November 27, 2012

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 December 5, 2012, Regular Meeting of the County Committee

The regular meeting of the County Committee scheduled for Wednesday, December 5, 2012, has been CANCELLED. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 9, 2013, at 11:30 a.m. Please note the new date and time for the January meeting only.

The following is an update of relevant information as of November 26, 2012.

Staff Activities

- On October 29, 2012, staff conducted the 2012 election of County Committee members at the annual meeting of the Los Angeles County Association of School Trustees in Gardena, CA. Mr. Frank Bostrom was reelected to represent the Fourth Supervisorial District. Mr. Joel Peterson was elected to represent the Fifth Supervisorial District. In the First Supervisorial District, there will be a run-off election, which concludes November 30, 2012. Staff will announce the successful candidate in a bulletin to be distributed in early December.

- Staff is finalizing a bulletin to Los Angeles County School and Community College Districts on updates related to the California Voting Rights Act.

Newspaper Articles

- A November 7, 2012, article from the Visalia Times-DELTA - “Visalia voters reject council districts.” (Attachment 1)

- A November 12, 2012, article from the Sacramento BEE - “Sacramento-area school board races vary widely in voter participation.” (Attachment 2)
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- A November 13, 2012, article from the Inland Valley Daily Bulletin—“Pomona officials asked too much for taxes to pass.” (Attachment 3)

- A November 16, 2012, article from the San Mateo Daily Journal—“District election lawsuit still a go.” (Attachment 4)

- A November 17, 2012, article from the Long Beach Press Telegram—“District voting system brings 3 Latinos to Cerritos College board.” (Attachment 5)

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 6)
- “Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals (excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District).” (Attachment 7)

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

KDC/AD:ah
Attachments
November 7, 2012

**Visalia voters reject council districts**

Visalians voted no on Measure P, which would have required council members to be elected by district rather than citywide, but the city could still be forced to district elections if the matter goes to court.

The measure never gained ground with voters, and for the most part, members of the City Council were silent on the subject. The measure fell by a margin of 59 percent to 41 percent (15,218 to 10,474) with all 43 precincts reporting as of 11:15 p.m., according to the Tulare County Registrar of Voters.

Visalia Mayor Amy Shuklian was against the measure from the start, asking why fix a system that isn’t broken.

“I think the voters have spoken,” Shuklian said. “There were no proponents for Measure P out there. The folks who felt so passionately about our need to go to district elections weren’t out there campaigning for it. I think folks think the city has been run fairly and those who have been elected have served the city well.”

Councilman Warren Gubler was the only council member who supported the measure.

“I’m disappointed,” Gubler said. “I thought [the measure] had a lot of merit. We put it on the ballot so that Visalians would tell us what they want, and they let us know.”

He said more support from people who had served on a task force that recommended the districts might have helped gain support for Measure P.

Measure P’s failure doesn’t mean the issue of district elections in Visalia dies with it.

The California Voting Rights Act was signed into law in 2002. It expanded the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965 making it easier for minority groups in California to prove that their votes were being diluted in at-large elections. Critics of district elections argue that race plays a predominant factor in them, while those who are against at-large elections say they tend to keep minorities out of office.

Lawsuits in Modesto, Madera and Hanford caused them to change from at-large to district elections. All three suits were settled after court proceedings had taken place.
with rulings and appeals. The total cost for the three cities in lawyer fees was nearly $4.3 million, according to an Associated Press report in 2010.

"If the percentages stand, Visalians have spoken clearly on the issue, and I prefer to let the local voters decide the issue," Gubler said. "I've done what I can but I'd be disappointed if outside forces thought they had to come in and get involved in the mix. Bottom line is I hate to use taxpayer money to fund litigation. There are so many things we can use that money for."

If Measure P had passed, City Council members in Visalia would have been elected by voters in individual districts instead of by all city voters. The city would have had to draw up a map with five distinct districts and the new process would have started in 2013.

Also, if it had been approved, voters would have elected City Council members every four years instead of two years.

Since the city's beginnings, members of the city council have been elected as at-large candidates — meaning they could reside anywhere in Visalia and be voted onto the council.

But last year, because of fear of possible litigation, the City Council spent $50,000 on a consulting firm to consider whether Visalia should change to district-based elections. The consultant's findings were that the city should use district elections. Then a task force, made up of 13 members of the community, recommended changes for the city's election process to be decided in November's election.
Sacramento-area school board races vary widely in voter participation

Published Monday, Nov. 12, 2012

As ballots continue to be counted, a trend among local school districts appears to be holding — voter participation in school board races varies drastically from one area to another.

In Natomas and San Juan Unified trustee elections, more than 40 percent of people who cast ballots either skipped the school board race or did not use all three of the votes available to them. Election officials refer to this as an undervote.

Sacramento City and Elk Grove school districts recorded much higher voter participation, with an undervote of 20 percent to 25 percent.

Why the discrepancy?

Some candidates point to each district’s voting method as a potential factor.

"It’s a matter of democracy and being adequately represented," said Natomas school board candidate Karen Bernal, who in the most recently released election count is 297 votes behind Scott Dosick for the third seat in Natomas Unified.

Bernal said the high undervote makes her argument that the north area school district should consider trustee area elections over its current method of at-large elections so voters feel a stronger connection with their representative.

"I don't think the community is being served (the current) way," said Bernal. "It makes campaigning difficult. We have a much larger universe to reach."

Both Natomas and San Juan use at-large elections in which voters living in the school district cast votes for all available trustee seats.

In trustee area elections, which are used by Sacramento City Unified, the district is broken up into areas in which voters cast one vote for a board member from their general area. Elk Grove Unified uses a hybrid model in which school board members must live in one of seven trustee areas, but residents in the district vote for all available trustee seats.

"Part of the undervote are people who weren't reached by candidates," said Dosick, a business owner in Natomas and first-time school board candidate. "We are on the
smaller side of school districts, but it's a very large district to campaign in. I knocked on
doors constantly and only spoke to a small percentage of voters."

Dosick said he was interested to see the high number of undervotes in Natomas
Unified, but he said he doesn't entirely attribute them to the district's election method.
He said there are other factors to consider, including the percentage of renters vs.
homowners, percentage of households with children, the long ballot and whether there
were busy precincts with long lines.

In the 2010 and 2008 elections, the undervotes percentages in the Sacramento City,
Natomas and Elk Grove districts were similar to this year's totals. San Juan Unified had
an even higher percentage of undervotes in 2010 and 2008 when 50 percent – or
364,000 votes – went uncast by people who voted in other races.

In Tuesday's election, there were 150,000 undervotes in San Juan Unified and 22,000
in the smaller Natomas district.

Sacramento City Unified trustee Patrick Kennedy, who won re-election Tuesday, said
he doesn't see a correlation between undervotes and district election methods. He said
that in Natomas, the undervotes are likely a sign of mistrust.

"In Natomas, it was a nasty race and people are discouraged about their schools
because of the controversy they've had," Kennedy said.

The issue of trustee area elections has been debated by many school districts,
particularly in recent years after San Francisco civil rights lawyers began suing school
districts, and winning.

The Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area has sued and
threatened to sue school districts and cities under the California Voting Rights Act of
2001, which prohibits at-large elections if they dilute the voting influence of minority
groups.

"I think there are pros and cons with both models," said San Juan Unified trustee Larry
Miles, who did not seek re-election. "The concern I have with the trustee model in
school districts is it permits school board members to worry about only the schools in
their districts."
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Pomona officials asked too much for taxes to pass

Monica Rodriguez, Staff Writer

Posted: 11/13/2012 06:27:18 PM PST

Updated: 11/13/2012 08:09:24 PM PST

POMONA - All five of the city's ballot measures - three of which involved increasing or establishing taxes - were shot down by voters this election cycle.

The failure of the tax measures shouldn't have come as a complete surprise as people usually vote to support one tax measure but no more than that, said Michael Coleman, a local government finance expert.

The conventional wisdom is to give voters one item to decide on, Coleman said.

If people have more than one tax choice, "they might say I don't want all of these" and reject them all, he said.

Mayor Elliott Rothman predicted just that outcome during a campaign forum in October, saying he thought all five measures would fail.

Pomona measures
Pomona residents denied five ballot measures on Election Day.

They were:

- Measure T sought to change the way council members are elected. Council members are currently nominated by voters of the district they live in and elected by district. Had the measure been approved, candidates would have been nominated by district voters but elected at-large.
- Measure U called for the approval of updates to the city's charter proposed by a citizens commission.
- Measure V would have raised the city's transient occupancy tax charged at all hotels in the city, producing some $288,000 a year for the city's general fund.
- Measure W would have increased the city's property transfer tax, generating about $1 million annually for the general fund.
- Measure X would have established a parcel tax that would have produced about $1.5 million per year for the library.

Measures V and W, which sought increases to existing taxes, and Measure X, which would have established a parcel tax to generate revenue to pay for the operations and services of the city's Public Library. The other two measures, T and U, involved broadening elections and updating the city charter, respectively.

The struggles in Pomona to get the measures passed was in contrast to other cities in California.
Ten out of 24 parcel taxes in the state received approval from voters. Of the 10 that passed, five were extensions of existing parcel taxes, Coleman said.

The best approach would have been to seek the assistance of a consultant to help determine what had the best chance of being approved, he said.

Councilman Freddie Rodriguez said he would have preferred to leave all three tax-related measures off the ballot.

"Just the word tax is a big no-no in the age we're at," Rodriguez said.

Councilwoman Cristina Carrizosa said the city had no choice but to try.

In the spring, council members voted to place Measures V and W on the ballot in an effort to bring in revenue to the city's cash-strapped coffers. Later, residents called for placing Measure X on the ballot to create a stable source of funding for the library.

The city faced two obstacles in passing the tax-related measures - a weak economy and absence of some type of campaign seeking support for Measures V and W, Carrizosa said.

"There was no organized effort," she said. City Hall could not campaign for any of the taxes.

Carrizosa said voters told her they needed information that clearly spelled out what each tax measure was and what it would do.

That was especially true of voters who are naturalized citizens and are more comfortable going through weighty subjects in their native language, she said.

Unlike Measures V and W, Measure X supporters worked diligently and were able to garner many votes, Carrizosa said. Although Measure X didn't achieve the necessary two-thirds majority to pass, it received 60 percent support.

"That demonstrates the community is willing to pay for that service," she said.

The council must now look for different ways of generating revenue to fund services.

"We've got to think outside the box," Rodriguez said. "We have to be different."

Paula Chamberlain, Pomona's finance director, said the process of developing a budget for the fiscal year that starts July 1 will begin next month and will include collecting information on revenue and revenue projections.

Contact Monica via email, by phone at 909-483-9336 or on Twitter @PomonaNow.

SAN MATEO DAILY JOURNAL

District election lawsuit still a go

November 16, 2012, 05:00 AM By Michelle Durand Daily Journal Staff

A lawsuit seeking to change San Mateo County to district elections for supervisor seats is still a go even though voters solidly agreed last week to switch from the current countywide system.

Backers of the six residents who sued called the Nov. 6 victory of Measure B a very positive development but say a judge’s ruling is still desired to confirm the county violated the California Voter’s Rights Act with the existing elections method and order the county to create a new district-based method.

But going ahead is a moot point, said attorney Jim Wagstaffe who represents the county in this matter.

“The electorate has decided the issue and a judge doesn’t need to. The county sent it to the voters to get the public’s view on it and they spoke through the election,” Wagstaffe said.

Wagstaffe does not believe a judge must establish or reaffirm district lines and plans to file a motion within weeks asking for the case’s dismissal.

The lawsuit and in essence Measure B aimed at changing the county’s current system in which board members must live in the specific district they represent but are chosen by voters countywide. Opponents argued this favors incumbents and causes a fundraising burden for candidates who must throw their net wider for money and votes. Supporters said countywide voters should be able to weigh in on elected officials who represent every resident.

The lawsuit also contended the existing method was unfair to minorities.

When Measure B passed, common wisdom echoed Wagstaffe’s thought that the pending change made the lawsuit unnecessary because there would be nothing left for the legal system to rectify.

Not so, said Robert Rubin, lead attorney for the plaintiffs and director of the California Voting Rights Institute of the Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights.
“The more important point of the lawsuit is that it seeks to cure the discriminatory effect of the system. We don’t know if that has been achieved because the county can easily dilute the votes of Asian and Latino voters through gerrymandered district lines,” Rubin said.

According to Rubin, the county can’t simply use the residency lines used to establish that a supervisor lives in a specific jurisdiction. The lines may very well end up the same or close to it, he said, but they must first be legally established as the district election boundaries.

The suit, filed on behalf of residents, Ray Satorre, Bradley Roxas, Joseph Olayde, Mario Panoringan, Violeta Ortega and Johanna Sandoval, contended that although Latinos and Asians make up approximately 25 percent of the county’s population, only one Latino has held a seat since 1995 and no Asians.

Rubin also points out that while Measure B was the will of the majority, it did not share the same support among the county’s leadership.

“We should be clear it was the lawsuit that prompted this change. The supervisors had turned this down several times and only after the lawsuit was it submitted. The idea was opposed to four out of five supervisors so it is no question it was against their will,” Rubin said.

San Mateo County voters twice defeated measures to change its election system, the only one of the 58 counties to elect supervisors countywide rather than by districts. A 2010 Charter Review Committee including now-Supervisor Dave Pine recommended the county put the question to voters again but the Board of Supervisors declined. The lawsuit was filed in April 2011 and, earlier this year, board President Adrienne Tissier suggested Measure B although nobody would say concretely it was a move to halt the lawsuit. Pine lobbied in favor of the change while Supervisor Carole Groom signed the opposition ballot statement and the rest of the board took no official stance prior to Nov. 6.

The lawsuit is currently scheduled for trial in February. A judge in August purposely delayed the previously set date until after the election as not to possibly influence voters.

Rubin said the two sides could stave off a courtroom battle by settling with the county submitting lines for consideration by the plaintiffs. If that does not happen, Rubin said they are prepared to head into court with a very strong case.

Wagstaffe, who believes the county would have prevailed in court if Measure B had not been proposed and passed, said heading to court is a waste of time and money.
“It does seem to me an example of people asking to litigate when in fact it is not at all necessary,” Wagstaffe said. “Hopefully, the county and the court will find no reason to create work for itself.”

The county last drew district lines in September 2011 as mandated after the U.S. Census numbers were released. The changes moved a piece of San Mateo from District One to District Two and a piece of Belmont from District Two to District Three. The result left District One with 139,933 people, District Two with 147,731, District Three with 143,936, District Four with 143,443 and District Five with 143,408.

The Board of Supervisor in closed session Tuesday will discuss the pending suit.

If the sides do end up in court, it wouldn’t be a first for the group which is known for its staunch support of the voting act. It has sued other governmental agencies in the past and though the city of Modesto challenged one lawsuit, it ultimately failed, costing the city $3 million in legal fees.

To date, San Mateo County has spent $293,567 in outside legal fees defending itself in the suit, said county spokesman Marshall Wilson.

Michelle Durand can be reached by email: michelle@smdailyjournal.com or by phone: (650) 344-5200 ext. 102.
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District-voting system brings 3 Latinos to Cerritos College board

By Kelly Puente, Staff Writer Long Beach Press Telegram

Posted: 11/17/2012 06:14:52 PM PST
Updated: 11/17/2012 06:16:37 PM PST

NORWALK -- Marisa Perez was trailing incumbent Ted Edmiston for most of the evening in the Nov. 6 race for a seat on the Cerritos College Board of Trustees.

Shortly after midnight, Perez pulled ahead to beat Edmiston, a 22-year incumbent, by just 100 votes.

With that apparent win -- the votes are still being finalized -- Perez became a part of history.
For the first time, voters elected three Latino members, while four out of five incumbents were swept out of office under a new trustee district voting system.

The change at Cerritos College is an indicator of what may come throughout California as a growing number of school districts, college boards and cities scramble to switch from at-large voting to electoral districts in an attempt to dodge lawsuits under the California Voting Rights Act.

"What we're seeing is the biggest and fastest change in local government since the early 1900s," said Douglas Johnson, president of the National Demographics Corp., a Glendale-based consulting firm that counsels cities and school districts on compliance with the California Voting Rights Act.

For the Norwalk-based Cerritos College Board, the elections brought a new face of diversity with three Latina representatives, a first for a board that serves a largely Latino population in southeast Los Angeles County.

Cerritos College President Linda Lacy said the board's decision to switch from an at-large system of electing trustees to seven trustee districts last year was a major catalyst for the change.

"I believe this is the biggest change we've seen on the board," Lacy said. "We've had several long-serving board members who have served this board very well, and their experience will be missed. Now we have a new group coming in who all seem very bright and qualified. It's a time for new ideas."

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

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

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

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

Johnson said his firm has provided more than 250 demographic assessments for concerned cities and school districts in just the past 18 months.

"It's definitely an exploding field as jurisdictions try to get ahead of the lawyers," he said.
The majority of California school boards use at-large voting, as do many small cities. In district elections, candidates can run only in the district in which they live.

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

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

Robert Rubin, a civil rights attorney who co-drafted the law along with Seattle law professor Joaquin Avila, said he plans to target all school districts and city councils until they are in compliance with the law.

"Our ultimate goal is to ensure that Latinos and Asians in particular have full and fair voting rights," he said.

After focusing on regions in Northern California and the Central Valley, Rubin, senior counsel at the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area, said he's now taking a closer look at San Bernardino, Riverside and Los Angeles counties.

Cities like Bellflower, which has a 52 percent Latino population but currently no Latinos on the City Council, are potential targets.

"Bellflower is on our radar," he said.

Rubin said he's currently in a legal battle with the city of Anaheim.

Critics have argued that the law is a money grab for attorneys snapping up millions of dollars in legal fees. Proponents say the law is essential for equal voter representation.

Joanna Cuevas Ingram, a fellow with Equal Justice Works, a nonprofit dedicated to training lawyers in the area of public service, said more school districts and cities are moving to changing their voting system as a way to better serve their constituents.

"They're not just avoiding suits; they're looking to become more accountable to their communities," she said.

In the case of Cerritos College, the college last year was sued by lawyers representing a group of Latino residents who claimed the at-large system of voting left Latino voters underrepresented. College officials said the college had already started the process of switching to trustee districts when it was hit with the lawsuit.
The suit noted the district is more than 50 percent Latino, but the seven-member board had no current Latino trustees and had not had more than one Latino trustee at a time since 2003.

The college settled the suit out of court for $55,000.

Two of the plaintiffs, Carmen Avalos and Leonard Zuniga, also ran for seats on the board this month. Zuniga lost to incumbent and board president Robert Arthur, while Avalos beat out incumbent Tom Jackson, a retired faculty member who was first elected to the board in 2003.

Sandra Salazar, a local physician, also scored a victory, beating out incumbent Tina Cho with 58 percent of the votes. John Paul Drayer, a Bellflower educator, won a seat from incumbent Jean McHatton with 67 percent of the vote.

Avalos, the city clerk for the city of South Gate, said she had been pushing for years to get the college to change its voting system. Avalos previously served on the board from 2005 to 2009 and then lost a re-election bid.

Avalos, who immigrated here from Mexico with her family at age 3, said she faced significant hurdles as an undocumented immigrant. Despite the challenges, she went on to earn her bachelor’s degree in biology from Cal State Dominguez Hills and a master’s in education administration from Cal State Long Beach.

Now a 43-year-old mother of six, Avalos said she plans to work to provide the same educational opportunities for those who face similar struggles.

"I was concerned because we had no Hispanics serving the institution, our vote was completely diluted," she said. "Now I feel we have equity. We have a board that now resembles our community."

Area's population

The Cerritos College district serves a large and diverse area portion of southeast Los Angeles County, including the cities of Norwalk, Downey, Cerritos, Bellflower, Artesia, Hawaiian Gardens and portions parts of Lakewood, Long Beach, La Mirada, Whittier and South Gate.

Here is a closer look at the populations of cities in the Cerritos College district, including the three largest ethnicities, according to the 2010 United States Census.

ARTESSIA

Population 16,522

Asian 37.1%
Hispanic or Latino 35.8%
White (non-Hispanic) 21.3%

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

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

DOWNEY
Population 111,772
Hispanic or Latino 70.7%
White 17.7%
Asian 7%

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

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

LA MIRADA
Population 48,527
Hispanic or Latino 39.7%
White 38%
Asian 17.8%

LONG BEACH
Population 462,257
Hispanic or Latino 40.8%
White persons not Hispanic 29.4%
Black 13.5%

NORWALK
Population 105,549
Hispanic or Latino 70.1%
White 12.3%
Asian 12%

SANTA FE SPRINGS
Population 16,223
Hispanic or Latino 81%
White 11.9%
Asian 4.2%

SOUTH GATE

Population 94,396

Hispanic or Latino 94.8%

Persons reporting two or more races 3.7%

White 3.4%

WHITTIER

Population 85,331

Hispanic or Latino 65.7%

White 28.3%

Asian 3.8%

kelly.puente@presstelegram.com, 562-714-2181, twitter.com/kellypuentes
Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals

December 2012

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 November 26, 2012.

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) 

December 2012

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 November 26, 2012.

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.

*Status:* Petition on hold at the SBE; Centinela Valley UHSD, and Hawthorne, Lawndale, Lennox, and Wiseburn SDs participating in LCFA JPA; legislation to facilitate formation of the Wiseburn USD signed by the Governor. Clean-up legislation to follow.

**Status Date:** November 26, 2012

* Indicates update from previous summary.
PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN, ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUSTEE AREAS, AND THE REQUIREMENT OF TRUSTEE AREA VOTING, WITHIN THE POMONA USD

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

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

**Status:** Petition in circulation.

**Status Date:** June 20, 2012

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

On January 17, 2006, LACOE received a request for a petition from chief petitioners Ms. Maurice Morse, Ms. Shirlee Smith, and Mr. Bruce Wasson, three community members who are residents of the area known as Altadena. The chief petitioners want to form an Altadena USD from territory within the boundaries of the Pasadena USD. The petition request was 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.

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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

OTHER INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last six months)

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

- None

* Indicates update from previous summary.