Newport-Mesa’s boundaries changed was in the Bonita Canyon deal in 1996, Newport-Mesa Deputy Superintendent Paul Reed said, when affected districts were lined up with what became the 73 toll road.

During that deal, he worked for Irvine Unified School District, where he worked for 26 years. Reed said that, in his experience, boundary changes are rare.
Since the beginning of 2011, district boundaries have been changed or adjusted in Orange County three times, according to minutes from OC Department of Education County Committee on School District Organization meetings posted online.

Generally, Reed said, “a change of boundary requires the concurrence of both school districts or it doesn’t happen.” For Santa Ana Unified, more students mean more revenue; Newport-Mesa gets more money solely from collecting more property taxes. A Santa Ana Unified spokeswoman said she couldn’t offer any information on boundary changes.

For Newport-Mesa, whether to go forward with changing the district boundaries is the school board’s decision, said district Superintendent Fred Navarro. He said his office had yet to receive any direction from the board, but will bring information to its members.

“Any time you have an opportunity to bring in some revenue through property taxes, you want to look at that carefully,” Navarro said.

Reed indicated that on paper the move seems beneficial. “Since we’re funded under the basis of property value, then arguably greater property value is in our interest,” he said.

Staff writer Deepa Bharath contributed to this report.
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Ruben Hueso and Tyron Hampton will meet in a runoff election on April 16 to decide who will represent the Pasadena Unified School District’s newly formed District 3 on the Board of Education.

With all precincts reporting, Pasadena City Clerk Mark Jomsky said Hueso bested Hampton with 846 votes — or 48.7 percent of the ballots cast. Hampton received 662 votes, or 38.1 percent.

Hueso almost avoided the runoff on March 5, when he picked up 756 votes, giving him with 49.9 percent — two votes shy of the 50 percent plus one vote needed to win the election. However, more than 500 provisional ballots remained uncounted at that time. After all the votes were counted Monday, Jomsky said the top two vote-getters were pushed into a runoff.

"I am really happy the community turned out the way they did," Hampton told the Weekly Monday. "The community really cares about our youth. This is about propelling our youth and making sure they can build a great future."

Hampton, who attended local schools and graduated from John Muir High School, surprised some political observers by raising less than $1,000 in campaign contributions.

"I plan to raise some money this time," Hampton said. "Like I said election night, I am putting on my running shoes."

Hueso, brother of former Democratic Assemblyman Ben Hueso of San Diego, raised $6,175, including a $5,000 contribution from former Democratic Assembly Speaker Fabian Núñez, who is also from San Diego.

United Teachers of Pasadena rescinded its endorsement of Hueso days prior to the election due to conflicting information found on different forms regarding Hueso’s endorsements from individuals and organizations.
Hueso did not return phone calls.

The new district boundaries were created last year by special task force in hopes of staving off potential lawsuits that might be filed against the district under provisions of the California Voting Rights Act. In all, seven minority candidates competed for the four open board seats in Tuesday's elections. In the end, three white incumbents running for four available seats — Kim Kenne, Elizabeth Pomeroy and Scott Phelps — won back their respective positions.

PATTERSON IRRIGATOR

Latino group seeks changes to City Council elections

by Nick Rappley | Patterson Irrigator

Mar 14, 2013

A group of Latino leaders in Stanislaus County is threatening suit against the city of Patterson unless it changes how it elects City Council members because they believe the city is violating state and federal civil rights laws.

The Latino Community Roundtable, a group of elected and appointed officials, sent a letter to the Patterson City Council on Feb. 6 demanding that council members be elected to represent specific districts within the city, replacing the at-large election process.

Maggie Mejia, the roundtable’s president, wrote that at-large elections violate the federal 1965 Voting Rights Act and the 2001 California Voting Rights Act.

“If Patterson does not immediately adopt district elections, we will file a lawsuit to seek judicial relief on behalf of Patterson residents,” Mejia wrote. “We will ask the court to impose district elections immediately, to draw the new district maps and to enjoin any attempts by Patterson City Council to perpetuate the current election scheme.”

Modesto lost a challenge to a lawsuit making similar claims in 2007 and paid a $3 million settlement to a San Francisco law firm, according to Doug White, Patterson’s deputy city attorney.

White said this week that no one who has challenged this type of lawsuit has been successful, and monetary damages have been large.

But Mejia said the group is looking for fair representation for all ethnic groups in the city, not money.

Rod Butler, Patterson’s city manager, said the council is doing what it can to cooperate.

“(The City Council) really doesn’t want to rush into this,” Butler said. “They are open to investigating the idea but don’t want to be threatened or pushed into a corner.”

He said the council is waiting for extensive information from White and his law firm that should explain what the city faces.
Mayor Luis Molina and Councilman Dominic Farinha declined to comment this week and referred questions to Butler.

Council members Sheree Lustgarten, Deborah Novelli and Larry Buehner did not return calls.

Mejia said Monday, March 11, that her group had not heard anything yet from Patterson officials.

She said the roundtable had received positive responses from other cities, including Turlock and Ceres, but had not heard from Oakdale, Riverbank or Hughson.

“Right now, we believe no news is good news,” said Mejia, who believes the cities are looking into the matter. “It was just a matter of time, and the time is now.”

The Patterson Joint Unified School District, which received a letter from the roundtable in January, recently decided to institute district elections for its seven trustees.

*Contact Nick Rappley at 892-6187, ext. 31, or nick@pattersonirrigator.com.*

Read more: Patterson Irrigator - Latino group wants City Council districts
LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION
(COUNTY COMMITTEE)
LEGISLATIVE REVIEW-APRIL 2013

BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR: Senate Bill 41/Wright
INTRODUCTION DATE: 12/12/12
LAST ACTIVITY/DATE: 02/01/13: Set for hearing
February 27.

DESCRIPTION OF BILL
This bill attached 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.
BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR: Assembly Bill 450/
Jones-Sawyer

INTRODUCTION DATE: 02/19/13


DESCRIPTION OF BILL
This bill would require the Los Angeles Community College District (CCD) to establish seven trustee areas by July 1, 2014, but would retain at-large voting in the district for four of the board’s seven seats in 2015, not moving them to trustee area voting until 2019. The other three seats would be elected via trustee area voting beginning in 2017.

POTENTIAL IMPACT OF BILL ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE, SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION PROCESS AND/OR LOS ANGELES COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS
Because the proposed changes to the governance structure of the Los Angeles CCD will not be implemented until 2017, the district may remain vulnerable to liability under the California Voting Rights Act during any time it does not have trustee areas and trustee area voting.

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

April 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 March 18, 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)

April 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 March 18, 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 Steentoft, 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,

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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 worked with LACOE financial staff to develop the blended revenue limit for the Wiseburn USD (when formed), in consultation with the CDE. Staff also assisted LACOE

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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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). At the February 6, 2013, meeting of the County Committee, staff provided an update on the process. On March 21, 2013, the Wiseburn SD will host a hearing on the final CEQA study, presented by Terry Hayes and Associates (environmental consultants).

*Status: 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; petition scheduled for review by the SBE in May, 2013; CEQA public hearing scheduled for March 21, 2013.

Status Date: March 18, 2013

PROPOSED UPDATE OF TRUSTEE AREAS AND INSTITUTION OF TRUSTEE AREA VOTING WITHIN THE DOWNEY USD

On January 31, 2013, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §5019 to update the trustee areas and institute trustee area voting within the Downey USD.

The proposal was initiated by the adoption of a resolution of the Board of Trustees of the Downey USD. Downey USD has had trustee areas with at-large voting (referred to as a hybrid voting structure) for many years and the district is seeking to add trustee area voting. In addition, the district reviewed and seeks to update its existing trustee areas. This issue was introduced at the March 6, 2013 regular meeting of the County Committee, and a public hearing on the issue was held immediately following the meeting. The County Committee voted to approve the petition. The Downey USD has submitted a waiver request to the SBE to waive the election certifying its updated trustee areas and the institution of trustee area voting. That waiver request was scheduled to be heard at the SBE’s March 2013 meeting.

*Status: County Committee approved petition; waiver pending before the SBE.

Status Date: March 18, 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.

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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 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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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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
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.

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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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

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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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

Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

- ABC USD/January 2013

* Indicates update from previous summary.