August 13, 2013

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

FROM: Keith D. Crafton, Secretary

SUBJECT: Regular Meeting of the County Committee- Wednesday, September 4, 2013

The next regular meeting of the County Committee will be held at **9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, September 4, 2013**, in the Board Room of the Los Angeles County Office of Education, located at 9300 Imperial Highway in Downey. Reserved parking spaces will be available on the east side of the building just south of the main entrance for County Committee members.

Attached is the agenda for the meeting of September 4, 2013.

If you have any questions, please call me at (562) 922-6144.

KDC/AD:ah
Attachments
AGENDA

LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION
(COUNTY COMMITTEE)

Regular Meeting

Los Angeles County Office of Education
Board Room
September 4, 2013
9:30 a.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER – Chairperson Mr. AJ Willmer

II. FLAG SALUTE – Mr. Willmer

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES I, D, A*

The minutes of the regular meeting of the County Committee, held on June 5, 2013, will be submitted for approval.

IV. COMMUNICATIONS – Secretary Mr. Keith D. Crafton I, D*

Newspaper Articles

- A July 25, 2013, article from the L.A. Times-“A judge decides that Palmdale’s voting system has illegally impaired minorities’ ability to win office.” (Attachment 1)

- A July 27, 2013, article from the Press Telegram-“All-Cerritos school board: Lawsuit claims ABC Unified violates California Voting Rights Act.” (Attachment 2)
• A July 29, 2013, article from the Santa Clarita Valley Signal-“League of California Cities reviews Voting Rights Act lawsuits.” (Attachment 3)

• An August 5, 2013, article from the San Diego Union-Tribune-“Election lawsuits spreading across state-2002 voting rights law forcing switch from at-large elections to voting districts.” (Attachment 4)

• An August 5, 2013, article from the Whittier Daily News-“Suit filed challenging at-large voting in Whittier city elections: Latino coalition says no more waiting.” (Attachment 5)

• An August 7, 2013, article from the Santa Clarita Valley Signal-“Lancaster weighs voting options at town hall.” (Attachment 6)

• An August 7, 2013, article from the Santa Clarita Valley Signal-“Lawyer in Voting Rights Act cases seeks to stop Palmdale election.” (Attachment 7)

• An August 7, 2013, article from the La Canada Valley Sun-“LCUSD passes final budget and resolution to include Sagebrush area.” (Attachment 8)

• An August 10, 2013, article from the Long Beach Press Telegram-“Six area school board races taking shape for November election.” (Attachment 9)

V. PRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

Any persons present desiring to address the County Committee on any proper matter may do so at this time. (Form must be completed and submitted to the Secretary.)

VI. UPDATE ON THE PETITION PROPOSING TO FORM A WISEBURN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (USD)

The Secretary will update the County Committee on the petition to form a Wiseburn USD.

VII. UPDATE ON THE CALIFORNIA VOTING RIGHTS ACT (CVRA) AND TRUSTEE AREA ISSUES

The Secretary will discuss recent developments related to the CVRA and trustee area issues in Los Angeles County.
VIII. UPDATE ON COUNTY COMMITTEE WEBSITE DEVELOPMENT

The Secretary will discuss the development of a LACOE-hosted website for the County Committee.

IX. REVIEW OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The Secretary will provide the County Committee with an overview of proposed legislation related to school district organization. The County Committee may take action to support or oppose the legislation or provide comments to the authors. (Attachment 10)

X. UPDATE ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY USD REORGANIZATION PROPOSALS

The Secretary will provide the County Committee with an update on school district reorganization proposals affecting the Los Angeles USD. (Attachment: "Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals") (Attachment 11)

XI. UPDATE ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY REORGANIZATION PROPOSALS EXCLUDING THOSE AFFECTING THE LOS ANGELES USD

The Secretary will provide the County Committee with an update on school district reorganization proposals affecting Los Angeles County school districts other than the Los Angeles USD. (Attachment: “Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals [excluding those affecting the Los Angeles USD]”) (Attachment 12)

XII. ADDITIONAL COMMUNICATIONS, CONCERNS, OR ITEMS FOR NEXT AGENDA

XIII. ADJOURNMENT
The Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) met on Wednesday, June 5, 2013, at the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) in Downey. The meeting was called to order at 9:35 a.m. by Chairperson Mr. AJ Willmer.

Members Present

Ben Allen
Frank Bostrom
Ted Edmiston
Owen H. Griffith
Joel Peterson
Suzan T. Solomon
AJ Wilmer

Members Absent

Maria Calix
Joan Jakubowski
John Nunez
Frank Ogaz

Staff Present

Keith D. Crafton, Secretary
Allison Deegan, Staff
Eric Hass, Staff
Anna Heredia, Recording Secretary

Ms. Anna Heredia led the flag salute.

It was MOVED by Mr. Frank Bostrom and SECONDED by Ms. Suzan Solomon that the minutes of the regular meeting held on March 6, 2013, be approved. Motion carried with one abstention.
Mr. Crafton reviewed and discussed correspondence contained in the County Committee agenda packets and member folders.

Communications

There were no members of the public to address the County Committee.

Presentations from the Public

Mr. Crafton reported that the Wiseburn School District (SD) petition was adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE) on May 9, 2013. He added that there are two documents in the folder that outline the process. He also added that the Wiseburn SD Superintendent, Dr. Tom Johnstone, was appreciative of all that the County Committee and LACOE staff have done to support the unification process. Mr. Crafton stated that there was a special election order sent to the Registrar Recorder set for November 5, 2013.

Update on the Petition Proposing to Form a Wiseburn Unified School District

Mr. AJ Willmer stated that this has been an interesting process with regards the timeline spanning 10 years, and he added that he would like the County Committee to be updated with regards to the reorganization and also receive student performance outcomes in a formal manner by staff.

Update on the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA) and Trustee Area Voting

Mr. Crafton stated that there has been increased activity with reference to the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA). LACOE will continue to keep districts as informed as possible.

Mr. Crafton stated that one of the uses of the County Committee website could be to provide information with regards to CVRA in the form of a library of bulletins and articles that are related to CVRA that were distributed to County Committee members as part of the monthly agenda packets.

Dr. Allison Deegan responded that there is currently another bulletin in the works that will address CVRA and that it will be sent to the districts.

In response to a question from the County Committee, Dr. Deegan added that we have no mechanism to urge the districts to inform us of where they are in the process of CVRA. There is a lack of dialogue that makes it difficult to track where the districts are in the process. Our approach has been to provide as much information as possible.
Mr. Bostrom suggested, and Mr. Willmer agreed that there should be an informative letter sent to districts in light of the information that will be available on the County Committee website. Mr. Willmer added that he would like the County Committee to have input in this letter.

Mr. Bostrom suggested there be a paragraph from County Counsel included in the letter.

Dr. Deegan added that LACOE consistently provides information to districts with regards to CVRA.

Mr. Crafton introduced Dr. Alex Cherniss, LACOE’s Chief Business Officer, who arrived in time to discuss the website presentation.

Mr. Crafton, Dr. Deegan and Mr. Eric Hass, staff to the County Committee, have been working together on the website. Mr. Crafton gave the Committee a brief overview of what the website looks like. He reviewed the content and also the location of information that may be useful to districts.

Mr. Willmer suggested that the roster page be in the form of an html document.

Discussion occurred regarding contact information for County Committee members accessible through the website. The possibility of assigning Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) emails to the committee members was discussed.

Mr. Willmer suggested that there be follow up dialogue regarding County Committee emails.

Dr. Deegan stated that a historical library will be maintained to include all articles with reference to CVRA that have been sent to County Committee members in monthly agenda packets.

Mr. Crafton added that with the website, staff can post bulletins, announcements and agenda packets.

Mr. Willmer stated that before staff spends a considerable amount of time on the website structure, he suggested that staff seek input from the County Committee members.

Mr. Crafton added that the structure of the website is a work in progress.

Mr. Willmer suggested that if input on the website is needed, staff should direct the County Committee to email links, information, etc., and to not wait for meetings.
Mr. Crafton reported that SB41, relating to Wiseburn SD’s unification and revenue structure, was approved by the Governor.

Mr. Crafton also reported that AB450, a bill related to L.A. County Community College District (LACCD), has changed. The bill proposes that the LACCD move to trustee area voting, but at a much shorter timeline than originally proposed.

Dr. Deegan reported that Mr. John Mendoza is circulating a petition within the Pomona USD seeking signatures from 10% of the registered voters to add trustee areas to the district. If he succeeds he can bypass the County Committee.

Dr. Deegan stated that the website will be an ongoing topic. She informed the group that there probably will not be a County Committee meeting until October 2, 2013.

She also stated that she is working with the sub-committee on the bylaws and policies of the County Committee and that she has done extensive research that Mr. Peterson is reviewing. She will follow up with Counsel as directed by the County Committee.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:05 a.m.
Palmdale elections unfair to blacks and Latinos, judge rules

A judge decides that Palmdale's voting system has illegally impaired minorities' ability to win office.

July 25, 2013 | By Frank Shyong, Abby Sewell and Joseph Serna

In a new critique of how minorities are treated in the Antelope Valley, a judge has ruled that Palmdale violated state voting laws by maintaining an election system that hampered the ability of Latinos and blacks to win office.

The judge's findings come a month after the U.S. Justice Department accused Palmdale, Lancaster and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department of a systematic effort to discriminate against minorities who received low-income subsidized housing. Federal officials said deputies conducted widespread unlawful searches of homes, performed improper detentions and used unreasonable force that specifically targeted blacks and Latinos.

The Palmdale voting rights case has been watched closely by minority activists in the Antelope Valley. V. Jesse Smith, president of the Antelope Valley Chapter of the National Assn. for the Advancement of Colored People, lauded the judge's decision.

"A lot of us [minorities] have been locked out of the process," said Smith, who unsuccessfully ran for a seat on the Palmdale City Council in 2009. "There's a great deal of the old boys' club there."

In an opinion released this week, L.A. County Superior Court Judge Mark V. Mooney concluded that Palmdale's at-large voting system violated state law because the city has "racially polarized voting" and minorities have less influence over the outcomes of elections.

Palmdale is 54.4% Latino and nearly 15% black, yet it has elected only one Latino City Council member and never a black council member in its history, said plaintiff Juan Jauregui's attorney, R. Rex Parris.

Parris and others argue that minorities would have a better shot at being elected if Palmdale were divided into council districts.
Parris is also the mayor of neighboring Lancaster, which also holds at-large, or citywide, elections. But voters in Lancaster have elected multiple black and Latino council members.

Palmdale Mayor Jim Ledford said the city plans to appeal the decision. He called the lawsuit a "money grab" by outsiders and trial lawyers trying to meddle in the community. The California Voting Rights Act, he said, is "poorly written" and unfairly holds cities responsible for the choices of their voters and the quality of their candidates.

"This is not a voter rights lawsuit. This is not about black or white, it's about green," Ledford said.

About 15 to 20 cities, school districts and other government entities have been sued under the California Voting Rights Act since the law was enacted in 2002, according to Robert Rubin, an attorney who helped write the act and is representing the American Civil Liberties Union in an ongoing lawsuit over Anaheim's election system. The act forbids the use of at-large elections to dilute the power of minority voters.

The Palmdale case is the first that has been decided at trial. All the previous cases have settled, some after protracted — and expensive — battles.

The city of Modesto appealed the constitutionality of California's voting rights law to the U.S. Supreme Court, which refused to hear the case. In the end, the city settled a voting rights case against it for $3 million and switched to by-district elections.

The city of Compton fought a voting rights case filed in 2010 by a group of Latino residents for more than a year before agreeing to a settlement under which the city put a measure on the ballot asking voters whether they wanted to switch to by-district elections. Voters approved the measure, and the city's first Latino councilman was elected last month.

Rubin, who also represented the plaintiffs in the Modesto case, said Palmdale's loss at trial may send a signal to other agencies to voluntarily adopt by-district elections or risk facing expensive lawsuits.

Often, said Rod Pacheco, a former Riverside County district attorney who now specializes in voting rights cases, elected officials appeared to be trying to drag out the case despite knowing that they probably would lose and that taxpayers would be stuck with the bill.

"The City Council of Palmdale, which made the decision to fight this and expend those funds, didn't spend their own money," Pacheco said. Officials often seem primarily concerned about hanging on to their jobs, he said: "The tack that many of these cities take is to get to the next election."

Ledford said he has endorsed multiple black and Latino candidates for Palmdale's City Council over the years and "can't explain" why the council does not reflect the diversity of the population.
"We go for the best and the brightest," Ledford said. "I can't speak for the message of the candidates or their ability to raise the funds to run."

He also said Parris seems to have a personal vendetta against Palmdale — an accusation Parris denies.

Henry Hearns became the first black elected official in the Antelope Valley when he won a seat on Lancaster's City Council in 1990, and he recalls receiving death threats during the campaign. He said the city of Palmdale should do everything it can to give blacks and Latinos a fair opportunity to be elected.

"I would hope that the citizenry in Palmdale would not just elect anyone based on race or culture," Hearns said. "I would hope that they would vote for the most qualified candidate."

frank.shyong@latimes.com

abby.sewell@latimes.com

joseph.serna@latimes.com
All-Cerritos school board: Lawsuit claims ABC Unified violates California Voting Rights Act

By Phillip Zonkel
phllip.zonkel@presstelegram.com
@zonkelpt on Twitter

Posted: 07/27/2013 10:14:58 PM PDT
Updated: 07/27/2013 10:39:30 PM PDT

LONG BEACH -- Even though the ABC Unified School District encompasses all or part of six cities, all of its board members live in Cerritos.

And while the cities represented -- Long Beach, Cerritos, Hawaiian Gardens, Artesia, Lakewood, Norwalk -- encompass a broad spectrum of ethnicity, five of the seven board members are Asian, and two are white.

Three residents have now sued the district, alleging the way its board conducts elections violates the California Voter Rights Act of 2001.

The district has an upcoming election in November.

The district operates under an at-large election process, which does not require candidates to reside in any particular area of the district, and any eligible voter may vote for any candidate, regardless of where that voter resides.

The lawsuit -- filed in April by former trustee applicant Olga Rios and Marian Rios of Hawaiian Gardens and Thomas Chavez of Norwalk -- requests the district to change to a trustee district election system, where the district would be divided into seven geographic zones, with representatives elected from each of them.

A case settlement conference is scheduled for Wednesday.

Warren Kinsler, the attorney for the district, said in a written statement said the district is working to resolve the issue.

"ABC Unified is a very diverse district with many diverse interests," he said. "Our primary goal is to maintain and enhance our strong instructional program, while celebrating our diversity. Whatever the district does with regard to this or any other lawsuit will be in line with that goal."
Laura Ho, one of the attorneys representing the plaintiffs, says the district needs to change its voting system.

"ABC Unified's at-large method of election violates the California Voting Rights Act because racially polarized voting has resulted in vote dilution for Latino voters and denied them effective political participation in elections to the board," Ho said.

For example, Ho says, Rios, who attended ABC Unified schools for her entire K-12 education and has two children in the district, applied for an open position on the board two years ago after Mark Pulido was elected to the Cerritos City Council.

About a dozen other applicants also applied to fill Pulido's unexpired term and were interviewed; however, the district "decided not to appoint anybody to the position until the next election, despite Olga's exceptional credentials in education, including a master's degree in education from Harvard University," the lawsuit says.

Another attorney representing the plaintiffs, Thomas A. Saenz of the Mexican American Legal Defense Fund, said it is important that the Latino population gain a voice. Roughly 25 percent of those who live in ABC's district are Latino.

"With the growing Latino student population nationwide, it is particularly important that our democratic processes work to secure adequate opportunity for the Latino community to elect its representatives to participate in school governance," he said.

Signed by then-Gov. Gray Davis in 2002, the California Voting Rights Act prohibits local governments from holding at-large elections 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 after the city of Modesto claimed the act inherently favored people of color.

In January 2012, ABC Unified sent an open letter to the community saying it had conducted an extensive demographic study from 2003 to 2009 and determined that the voting system wasn't polarized along racial or ethnic lines.

The details of that analysis has not been publicly released.
With three agencies in the Santa Clarita Valley facing California Voting Rights Act lawsuits, new attention is being paid to the wording of a law that was passed more than a decade ago.

The most recent suits — filed against the city of Santa Clarita, the Santa Clarita Community College District and the Sulphur Springs School District — are part of a fairly new trend, according to Patrick Whitnell, general counsel for the League of California Cities.

Those lawsuits allege that at-large election methods — in which voters can cast ballots for all seats up for election, not just one based on where they live — prevent minority voters from electing candidates of their choice, a violation of the Voting Rights Act.

Such lawsuits have been filed periodically against entities, mostly school districts, since the law was passed in 2001, according to Whitnell. But legal action against cities did not start occurring at a pronounced rate until the resolution of a lawsuit against the city of Modesto.

“I think that opened the floodgates to these types of lawsuits,” Whitnell said.

Modesto case

Unlike the recent cases against Santa Clarita Valley agencies, which deal with specific portions of the Voting Rights Act, the Modesto case focused on the constitutionality of the act itself.
Modesto city officials argued against the 2001 law itself, saying it was unconstitutional and allowed racial discrimination.

Modesto won an initial ruling on the case, but that verdict was overturned on appeal.

Officials then appealed to the California Supreme Court and eventually the United States Supreme Court, both of which declined to hear the case.

In the end, Modesto had to shell out millions of dollars in legal fees. The city moved to district-based elections for its City Council in 2009.

Palmdale case

While the lawsuits against agencies in the Santa Clarita Valley are just beginning, a Los Angeles Superior Court judge ruled against the city of Palmdale in a similar case last week.

Judge Mark V. Mooney wrote in his findings in the Palmdale case that intent to discriminate against a particular race or class of people does not need to be present for there to be a violation of the Voting Rights Act.

He also determined that members of a particular class do not need to be geographically concentrated for racially polarized voting to take place.

The latter finding could be particularly applicable to the Santa Clarita Valley, as officials with the agencies being sued have told The Signal that moving to district-based elections would likely not alleviate any minority-voting issues since populations of minorities are fairly spread out in the Santa Clarita Valley.

Radically polarized voting

Racially polarized voting, as defined in the Voting Rights Act, occurs when a “protected class” of voters chooses a particular candidate or candidates different from the general electorate’s choice.

Two expert witnesses in the Palmdale case studied election history in the city of Palmdale since 2000 and presented their analysis to the court.

In both cases, the judge ruled, the evidence of racially polarized voting was clear.

“The failure of minority candidates to be elected to office does not by itself establish the presence of racially polarized voting,” Mooney wrote in his judgment. “However, the
regression analysis undertaken by both experts nevertheless established a clear history of a difference between the choice of candidates preferred by the protected class and the choice of the non-protected class.”

Palmdale has vowed to appeal the court’s ruling.

League role

Because Voting Rights Act lawsuits against cities are relatively new, the League of California Cities has not determined how to advise cities to lessen the chance for litigation, Whitnell said.

If Palmdale were to approach the league for some assistance, the league could file a legal brief in support of the city, Whitnell said.

He said he plans to review the Palmdale case sometime this week.
A lawyer who won a Superior Court decision against Palmdale for holding at-large elections, which he says violates the California Voting Rights Act, is trying to block the city’s scheduled November City Council election.

But Palmdale City Attorney Matthew Ditzhazy said an injunction against the fall election would leave the city without a quorum on its council.

“If there is no election, then the city ends up with only two council members and three empty seats and a total inability to transact business,” Ditzhazy said Wednesday.

A Los Angeles Superior Court judge ruled in July that Palmdale’s at-large system — whereby citizens can vote for all seats up for election, not just one based on the district in which they live — violated the 2001 California Voting Rights Act.

The lawsuit was brought by the Malibu firm of Shenkman & Hughes, which has also sued Santa Clarita, the Sulphur Springs School District and the Santa Clarita Community College District for employing the same election system. The lawsuits allege such a system denies minority voices in the election process.

“We could not wait any longer, nor should the minority citizens of Palmdale be forced to wait any longer for justice,” firm partner Kevin Shenkman wrote in an email. His firm filed a request for an injunction to halt Palmdale’s election.

Ditzhazy said it was premature to ask for an injunction before the legal process regarding the Palmdale case is complete.
“The City Council has already directed my office to appeal once we have a final decision,” Ditzhazy said. “It seems that Mr. Shenkman is simply furthering his efforts to ‘run the meter’ on his legal costs in this case.

“His actions are reprehensible.”

A hearing on the injunction is scheduled Sept. 30, according to Shenkman.

Plaintiffs in the Palmdale case and the suits filed against Santa Clarita, the community college district and Sulphur Springs are represented by Shenkman & Hughes as well as the law firm of Lancaster Mayor R. Rex Parris.

Shenkman said his firm has filed a similar suit alleging violations of the Voting Rights Act against the Lancaster School District, but Parris’ law firm is not involved in that suit.

“The whole situation in Lancaster demonstrates the absurdity of these cases,” Palmdale Mayor James C. Ledford said in a news release. “I’m sure Parris dropped out of the school district case to avoid the bad publicity he’d get out of ‘fleecing his own flock,’ since the bulk of the Lancaster School District lies solidly within the city of Lancaster.”

Though it is not the target of any litigation at this time, Lancaster has created a committee to examine its election system to see if it, too, could be a target for a Voting Rights Act lawsuit.

Parris could not be reached for comment Wednesday.

Lmoney@signalscv.com
661-287-5525
On Twitter @LukeMMoney
REGION — A lawsuit that is forcing Escondido to switch to city council elections by
district, rather than at-large voting, is part of a wave of similar litigation spreading across
California — and at least five other San Diego County cities could be vulnerable.

Oceanside, El Cajon, Vista, San Marcos and Imperial Beach are all ethnically diverse
cities whose city councils don’t necessarily reflect their demographics.

The cities are among dozens throughout the state being tracked by Redistricting
Partners, a Sacramento consulting group that identifies municipalities at risk for being
sued under the 2002 California Voting Rights Act.

The law removed a legal hurdle included in the 1965 federal Voting Rights Act, making
it easier for plaintiffs in California to prove minority votes are diluted in at-large elections.
It also put municipalities who can’t show that minorities are fairly represented in citywide
voting on the hook for plaintiffs’ legal fees.

Throughout the state, seven cities — including four in the last two years — have been
sued under the 2002 state law. Nine county governments, community colleges and
school districts have also been sued and nearly 100 others have switched to districts
voluntarily based on the threat of litigation.

Most of the early lawsuits were filed by the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights in San
Francisco, but other groups have begun piling on, including the state Building and
Construction Trades Council — which filed the suit against Escondido — and the
American Civil Liberties Union, which sued Anaheim last year.

Doug Johnson, a professor at Claremont McKenna College’s Rose Institute of State and
Local Government, said all cities engaged in at-large elections should be looking over
their shoulders.
“It’s just a matter of time before these lawsuits spread across the state,” said Johnson, who has criticized the state Voting Rights Act for being too expansive. “The law is written in such a way that many cities are vulnerable, so they should be looking into it.”

In San Diego County, at least three cities — San Marcos, El Cajon and Imperial Beach — have all-white councils despite large Latino populations. (San Marcos is 37 percent Latino, El Cajon, 28 percent, and Imperial Beach, 49 percent.)

The city of San Diego switched to district elections in 1988, citing the 1965 federal law, and Chula Vista will make the change in 2016, in part to avoid a lawsuit.

Paul Mitchell, who owns Redistricting Partners, said every city with a significant Latino population should study their demographics and voting patterns, and look at how Latinos have fared in local elections.

He declined to say which cities in California may be most at risk — or which his group advises — but said the Escondido lawsuit was easy to predict. That city was particularly vulnerable to a lawsuit, he said, because “it has a Latino downtown core that’s never elected anyone. So you have geographic dispersion and the white area of town has been outvoting the Latino area.”

The mayors of San Marcos, El Cajon and Imperial Beach said this week that changing the structure of their council elections hasn’t been talked about.

“I’m not sure what makes us vulnerable or not, but we haven’t been discussing it,” San Marcos Mayor Jim Desmond said.

No Latino has served on the San Marcos council since Vince Andrade in the late 1990s, but Desmond said city leaders encourage anyone who cares about the city to run for office.

“It’s not that we’re shunning anyone,” he said. “Latinos just haven’t been running.”

Desmond said recent efforts to improve a large Latino neighborhood near Autumn Drive with parks and new housing show that city resources have been doled out fairly across the city of about 90,000 people.

“We’re trying to make it a better and safer place,” he said.

Mark Lewis, mayor of El Cajon, said district elections wouldn’t make sense in his city of just under 100,000.

“We’re very diverse so it would be unworkable to have people from every group on the council,” said Lewis, noting that people from more than 70 ethnic groups live in El Cajon.
Lewis said district elections can polarize communities because “you’ll end up with a lot of discord and controversy if people only worry about their own groups.”

He said he was confident El Cajon residents feel their council represents the whole city.

“If they don’t think we’re representing them fairly, they can vote us out,” he said.

Jim Janney, mayor of Imperial Beach, said he thinks his city is too small in geography and population to be targeted for a voting rights lawsuit. Imperial Beach has 27,000 people and is 4 square miles in size.

“Districts wouldn’t make sense in a city this size because every block would be its own district,” Janney said. “But I would never say I was confident we weren’t vulnerable.”

Brian Adams, a political-science professor at San Diego State, said the threat of litigation has prompted some cities to aggressively recruit Latino candidates to run for office.

He said one example is Vista, which was investigated a decade ago under the federal Voting Rights Act. The city did some community outreach and groups embarked on a strong voter registration campaign in Latino neighborhoods.

Two Latinos have been elected to the Vista council since then. Frank Lopez won his first term in 2004 and was re-elected in 2008, before losing his seat last year. Councilman John Aguilera was elected to a four-year term in 2010.

“There can be some real impact even without a lawsuit,” Adams said. “If the pressure is ratcheted up on cities like El Cajon and San Marcos, it will happen.”
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WHITTIER - The day before the Whittier City Council was set to meet to discuss threatened voting rights act lawsuits, a suit was filed in Los Angeles Superior Court making that claim.

The suit was filed Monday evening by three Latino residents of Whittier and is supported by the Whittier Latino Coalition, which at a June City Council meeting served notice that a lawsuit would be filed if the city did not change its system for municipal elections.

Angie Medina, chairwoman of the Whittier Latino Coalition, said the city's recent actions in hiring a Northern California law firm to advise it on the threatened suit indicated that city officials wanted to delay action as long as possible.

"We would like to move forward before the next (city) election (in April)," she said.

Earlier, the coalition agreed to delay the filing until City Council could analyze the issue.

The suit observes that in 115 years, only one Latino has been elected to City Council.

In the past 12 years, at least eight Latinos have run, but none of them were elected.

It alleges that data on voting patterns show that Whittier has polarized voting involving a protected group, Latinos, said attorney Felix Woo, of the L.A. office of Dentons, a global law firm, with Rod Pacheco, a former assemblyman and Riverside County district attorney, also of Dentons.

Polarized voting means that there's a difference in the choice of candidates or election choices by the protected group and the rest of voters, said Woo.
The complaint lists examples on issues such as illegal immigration, bilingual education and City Council elections, said Woo.

The suit also objects to holding municipal elections, at greater expense and with no apparent reason, in the low voter-turnout month of April rather than during general elections in November, said Woo.

"The purpose and result is to suppress voter turnout and participation, and we have the numbers to back that up," said Woo.

In the 2012 municipal election, 25 percent of the voters were Latinos, he said. In the November 2012 election, 50 percent were Latino.

There also was a large difference in total turnout, with 3,500 voting in April and more than 30,000 voting in November, said Woo.

The suit seeks to replace the at-large system with a district system, said Woo.

It also asks the court to enjoin, or prevent, the city from going forward with its April election. The plaintiffs want it moved to November.

Plaintiffs in the suit are Jafet Diego, Miguel Garcia and Lisa Lopez, all of Whittier.

City Council will meet tonight behind closed doors to discuss to the lawsuit and another threatened suit, according to its agenda notice.

The city has retained a Northern California attorney who specializes in voting rights matters to advise City Council.

In response to a request for a statement, City Manager Jeff Collier said there isn't much to say until City Council makes a public decision.

"The council is meeting with our experts to discuss a response to the demand letters," Collier said Monday in an email. "They'll be meeting in the near future to discuss this matter publicly and respond to the two parties that submitted the demand letters."

The most recent letter states:

"It is our belief that Whittier's at-large system dilutes the ability of minority residents particularly Latinos (a protected class) ""to elect candidates of their choice or otherwise influence the outcome of Whittier's city council elections."

The July 3 letter, from Malibu attorney Kevin I. Shenkman, of Shenkman & Hughes, asks City Council to respond to changing its at-large system by July 24 or face a lawsuit on behalf of residents of Whittier. It does not say who the firm represents.
Whittier's at-large voting system is mandated by the city charter, which can only be changed by a general election.

"As you may be aware, a ballot measure would have to be passed to change the current voting system, and that cannot be accomplished by July 24," said the city's July 15 letter to Shenkman.

City Council received Pacheco's letter protesting at-large elections and requesting districts at a June 27 council meeting. About 100 people attended the meeting to support the speakers.

The letter threatened to file suit unless council adopted a resolution calling for a vote on at-large voting by July 17. However, the coalition agreed to extend the deadline on July 16.

However, Medina said the city's action in hiring the same law firm Anaheim hired concerning a voting rights complaint convinced coalition members that the city was intent on delaying action.

The city has retained an attorney who specializes in civil litigation related to voting rights questions, Marguerite Mary Leoni, of the San Rafael office of Nielsen, Merksamer, Parrinello Mueller & Naylor.

In 2003, when the California Voting Rights Act was signed, the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) put out a celebratory press release that said the "(b)ill makes it easier for California minorities to challenge 'at-large' elections."

Whittier College political science professor Eric Lindgren, who is advising the Whittier Latino Coalition, has stated that Whittier is vulnerable to challenges to its at-large elections, as one of nine California cities with majority-minority populations and zero representation on city councils.

Whittier City Councilman Fernando Dutra, who came to Whittier from Portugal, is Hispanic. However, coalition members point out that Dutra was appointed, not elected, to the council in 2012 after former Councilman Greg Nordbak stepped down.

Several Whittier council members defended at-large elections recently saying districting leads to polarization.

Currently, a number of election districts are facing similar challenges including the cities of Anaheim and Santa Clarita.

In a July 25 ruling, a Los Angeles Superior Court judge found the city of Palmdale's at-large elections caused racial polarization.
LANCASTER — The possibility of a California Voting Rights Act lawsuit was the center of a town hall discussion in Lancaster Tuesday night, where residents and members of a city committee discussed ways to avoid the kind of litigation that has been filed against both the city of Palmdale and the city of Santa Clarita.

The meeting was held by the Lancaster election policy committee, a body charged with examining how or if to change Lancaster’s current method of electing city council members.

Lancaster, like Santa Clarita and Palmdale, uses an at-large election system, where residents can vote for all seats up for election, not just one tied to where in the city they live.

Lawsuits filed in and outside the Santa Clarita Valley have alleged that these election systems violate the 2001 California Voting Rights Act by preventing minority voters from electing candidates of their choice and that other systems, such as district-based elections, would better suit the will of minority voters.

The lawsuits also allege that there is the presence of racially polarized voting, with minority citizens supporting candidates of their choice and voters in the rest of the electorate voting against them.

Xavier Flores, a representative of the Antelope Valley League of United Latin American Citizens, said the presence of racially polarized voting in Lancaster is clear and that the city should examine a move to district-based elections.
“We do know that for Latinos the biggest obstacle to our electoral voice is at-large elections,” he said. “That’s the fundamental truth.”

Other speakers, like longtime Lancaster resident Cesar Vega Magallon, said districts should not just be examined for racial reasons, but for social and economic ones as well.

“It’s not always that Latinos just want to vote for a Latino candidate,” he said. “Latinos want a candidate that, above all else, represents the Latino viewpoint.”

Other speakers said Lancaster should examine changing its election dates to align them with county-run elections in an attempt to increase voter turnout.

School districts in the Santa Clarita Valley, along with the Newhall County Water District, made such an attempt earlier this year, but were not able to get the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors to sign off on the move.

Election policy committee member Steven Derryberry said he thinks Lancaster should collect demographic data to determine whether districts could be implemented effectively in the city.

“I think a lot of this conversation is incredibly premature until we find out what the statistics are,” he said.

Commission member Ed Galindo agreed with the sentiment.

“Whatever it is going to cost us to get these statistics is going to be far less than the cost of getting hit with one of these lawsuits,” he said.

Plaintiffs in the cases against Palmdale and agencies in the Santa Clarita Valley are represented by the Malibu firm Shenkman & Hughes and the law firm of R. Rex Parris, the current mayor of Lancaster.
LCUSD passes final budget and resolution to include Sagebrush area

Board passes resolution in support of integrating Sagebrush area.

August 07, 2013 | By Sara Cardine

The La Cañada Unified School District will receive $1.5 million more in revenue from the state this school year than it did last year but will still be operating with an $800,000 deficit, according to a final budget passed Tuesday night.

School board members voted unanimously to approve the $36.6-million budget, a revision that takes into account Gov. Jerry Brown's new school-funding model, but stressed the need for fiscal prudence and an end to deficit spending moving forward.

The board also formally passed a resolution declaring its unanimous support for a community petition requesting the integration of the western section of La Cañada, known as the Sagebrush area, into school district boundaries. The declaration follows a June 3 resolution passed by the La Cañada Flintridge City Council.

Ruben Rojas, recently hired as LCUSD's chief business and operations operator, presented the details of the new budget and the impact of the state's new funding formula at Tuesday's meeting.

"We've actually gained, by virtue of the new funding model, about $1.5 million. It's true we did not lose revenue, we gained revenue," Rojas said.

According to the new budget, La Cañada Unified will receive $6,167 per average daily attendance (ADA). One student who attends every school day equals one ADA. The old funding model would have brought in only $5,320, according to district figures.
The new model, called the Local Control Funding Formula, offers additional money for disadvantaged districts and low-income students and English Language Learners, but the La Cañada district does not demographically qualify for that.

The school board passed an earlier budget June 18, just four days after passage of the state budget, to keep the district in compliance with mandated deadlines. Officials knew then that La Cañada Unified would have 45 days to submit a revised budget using the new funding formula figures.

That budget, in the amount of $35.2 million, was passed before the district-approved 2% salary increases for its union employees retroactive to July 2012. The new budget does account for that, which is partly why expenditures exceed revenue.

Rojas praised the district for its cautious maintenance of reserve funds beyond what is recommended by the California School Boards Assn., but emphasized the need to reduce the deficit sooner rather than later. LCUSD maintains a 3.5% reserve as opposed to the recommended 3%.

"We are living beyond our means and that's a real critical factor," he said. "We either have to increase our revenue or we have to decrease our expenditures — there's no Harry Potter magic dust that's going to fix everything."

One potential revenue source could come in the form of a new parcel tax, which will appear on a mail-in ballot this spring. A renewal of the tax, set to expire in spring 2014, could bring anywhere from $900,000 to $3.2 million of annual revenue into the district.

Though the budget was a first-read item, it was brought to a vote on an emergency basis, as the deadline for submitting the final budget is Aug. 9.

Despite the evening's focus on finances, most in attendance at Tuesday's meeting were there to hear news on the resolution regarding the Sagebrush area. Board President Scott Tracy said district officials have met three times with members of Glendale Unified School District, which currently maintains jurisdiction of that area, and that the districts are "heading down parallel paths" toward an understanding on the issue.

"We don't know if that will be a successful path or not," Tracy clarified.

According to Tracy, Glendale Unified has asked LCUSD to prepare a memorandum of understanding it might discuss in a future closed-session board meeting.

Tom Smith, chair of the citizens' committee that brought the most recent request before the City Council, said the next steps were crucial.

"It's incumbent on us to have good discussions with Glendale and not have acrimonious discussions," Smith said. "There are a lot of mixed ideas, things that need to be considered thoughtfully."
Board member Joel Peterson, who also sits on the L.A. County Committee on School District O recused himself from voting on the resolution.

The final vote was 3-0, as board member Ellen Multari was away on vacation. The audience erupted in applause when the resolution’s passage was announced.
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Four school board races are taking shape for the November election.

ABC, Bellflower, Downey and Paramount school districts all have four-year-term open seats with many incumbents seeking re-election and facing opposition by several challengers.

The filing deadline was 5 p.m. Friday. However, on Monday morning, the Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's office in Norwalk will list any incumbent or incumbents who didn't pull papers. In that case, the filing deadline for challengers would be extended to Friday. A complete list of qualified candidates will be released by the end of August.

ABC, Bellflower and Paramount districts have at-large voting, meaning candidates can reside in any area of the district, and any eligible voter may vote for any candidate, regardless of where that voter resides.

But ABC's voting system is being challenged. Even though the district encompasses all or part of six cities, all of its board members live in Cerritos. And while the cities represented -- Long Beach, Cerritos, Hawaiian Gardens, Artesia, Lakewood and Norwalk -- encompass a broad spectrum of ethnicity, five of the seven board members are Asian and two are white, even though 25 percent of the district's registered voters are Latino.

In April, three district residents sued the district, alleging the at-large voting system violates the California Voting Rights Act of 2001 by disenfranchising minority voters.

They want the district to change to a trustee district election system, where the district would be divided into seven geographic zones, with representatives elected from each of them.
In the ABC race, three seats are open. Olympia Chen and Lynda Johnson, two of the three incumbents, have filed papers. James Kang hasn't pulled or filed papers yet.

Challengers Daniel Fierro and Soo Y. Yoo have pulled papers but not yet filed them.

In Bellflower, five people are competing for three open seats, including incumbents Paul Helzer and Laura Sanchez-Ramirez. A third incumbent, Donald McMackin, has not yet pulled or filed papers.

The three challengers are Sean Bookout, Sue E. Elhessen and Angelia Parrish.

Over in Paramount, incumbents Sonya S. Cuellar, Alicia M. Linden Anderson and Tony Pena don't have any challengers.

Unlike the other districts, Downey operates an a seven-district, by-area voting system. Last August, the school board abolished its at-large voting system in favor of the district system after concerns surfaced about the California Voting Rights Act.

The Downey race has three open seats in three districts.

In District 1, incumbent Martha E. Sodetani faces challenger Victor Manuel Malagon, while District 5 incumbent Nancy A. Swenson doesn't yet face any challengers. In District 7, incumbent Barbara Rae Samperi faces two challengers: Betty Luz Monroy and Bertha Rath Valenzuela.

_Phillip Zonkel can be reached at 562-714-2098_

phillip.zonkel@presstelegram.com
@zonkelpt on Twitter
LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION (COUNTY COMMITTEE) LEGISLATIVE REVIEW-SEPTEMBER 2013

BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR:
Assembly Bill 450/
Jones-Sawyer

INTRODUCTION DATE:
02/19/13

LAST ACTIVITY/DATE:
05/24/13: In committee, set for a second hearing.

DESCRIPTION OF BILL

This bill would require the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) to establish seven trustee areas by July 1, 2014, with vacancies filled at subsequent elections via trustee-area voting. Four of the seats will expire June 30, 2015, and the other three seats will expire June 30, 2017.

POTENTIAL IMPACT OF BILL ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE, SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION PROCESS AND/OR LOS ANGELES COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Given the significant lead time before the next election (June 2015) of four of the expiring future-trustees, activity isn’t expected lest it be forced via petition. The other three future-trustee seats won’t expire until June 2017.

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

September 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 August 12, 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 nine months)

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Inner City Unified School District/July 2012

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None

This document was prepared by staff to the County Committee.
Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals (Excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District)

September 2013

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals [exclusive of those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District (USD) that are at various stages in the school district reorganization process as of August 12, 2013.]

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

In May of 2001, the Citizens for a Wiseburn Unified School District organization petitioned to form a Wiseburn USD from within the boundaries of the Centinela Valley Union High SD (UHSD). After approval by the County Committee and a long review period by the CDE and SBE, the petition was moved forward via successful legislation, the formation of two related joint power agencies, and final approval by the SBE on May 9, 2013. The final step to form a Wiseburn USD is a local area election scheduled for November 5, 2013.

*Status: Election scheduled for November 5, 2013
Status Date: August 12, 2013

PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING, WITHIN THE ABC USD

On January 18, 2013, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §5019 and §5020 to establish trustee areas, and trustee area voting within the ABC USD. The request was submitted by chief petitioner, Mr. Charles Ara. The petition was forwarded to County Counsel to determine the legal compliance of format and content. On February 21, 2013, County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient; staff returned the petition to the chief petitioner on February 27, 2013, for circulation.
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).

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 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.
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

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

• Glendale USD to La Canada USD/May 2013
• Pasadena USD to La Canada USD/April 2013
• 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

This document was prepared by staff to the County Committee.