December 21, 2012

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

FROM: Keith D. Crafton, Secretary
County Committee

SUBJECT: Regular Meeting of the County Committee-
Wednesday, January 9, 2013

The next regular meeting of the County Committee will be held at 11:30 a.m. on Wednesday, January 9, 2013, in the Board Room of the Los Angeles County Office of Education, located at 9300 Imperial Highway in Downey. Please note the later starting time for this annual organizational meeting. 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 January 9, 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
January 9, 2013
11:30 a.m.

I  Information
D  Discussion
A  Action
*  Sent to Committee

I. CALL TO ORDER—Chairperson Ms. Maria Calix

II. FLAG SALUTE—Mr. Calix

III. RESULTS OF THE ANNUAL COUNTY COMMITTEE ELECTION OF MEMBERS CONDUCTED ON OCTOBER 29, 2012-Secretary Mr. Keith Crafton

The Secretary will provide the results of the annual election of members to the County Committee that was conducted at the fall meeting of the Los Angeles County School Trustees Association on October 29, 2012.

IV. ADMINISTRATION OF OATH OF OFFICE—Ms. Calix

Ms. Calix will administer the oath of office to the reelected and newly elected County Committee members for the First, Fourth and Fifth Supervisorial Districts.

V. NOMINATING COMMITTEE—NEW OFFICERS

The Nominating Committee, consisting of Ms. Susan Solomon (Chair), Ms. Joan Jakubowski, and Ms. Maria Calix, will submit its recommendation for chairperson and vice chairperson for 2013. The County Committee will vote on the nominating committee’s recommendation. The new officers will assume their duties immediately.

VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of the County Committee, held on October 3, 2012, will be submitted for approval.

VII. COMMUNICATIONS—Mr. Crafton

Newspaper Articles

- A November 21, 2012, article from the Pasadena Weekly—“Unintended consequences.” (Attachment 1)
• A December 1, 2012, article from the San Diego Union Tribune—"CITY OPTS TO SETTLE VOTING SUIT; LAWYER ASKS TO SET TRIAL DATE." (Attachment 2)

• A December 8, 2012, article from the Fresno Bee—"Lew Griswold: 3 from Central Valley honored for farmworker safety training.” (Attachment 3)

• A December 10, 2012, article from the San Diego Tribune—"MENIFEE: School board moving forward with by-trustee election decision.” (Attachment 4)

• A December 13, 2012, article from the Press-Enterprise—"RIVERSIDE: Alvord board delays trustee area.” (Attachment 5)

• A December 13, 2012, article from the Los Cerritos News—"History Made At Cerritos College After Four New Trustees Take Office.” (Attachment 6)

Informational Correspondence

• Informational Bulletin No. 3456, dated December 12, 2012, Update on Trustee Area Voting and the California Voting Rights Act. (Attachment 7)

• A December 12, 2012, Local Agency Formation Commission Notice (LAFCO), Notice to Subject/Interested Agencies, Annexation No. 2012-20 (Anaverde Hills School) to Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40, Antelope Valley (Attachment 8)

VIII. 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.)
IX. EVALUATION OF THE SECRETARY AND STAFF TO THE COUNTY COMMITTEE

The County Committee will adjourn to closed session pursuant to Government Code §54956.9(e) to discuss the PUBLIC EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION. The Evaluation Committee, consisting of Mr. Frank Bostrom (Chair), Mr. John Nunez, and Mr. Owen Griffith, will present an evaluation recommendation to the County Committee. The County Committee may take action to either modify the evaluation or to accept the evaluation as presented.

X. RECONVENE IN OPEN SESSION

At the end of the closed session, the County Committee will reconvene in open session and report on any action taken.

XI. DISCUSSION OF 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.

XII. 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.

XIII. UPDATE ON LOS ANGELES 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”)
XIV. UPDATE ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY SD 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 Unified School District]”)

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

XVI. ADJOURNMENT
UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF THE
LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION

Regular Meeting
October 3, 2012

The Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) met on Wednesday, October 3, 2012, at the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) in Downey. The meeting was called to order at 9:37 a.m. by Chairperson Ms. Maria Calix.

Members Present
Ben Allen
Frank Bostron
Maria Calix
Ted Edmiston
Owen H. Griffith
Joan Jakubowski
Maurice Kunkel
John Nunez
Suzan T. Solomon
AJ Wilmer

Members Absent
Frank Ogaz

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

Keith D. Crafton introduced himself as the new Assistant Director of Business Advisory Services.

It was MOVED by AJ Wilmer and SECONDED by Mr. Bostron that the minutes of the regular meeting held on June 6, 2012, be approved.

Mr. Crafton reviewed and discussed correspondence contained in the County Committee agenda packets and member folders. Allison Deegan added that these articles deal with CVRA issues around the state.

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

Approval of
the Regular Meeting Minutes of June 6, 2012

Communications

Presentations from the Public
Ms. Calix called Dr. Helen Morgan, Superintendent, Hawthorne School District (SD); Mr. José Fernandez, Superintendent, Centinela Valley Unified High School District (UHSD); and Dr. Tom Johnstone, Superintendent of the Wiseburn School District (SD), to come forward as a group and introduce themselves to address the County Committee.

Dr. Johnstone explained that Senator Wright introduced Senate Bill 477 in July and that it passed out of the Assembly on a 64-0 vote and then went to Senate on a 33-0 vote. The Governor signed the legislation with two caveats. The first caveat is to introduce urgency legislation in the month of December that is related to the revenue limit. Dr. Johnstone explained that in the bill was a formula that is not in alignment with current Education Code. Therefore, the recommendation to the Governor from the Department of Finance was to veto the legislation. He added that, Wiseburn SD will need to pull the piece out and introduce legislation that puts them back in alignment with the Education Code due to the fiscal impact to the state which would be between $500,000-$700,000 a year.

The second caveat is to have Centinela Valley UHSD write a letter indicating that all four (4) districts agree not to oppose the unification and that they could support a narrow area election if Wiseburn SD comes through the State Board of Education.

Mr. Fernandez reiterated what Dr. Johnstone stated. He also informed the committee that he had consulted with his board and that they understood the significance of writing the letter. Mr. Fernandez added that they are now at the end of the process and that the parcel tax will be coming before voters in November.

Dr. Ellen Dougherty from Lawndale School District and Dr. Barbara Flores from Lennox SD arrived and introduced themselves.

Dr. Flores stated that her district supports the parcel tax and the unification of Wiseburn SD.

Ben Allen asked for reflections of the process.

Mr. Fernandez stated that when he first came to Centinela Valley UHSD as the Interim Superintendent, he felt that there was a lot of distrust among the districts, he realized that the parties involved needed to figure out how all districts could be winners and come up with a plan that would benefit the entire region.

Dr. Morgan added that it was important to have everyone involved in the communication process and to have every district receive the same information.
Dr. Morgan agreed that they are in a good place right now but it has taken a lot of work to get there.

Dr. Dougherty stated that once the districts started to work together for the benefit of the students things started to come together. Dr. Dougherty reiterated that they are not supporting the unification, only agreeing not to oppose. She added that all districts involved need to continue with open communication and basing decisions on what is best for the students.

Ben Allen asked Mr. Fernandez what challenges he faced throughout this process.

Mr. Fernandez stated that the challenge he faced was overcoming the economic hurdle. He stated that the problem Centinela Valley UHSD had with the unification of Wiseburn SD was that without preserving the 14 billion dollar tax base, it would be damaging to Centinela Valley UHSD and the remaining feeder districts because it would leave them with less resources. He added that with the current process, it protects the interest of Centinela Valley UHSD by retaining 91% of the tax base under JPA1.

Discussion occurred regarding the possibility of a nonresidential community of one district paying for taxes for a district not within their boundaries.

Dr. Johnstone added that Centinela Valley UHSD and Wiseburn SD will retain the same tax base they have had since 1905. 9-12 stays with the high school district and the K-8 stays with Wiseburn SD.

John Nunez stated that as long as corporations can’t vote everything will be okay.

Mr. Fernandez stated that corporations vote by mounting negative campaigns, and that they have not done so. He also stated that the community is aware of this process and that they have their full support.

John Nunez asked what would happen if a large corporation goes out of business and that area becomes residential.

Dr. Deegan responded that in the JPA language it talks about property type; if this property is rezoned it would fall under residential and it would shift the balance somewhat.

Suzan Soloman stated that due to the caveat in the JPA indicating that it is by type, it is possible that these areas may be converted to residential areas, however, she feels that these concerns are covered.
Joan Jakubowski wanted to confirm that the information in the red folder is an EIR study that is for the proposed high school in Wiseburn SD.

Dr. Johnstone responded that the Board of Trustees approved the purchase of a 13.7 acre site on Douglas Street which is currently occupied by Northrup and will be vacated by the end of December.

Dr. Deegan requested clarification regarding the bonds passed for a charter high school.

Dr. Johnstone stated that the bonds were passed for Wiseburn SD to open a high school, not specifically for a charter school.

Ms. Jakubowski had a concern about the parcel tax not passing.

Dr. Dougherty stated that the Lawndale City Council is against it and that there is a great possibility that the parcel tax will not pass.

Mr. Fernandez responded that the unification of Wiseburn SD will still move forward even if the parcel tax does not pass.

Ms. Jakubowski stated that this process has been long and grueling. She asked the panel if their boards feel that everyone is on the same page and that their concerns have been addressed in the JPA agreement.

Dr. Johnstone stated that the majority feel positively, there is more dialogue and cooperation and there are doors that have opened that had never been opened before.

AJ Willmer stated that the level of frustration was very high among the County Committee regarding the issues that were brought forth. He commended the Superintendents for coming together and moving forward to solve the problem at their level and putting the focus on student performance, most important. He reminded them that this is just the first step at looking at how to help student learners.

John Nunez echoed the level of frustration that was felt by the County Committee.

Frank Bostrom suggested that they also involve the neighboring colleges and universities.

Susan Solomon, Maria Calix, and Maurice Kunkel shared their experiences in their respective areas, where there is alignment among K-8, high school districts, and community colleges.

AJ Willmer is in favor of committee to create a letter of support to the State Board of Education. The rest of the committee agreed.
Mr. Crafton informed the group that a bulletin with regards to the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA) is in the works and is being reviewed by legal counsel in preparation for distribution. He also informed the group that the County Committee Secretaries Meeting will be held on October 5, 2012.

Dr. Deegan added that the County Committee Secretaries Meeting is a key source of information with regards how the CVRA is trending up and down the State.

AJ Willmer inquired about the contents of the bulletin.

Dr. Deegan informed the Committee that the bulletin will contain information and a summary of what is going on around the state with CVRA.

Ben Allen suggested that wording in the bulletin should not include verbage that would strengthen or encourage the districts to take action in any one way.

Dr. Deegan added that the bulletin will serve as a source of information only.

Maria Calix requested volunteers to head the nominating committee for new officers. Susan Solomon will head the committee and Maria Calix and Joan Jakubowski will serve on this committee as well.

Frank Bostrom will chair the committee on evaluation of secretary and staff, John Nunez and Owen Griffith will serve on this committee as well.

Mr. Crafton stated that there is no legislation to review at this time.

Mr. Crafton stated that the office has had an inquiry regarding the Inner City Unified School District petition process, however, no formal petition has been received.

There is nothing to report on this subject.
Maria Calix recognized the service of Maurice Kunkel, who has chosen not to continue to serve on the County Committee.

Dr. Deegan expressed her appreciation to Mr. Kunkel for facilitating communication with the Antelope Valley that still carries on to this day.

AJ Willmer stated that there is a section in the west side of the city that is requesting to be part of the Beverly Hills Unified School District (USD).

Dr. Deegan informed the Committee that in their red folder there is a copy of the bulletin regarding the County Committee Election and a yellow letter with information regarding the election banquet.

Maria Calix asked the committee members to provide the best means of communication to staff.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:55 a.m.
Unintended consequences

Few minority candidates pull nominating papers to run in newly configured PUSD voting districts; five candidates line up to take Holden's District 3 council seat

By André Coleman 11/21/2012

In the end, former longtime Pasadena Unified School District administrator and onetime Board of Education member Bill Bibbiani may have been right.

With less than two weeks left for candidates to pull nominating papers to fill four school board seats in the recently districted PUSD, a move approved by voters in June aimed at increasing democratic opportunities for minorities with children attending school in PUSD, only one minority candidate has pulled the necessary papers to run in the March 5 municipal elections.

Along with four school board seats, voters in March will also be asked to decide three City Council seats — District 3, soon to be vacated by longtime Councilman Chris Holden, who was elected to the state Assembly on Nov. 6; District 5, also represented by a longtime incumbent, Victor Gordo; and District 7, presently occupied by Councilman Terry Tornek.

Five candidates so far have pulled papers for the council seat Holden occupied for nearly 25 years, and one candidate appears prepared to begin the campaign process against Gordo. No one has turned out yet to challenge Tornek, who himself has pulled papers for a second term.

Candidates have until Dec. 7 to pull papers to run for both the council and the Board of Education.

Back in May, Bibbiani, who worked as an administrator for the district for more than 30 years before being elected to the first of two terms in 2000, was the only person to publicly oppose Measure A, a ballot initiative designed to increase minority inclusion in elections on the Board of Education and stave off potential lawsuits that might be filed under the California Voting Rights Act of 2001.

"I'm not surprised" that few others but incumbents have pulled papers, Bibbiani said.

Among those who have filed to run are incumbents Kim Kenne in the new District 1, Elizabeth Pomeroy in District 5 and Scott Phelps in District 7.
In District 3, Tyrone Hampton, a general contractor, has pulled papers to run. Under the new configuration, there is no incumbent in that district. Hampton is African American. Kenne, Phelps and Pomeroy are white. Because Kenne and fellow Board member Ramon Miramontes live in the same district, and candidates are required to live in the districts they seek to represent, Kenne would have had to face off against Miramontes, elected in 2008. However, Miramontes told the Weekly that he is not running for a second four-year term.

Kenne, who was in office two years before the district was created by a special task force and approved by voters, could have remained in her seat for two years before facing re-election, but decided to run for a full four-year term.
In Bibbiani’s opinion, the new districts have not done what they were supposed to do to attract minority candidates to run. In fact, Bibbiani considers the new districts a formula for disaster when it comes to making elected school officials more efficient and accountable.

“My fear in the long term, and this is not a criticism of the superintendent, within a few years, you will end up with the superintendent and the seven dwarves, because none of the board members will have a district-wide base of support, because they only have to please small groups of people,” Bibbiani said, pointing out that the former election system was at-large, with all candidates running district-wide for numbered board seats.

“It is not a shot at [PUSD Superintendent] Jon Gundry,” Bibbiani said of his quip. “The powers of the board will be diminished, and the powers of the superintendent will be increased.”

Ironically, with Miramontes, the board’s only Latino member, not running, the Board of Education could end up without Latino representation, despite having a Latino student population of roughly 60 percent.

Miramontes cited the birth of his twin sons last summer among his reasons for not running for a second term.

“The twins sealed the deal,” Miramontes said. “There is nothing wrong with one tour of duty. I shook things up, and I was not afraid of the system. It takes a lot out of you when you refuse to go the Pasadena Way. It is still difficult for minorities to run. I disagree with the maps, but not neighborhood districts.

“They [task force members] thought it was better to create a minority majority in the districts,” he added. “That is not how it is supposed to be. All groups should have a major voice in every district. Elected officials should sometimes have a contrarian role with city staff.”

A board-appointed districting task force spent nearly six months splitting PUSD — which includes Pasadena, Altadena and Sierra Madre — into seven separate districts of about 29,000 residents each. African Americans and Latinos make up the majority of the population in at least three districts, including District 1, where Kenne and Miramontes live.

Miramontes, Kenne and Phelps were usually allies against the board majority of Board President Renatta Cooper and Board members Ed Honowitz, Tom Selinske and Pomeroy. Miramontes’ exit from the board could shift the board’s balance of power away from what has been described
as a dysfunctional dynamic in which actual progress was often stymied by at times bitter infighting among board members.

One such incident last year involved Phelps, who was censured for making comments in public which led to one candidate dropping out of the race last year for the superintendent’s seat. That action against Phelps, however, didn’t end the finger-pointing among board members, with the Miramontes-led board clique calling for a censure of Cooper for an alleged violation of the Brown Act, the state’s open meeting law.

“I think the [district] maps needs to be circulated,” Cooper said when asked to speculate on why so few people seem to be interested in running. “We are going to have to do some voter education to get some people interested in the school board who have never run before. I am hoping that now that the national election is over there will be more attention given to the local elections.”

In the race for City Council, five possible candidates have pulled the necessary papers to begin campaigning for District 3, which includes portions of Northwest Pasadena and mid-city, north of Colorado Boulevard.

Those people include: Businessman Ishmael Trone; former NAACP President John L. Kennedy; Los Angeles litigation attorney William Pallares; Susana Porras, a part-time teacher; and Dentis Fowlkes, an information technology (IT) technician.

If none of the council candidates receive 50 plus one percent of the vote in the March election, the top two vote getters will square off in a runoff election on April 16.

Trone said he is running “based on a balanced perspective I have gained through my work in Pasadena over the past 25 years in Pasadena as a businessman and civic leader. From my experiences, I have the passion, vision, integrity and inclusionary thought process to further the growth of District 3.”

William Pallares — a Los Angeles litigation attorney — told the Weekly he was concerned about crime in the district, and that although he had pulled papers, he was still only considering running.

“I want to try and help out District 3 and improve the quality of life in the neighborhood,” Pallares said. “We are seeing more criminal activities, and I want to bring more attention to economic development.”

Kennedy said he originally planned to run 25 years ago against Holden but decided against it. Last year, people in the district began asking him to run for the seat.

“Due to my background in city government, public works and working for the former [assistant] city attorney, Nicholas Rodriguez, I have skill sets that would be helpful addressing some of the serious issues impacting Pasadena from a policy standpoint.”
Fowlkes could not be contacted, and Porras did not return a phone call seeking comment for this story.
Perhaps the biggest battle could occur in District 5 between Gordo, first elected in 2000, and Pasadena Marathon organizer Israel Estrada.

Estrada did not return several phone calls left at the Pasadena Marathon headquarters. He also did not return a number of emails seeking comment.

"I welcome opposition from anyone in the district who has lived here and has been working and will work to improve things," Gordo told the Weekly.
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CITY OPTS TO SETTLE VOTING SUIT; LAWYER ASKS TO SET TRIAL DATE

Judge scheduled to rule in January on conflicting requests

By David Garrick

Originally published December 1, 2012 at 12:01 a.m., updated November 30, 2012 at 4:38 p.m.

ESCONDIDO — Escondido officials have decided to settle a potentially costly voting rights lawsuit instead of fighting it, but the attorney who filed the suit says he wants a trial date set and evidence gathering to begin.

Seeking to limit the cost to taxpayers, Escondido officials asked Vista Superior Court Judge Earl Maas on Monday to indefinitely extend a suspension of the case so settlement talks can begin quickly.

John Ramirez, a Costa Mesa attorney Escondido hired for the case, wrote in a legal filing that Escondido officials have decided to settle the lawsuit by becoming the first city in North County to have City Council members represent specific geographic areas.

“Continued enforcement of the litigation stay is the best method to limit the expenditure of resources on both sides and encourage a settlement,” Ramirez wrote. “A stay allows all parties to focus on settlement rather than resuming discovery and preparing for trial.”

The lawsuit argues that Escondido’s at-large citywide elections violate the California Voting Rights Act by discriminating against Latinos. San Francisco attorney Jim Finberg filed the suit in December 2011 on behalf of five Latino city residents.

Finberg said this week that he could support a settlement. He also said he wants Maas to lift the suspension and set a fall 2013 trial date so evidence can be gathered.

“I’m always open to discussing a settlement, but there’s nothing that focuses people’s attention like a trial date,” Finberg said.
"I think there should be two tracks," he said. "If the settlement talks are constructive, we’ll want to limit the litigation, too. But if the talks don’t appear to be fruitful, it’s ‘damn the torpedoes, full speed ahead.’"

Maas is scheduled to rule Jan. 4 on the conflicting requests from Finberg and Ramirez.

The judge suspended the case June 1, shortly after the Escondido City Council agreed to include a switch to election districts in a charter city ballot measure called Proposition P. But in the Nov. 6 election, nearly 53 percent of voters rejected Prop. P, which would also have increased Escondido’s independence from the state by making it a charter city.

Council members decided during a closed session Nov. 14 that settling the lawsuit made the most sense.

Councilman Mike Morasco said this week that he still considers the state’s Voting Rights Act unconstitutional, but that the legislation makes it nearly impossible for cities to defend themselves against the claims of racially polarized voting included in the lawsuit.

A key argument in the lawsuit is that Latinos make up 49 percent of the city’s population, but only two Latinos have been elected to Escondido’s council since the city was founded in 1888.

City officials have said the lack of Latino representation hasn’t mattered, noting that Escondido has spent millions on infrastructure in predominantly Latino areas.

But Finberg expressed confidence he could show that the lack of Latinos on the council has had consequences.

He said examples include a 2006 City Council attempt to prohibit landlords from renting to illegal immigrants, and the city’s frequent staging of traffic safety checkpoints that critics say discriminate against Latinos.

“There’s been a lot of officially sanctioned hostility,” Finberg said.

Finberg said any settlement should require Escondido to give the public ample opportunity to participate in drawing the districts. He also urged the city to hire an independent group to handle the process, similar to how Escondido’s two school boards switched to district voting this year.

Finberg also said the courts should approve the district boundaries and any future changes the city makes based on shifts in population.

david.garrick@utsandigo.com
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Fresno Bee

Lew Griswold: 3 from Central Valley honored for farmworker safety training

Saturday, Dec. 08, 2012 | 11:29 PM

Three AmeriCorps workers from the Central Valley were honored last week in Washington, D.C., for training farmworkers in pesticide safety and heat stress prevention.

Guillermo Gonzalez of Woodlake, Lucio Avila of Selma and Nancy Alvarez of Madera did training for migrant and seasonal farmworkers in Tulare, Fresno, Kern and Kings counties.

Together, they trained 5,325 farmworkers, according to the Association of Farmworker Opportunity Programs, which gave the awards. Gonzalez got three special awards, one for writing a blog and two for training more people than others in the program.

The trio spent a year getting paid minimum wage, plus they will receive a $5,000 scholarship at the end.

It's not an easy job, said Joan Cuadra, an employee at Proteus Inc., a job skills training company in Visalia. Cuadra oversaw the AmeriCorps program locally.

They had to improve their Spanish, get up early and drive to remote farms, she said. "You go out there at 4 in the morning," Cuadra said. "There's 40 people expecting you. You can't be late."

But this is the final year that AmeriCorps will participate in pesticide and heat-stress prevention training, Cuadra said. In the Valley, the program will continue under different funding, she said.

Voting Rights: Rosalinda Avitia and Sherrie Bell were sworn in last week as members of the Tulare Local Health Care District board of directors, which operates Tulare Regional Medical Center.

Robert Montion, a former Tulare hospital CEO and a voting rights activist who ran Avitia's campaign, hailed her election as proof that switching from district-wide to by-area elections is a way to get Latino candidates elected to office.
Avitia defeated Laura Gadke, 1,090 votes to 990. She was elected in Area 2, which includes part of west and central Tulare and has a majority Hispanic population.

"It was the first contested area election" in the county for a governing board that switched to area elections, he said. "It was designated as a Latino area. It's the first test of the reality of area elections."

The hospital district board switched to area elections this year to settle a California Voting Rights Act lawsuit.

PARADE 2: Visalia's Candy Cane Lane parade was shown on national news last week.

"World News with Diane Sawyer" finished its Dec. 4 broadcast by showing about 30 seconds of the parade, including the Golden West High marching band.

The network sent a message to affiliates seeking video of holiday scenes, so ABC 30 submitted Candy Cane Lane footage that got accepted, said Kristie Gonzales, creative services and public affairs director.
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MENIFEE: School board moving forward with by-trustee election decision

By Jeff Sanders

Monday, December 10, 2012

The Menifee Union school board has voted to move forward with adopting a by-trustee area election over an at-large process to comply with state and federal voting rights acts aimed at protecting minority groups’ interests.

The three plans unveiled at the Dec. 4 meeting of the governing board divided the district into five areas along Interstate 215 and major roads, geographic features and elementary school boundaries. In all three versions, one trustee area included all of Quail Valley, which had some concentration of voting age Hispanics, according to a report from consultant Jeanne Gobalet.

The report added that the integration of Hispanics throughout the district would make it impossible to form a trustee area with a majority of Hispanic voters.

“We haven’t studied whether there is racially polarized voting in your district, but it’s a rare case where there isn’t some evidence of it, at least in my research,” Gobalet said. “Racially polarized voting can be found if you look hard enough, and sometimes people do look pretty hard for it.”

The 2001 California Voting Rights Act essentially makes local agencies with at-large district voting vulnerable to lawsuits — and successful plaintiffs’ legal fees — when they dilute the strength of minority votes.

The district will hold public hearings on Tuesday, Jan. 8 and Jan. 22, when the governing board is expected to vote on whether to adopt the by-trustee election process and which district map to implement in time for next November’s elections.

If the process is adopted, current board members will serve out their terms as a by-trustee-area election is phased into use.

Jerry Bowman, Randall Freeman and Ron Ulibarri are up for election in 2013 and Robert O’Donnell and Scott Mann’s replacement in 2015.
“It’s very important that we are transparent in the process and give the public ample opportunity to provide input on the maps presented,” Superintendent Linda Callaway said.

© Copyright 2012 The San Diego Union-Tribune, LLC. An MLIM LLC Company. All rights reserved.
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December 13, 2012

RIVERSIDE: Alvord board delays trustee areas

/CONTRIBUTED IMAGE

Alvord Unified School District Superintendent Nicolas Ferguson says the district can request a liability assessment before creating trustee areas or it can start the four-month process to draw trustee area boundaries without a liability assessment.

BY DAYNA STRAEHLEY The Press Enterprise

Published: December 13, 2012; 10:18 PM

Alvord school board members want to hear from the community before they proceed to create trustee areas to avoid potential lawsuits under the 2001 California Voting Rights Act.

The board voted unanimously to remove an item from its agenda late Thursday night, Dec. 13, to study the creation of trustee areas.
“I would like to go out to our community and understand how the community feels about this,” board member Carolyn Wilson said before moving to remove the item from the agenda. “I’d like to speak to them and hear what they have to say.”

Alvord Unified School District covers parts of west Riverside and west Home Gardens and some of east Corona. Board members say the southern part of the district, where four of them live, is generally more affluent than the northern part of the district, where no board members currently live. Wilson is the only board member who lives in Corona.

Districts across Riverside County and the state have changed to trustee areas. Some districts have been threatened with lawsuits under the California Voting Rights Act. Under that law, districts with at-large elections can be sued if black or Hispanic voters have not been represented by the candidates of their choice in past elections. Districts or cities served with such a suit are liable for plaintiff’s legal fees and have no defense if they have at-large elections, Inland school district officials have said.

Others questioned the effects of the law as well as the expense, estimated to total $45,000 or a potential law suit that could cost millions.

Art Kaspereen, who was elected board president Thursday night, said that when he was a counselor at the district’s alternative high school, he worked with students from all over the district and of all races. He said he has a problem with a law that says he can only represent students from a certain part of the district or some schools.

Board member Ben Johnson, who is black, expressed similar concerns but with more emotion, his voice cracking.

“Cost isn’t the biggest issue,” Johnson said. “It’s not 1962, and to say someone can’t represent someone (of another race) is even more offensive to me.”

Wilson noted that she and other board members attend events on every campus, not just the ones their own children attended. Johnson said the current board members would continue to represent all students, not just the schools in their own trustee areas. But in 25 years, he said he’s concerned that future board members will primarily concentrate on the schools in their own trustee areas.

In April, the board heard consultant and attorney David Soldani outline steps to create trustee areas. Typically, districts have a liability assessment first, to gauge how likely they are to be sued. The assessment can take four to six weeks and cost up to $20,000. Then they begin the process of drawing districts, a four-month process that can cost up to $25,000.

Last spring, Wilson suggested the board could have its own attorneys assess liability for far less money but the issue has not returned to the board’s agenda for action.

The law notes that at times, at-large elections disenfranchise Latino voters at the local level because Latino candidates often cannot win across a whole city or district. Dividing districts into smaller areas
allows Latino or other minority communities to elect a representative from their own neighborhoods, proponents say.

Riverside Unified School District abandoned its at-large elections June 10 and agreed on a map of trustee area boundaries in September. Lake Elsinore Unified and the Perris Union High School District have followed suit. Romoland and Menifee school districts are in the process of changing to trustee areas.

The Riverside Community College District divided itself into trustee areas in March and elected two board members in November by trustee areas. Its other three board members, who live in separate districts, will be up for re-election in two years. A Latina incumbent from Riverside was re-elected and a white man from Corona was elected. He is the first white man or Corona resident on the board in several years.

Follow Dayna Straehley on Twitter: @dstraehley_PE and watch for her posts on the Inland Schools blog: http://blog.pe.com/schools/
Los Cerritos News

History Made At Cerritos College After Four New Trustees Take Office

_Cerritos College Superintendent Dr. Linda Lacey administers the "Oath of Office" to newly elected Trustees Robert "Bob" Arthur, John Paul Drayer, Carmen Avalos, Marisa Perez, and Dr. Sandra Salazar, MD. Photo by Randy Economy_

By Randy Economy

December 13, 2012

It was a historical night for Cerritos College on Wednesday when four newly elected Trustees took the official "Oath of Office" and began to get down to business.

With more than 200 people gathered, four newly elected trustees were sworn into office by Superintendent Dr. Linda Lacey.

Newly elected trustees, Marisa Perez, Carmen Avalos, Dr. Sandra Salazar, and John Paul Drayer along with incumbent Bob Arthur were officially seated and immediately selected Perez to lead the "new" Cerritos College Board of Trustees.

"Talk about 'Changing of the Guard,' this is amazing," Norwalk resident and Cerritos College student Abel Marquez remarked.
Cerritos College Trustee Bob Hughlett, Superintendent Dr. Linda Lacey, and Board President Marisa Perez seen just moments after Perez was elected as new President of the Board. Randy Economy Photo

All five were elected in the recent November General Election in which voters, for the first time in the history of the college, elected Trustees via smaller voting districts as opposed to being elected "at large."

Perez was selected to be the new Board President with the support of Avalos, Salazar and Drayer over longtime Trustee Robert "Bob" Hughlett who had the support of Arthur and Trustee Shin Liu.

"The voters elected us (Avalos, Salazar and Drayer) because they want Cerritos College to go into a new direction," Perez told Los Cerritos Community Newspaper before the beginning of the meeting.

Avalos was selected as Vice President of the Board over Liu, and Salazar was voted as the new Secretary of the Board.

"This is a new day for Cerritos College," Drayer said.

Drayer also made "history" on Wednesday night as he becomes the first openly gay Trustee in the history of Cerritos College. Drayer will serve out the remaining two years of the Unexpired term of former Trustee Robert "Bob" Epple who died in 2011 after a battle with cancer.

"Tonight, I am remembering my friend Bob Epple," Drayer said. "I had the utmost respect for Bob and the Epple family and all of the contributions they made to Cerritos College. It is an honor to have the trust of the voters," Drayer said.

A formal reception was held after the meeting at the Student Activities Center in which outgoing Trustees Ted Edmiston, Jeanne McHatton, Tom Jackson and Tina Cho were all recognized for their service to the college.

Longtime Cerritos community leader Charlie Ara was beaming during and after the meeting. "This is a giant historical event. This swearing-in of four new members was made possible by the California Voting Rights Act which was signed into law by Governor Gray Davis in 2002," Ara told LCCN.

Ara also said that the selection of Perez as Board President "sends a powerful and symbolic message to the Student Body and surrounding community which is more than 50% Hispanic."
Another observer, Luis Melliz, who is a candidate for a Bellflower City Council seat in March of 2013 said he was “inspired” to see that the new “Cerritos College Board of Trustees now looks more like the community.” Melliz, 31, hopes to be the first Latino to win election to the Bellflower City Council. “This campaign was about change and bringing Cerritos College into a new era,” Melliz said.
December 12, 2012

TO: Superintendents and Presidents
   Business Administrators
   Governing Board Members
   Los Angeles County School and Community College Districts

FROM: Arturo Delgado, Ed.D.
      Superintendent

SUBJECT: Update on Trustee Area Voting and the California Voting Rights Act

This bulletin serves as an update on issues related to trustee area voting and the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA) which could impact school and community college districts in Los Angeles County. Please refer to Informational Bulletin No. 318 (2010-11), titled "Trustee Area Voting and the California Voting Rights Act," dated June 30, 2011, for additional background on this issue.

Election Challenges Related to the CVRA and Trustee Area Voting

The CVRA addresses racial, ethnic, and language groups impacted by voting policies that may impair their participation in the electoral process. Since the enactment of the CVRA in 2002, plaintiffs in California have filed claims against governmental agencies such as school districts, community college districts, cities, hospital districts, counties and other entities for violations based on what is called "racially polarized voting." In some of these cases, after researching the voting history within a specific district, plaintiffs have contended that at-large election methodology (where candidates and voters may live anywhere within a jurisdiction) prevented minority candidates from either being elected or influencing the outcome of an election. Some of these complaints were lodged even in majority-minority districts (which are districts where racial and ethnic minorities represent a majority of the population).

To date, all but a few districts and agencies involved in lawsuits filed under the CVRA did not have trustee area voting. Plaintiffs’ attorneys in these cases have contended that the implementation of trustee areas and trustee area voting (where both the candidates and any voters eligible to elect them must reside within the same trustee area) would address the issue of racially polarized voting, which prevents minority candidates from being
elected. In these cases, plaintiffs' attorneys have requested that districts implement trustee area voting immediately. Many of the challenges on these issues have also involved plaintiffs’ requests for significant attorney and expert fees, and other expenses, which are allowed under the CVRA. These lawsuits have proved to be very disruptive to districts and the financial settlements achieved have been very costly.

Potential Liability for Los Angeles County School and Community College Districts

As is the case statewide, the vast majority of school and community college districts in Los Angeles County do not have trustee areas or trustee area voting. While it is not possible for the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) to predict the legal liability of any individual district, LACOE encourages districts to take affirmative action to study and understand their local area. Several CVRA legal challenges and demand letters have been filed against Los Angeles County school and community college districts and districts are taking individualized approaches in their responses to these challenges. Some are involved in active litigation or pre-litigation. Others have moved to conduct district studies and have hired demographic consultants. Still others have held public meetings to solicit input in any changes to the district’s governance structure. Several local districts have had election or ballot initiatives related to trustee area issues.

While this bulletin does not constitute legal advice, it remains clear based on activity observed around the state and locally that, if challenged, implementing trustee areas is the only way for districts to protect against potential liability under the CVRA. Thus, LACOE advises all districts to meet with their own legal counsel to discuss possible liability based on their internal voting structure and the presence of or potential for racially polarized voting. In addition, LACOE advises all districts to study their local area to determine whether racially polarized voting is a phenomenon within their district.

Studying a Local District

Districts undertaking demographic studies as part of a process to determine whether to implement trustee area voting remain potentially liable to claims under the CVRA until trustee areas have been implemented. Districts are advised to seek professional guidance, both to conduct a thorough demographic review and to make sure any plans devised fully comply with all State and Federal voting regulations. Districts are advised to seek out multiple sources of demographic and legal guidance and to compare and vet any vendors
they engage carefully. LACOE has a list of consultants who have studied issues related to the CVRA and trustee areas for school and community college districts throughout California and will forward this list upon request. These consultants have been recommended by districts that have engaged them – LACOE offers no recommendation on any demographic consultants.

Please note that the cost of studying a district’s demographics in order to develop a trustee area voting plan may be lowered significantly if a broader geographic area is studied at one time. Thus, districts in a shared regional-location may benefit from engaging demographers as part of a multi-district package or contract. Several regions in Los Angeles County, and in areas throughout the State, have taken this collaborative study approach to share costs. Districts that conduct demographic studies and decide not to implement trustee area voting because they deem that they do not have racially polarized voting (or for other reasons) remain potentially liable to challenges and claims under the CVRA.

Taking Action to Address the CVRA

Seeking a Waiver from the State Board of Education

Education Code (EC) §§5019-5021 and §5030, state that districts must hold an election of the community in order to approve implementation of the trustee area voting method and any adopted trustee area plans. Districts seeking to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting may request waivers from the State Board of Education (SBE) for elections required to approve these new trustee areas. Waivers may be submitted by districts directly to the SBE or through the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization. To date, approximately 75 districts making the change to trustee area voting have requested waivers from the SBE on the requirement to hold elections to approve their new trustee area maps. All of the waiver requests have been granted. These waivers do not excuse districts from holding their regular board elections after trustee areas and trustee area voting are implemented; the waivers merely waive the requirement to hold a separate election to approve any new or revised trustee area plan. Districts remain vulnerable to potential liability under the CVRA until their trustee area voting plans are approved, either by voters at a scheduled election or via waivers from the SBE, and then implemented.
Adopt Resolutions

In some districts, boards have passed resolutions to study the issue of trustee areas. As stated above, districts remain vulnerable to potential liability under the CVRA until their trustee area voting plans are approved and implemented.

Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk’s Timelines and Requirements for Changes and Compliance

Districts seeking to implement trustee area voting are advised that the Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk (Registrar-Recorder) has established deadlines and data format requirements for the submittal of plans. For districts that hold their governing board elections in November of odd-numbered years, plans must be submitted to the Registrar-Recorder as soon as possible in order to be effective for the November 2013 election. It has not yet been determined when the final deadline is to submit new or revised trustee area plans, whether or not they have approved waivers from the SBE.

Districts that are seeking to implement trustee area voting, those which hold their governing board elections on dates other than November of odd-numbered years, or who have additional questions concerning the requirements of submitting a plan are advised to contact Mr. Elio Salazar of the Registrar-Recorder’s Geographical Information Systems Section at (562) 462-2465.

Districts implementing trustee areas must pass board resolutions, hire demographic firms, develop trustee area plans, and conduct public hearings to obtain input prior to the deadlines set by the Registrar-Recorder. LACOE encourages districts moving to study and ultimately implement trustee area voting to develop a mechanism to inform the public of the process. In some instances, members of the community may submit their own plans for a district’s board to consider. A district’s board does not need to adopt these alternative plans. However, districts would benefit from as open and inclusive a process as possible, including the solicitation of input from the public.

Districts located within a city where the city charter governs the election of the governing board should consult with a representative of the city. Additional time may be needed to implement a plan, and in some instances an election may be necessary to amend the city charter.
Conclusion

LACOE staff is available to provide referrals to news articles describing trustee area and CVRA issues around the State. We can also provide input on the process of selecting a demographic firm, how to begin the study process (based on what other districts have used throughout the State), and can provide additional details on the requirements and timeline of the Registrar-Recorder for trustee area plans.

This bulletin is posted on the LACOE Web site at the following address:

www.lacoe.edu/bulletins

Use the "Search" function to locate a specific bulletin by number or keyword.

Districts are advised to address any potential liability with their legal counsel. LACOE encourages districts to contact Dr. Allison Deegan, Regionalized Business Services Coordinator in the Division of Business Advisory Services, at (562) 922-6336, with any questions.

AD/KDC/AD:ah

Informational Bulletin No. 3456
A-3-2012-13
NOTICE TO SUBJECT/INTERESTED AGENCIES

Distribution:

Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40, Antelope Valley
Office of Supervisor Antonovich
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Consolidated Fire Protection District
Antelope Valley Mosquito & Vector Control District
Antelope Valley Resource Conservation District
Antelope Valley –East Kern Water Agency
City of Palmdale
Westside Union School District
Antelope Valley Union High School District

LAFCO File: Annexation No. 2012-20 (Anaerode Hills School) to Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40, Antelope Valley

Notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexation listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission. The application proposes to annex 10.54± acres of uninhabited territory into the boundaries of Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40, Antelope Valley. The subject territory is located on Greenbrier Street and Jackson Way, south of Avenue S, in the City of Palmdale.

The proposal application and map are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by Monday, January 14, 2013.

If you have any questions about this proposal, please contact this office at (626) 204-6500.

Date: December 12, 2012

Paul A. Novak, AICP
Executive Officer
LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO: 2012-20

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)
1. Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40, Antelope Valley
2. 
3. 
4. 

RELATED JURISDICTIONAL CHANGES
(Annexation, Detachment, Sphere of Influence Amendment, etc.)
1. Annexation
2. 
3. 
4. 

PROPOSAL INITIATED BY: 
☐ RESOLUTION ✓ LANDOWNER/REGISTERED VOTER PETITION

APPLICANT: Westside Union School District

TITLE: Assistant Superintendent CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER: Robert W. Abel

ADDRESS: 41914 N. 50th Street West

CITY: Quartz Hill STATE: CA ZIP CODE: 93536

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: Nellie Thomas TELEPHONE: 661-722-0716

E-MAIL ADDRESS: n.thomas@westside.k12.ca.us

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY
80 S. LAKE AVENUE, SUITE 870 PASADENA, CA 91101
TELEPHONE: (626) 204-6500 FAX: (626) 204-6507
By submitting this Application to Initiate Proceedings, the applicant acknowledges receipt of the "Instruction for Filing Application for Change of Organization/Reorganization/Special Reorganization" and agrees to be bound by same, including, but not limited to the provisions contained therein regarding filing and processing fees, and defense and indemnification of the Commission.

INDEMNIFICATION / LEGAL DEFENSE

As a condition of any LAFCO approval, the applicant shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless LAFCO and its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against LAFCO or its agents, officers, and employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul the approval of LAFCO concerning the processing of the proposal or any action relating to, or arising out of, such approval. At the discretion of the Executive Officer, a deposit of funds by the applicant may be required in an amount sufficient to cover the anticipated litigation costs.

SIGNATURE: [Signature] DATE: 10/23/2012

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:

Describe the location of the proposal area including major street and highways that border the project area.

Avenue S
Greenbrier Street
Jackson Way

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:

10.54 acres

Is the proposal area inhabited (having 12 or more registered voters residing within the territory)?

☐ Yes
☒ No
GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

1. PROPOSAL AREA: Give a detailed description of the proposal area and what it consists of (e.g. existing commercial corridors, residential communities, existing redevelopment area, public utility right-of-way, relevant structures, etc.)

   Construction of school site

2. TOPOGRAPHY: Describe the topography, physical features, (rivers, drainage basins, etc.) and natural boundaries of the subject territory.

   It appears that the bulk of the subject property is fairly flat or gently undulating, with a minor slope area extending into the site near the northwest part of the site, and a gradual slope down to the north/northwest. To the north/northwest the land is fairly flat or gently undulating, it slopes up into the hills to the southwest, and the park site adjacent to the southeast is slightly above grade of the subject.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. What is the current population of the subject territory? 0

2. If the proposal includes development, what is the estimated population of the proposed area? N/A

3. Number of registered voters within the proposed territory. 0

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory. 1

5. What is the proximity of the subject territory to other populated areas?

   The subject property is adjacent to Phase I of the community which was planned to include 1,417 single-family homes within 11 different neighborhoods. There are over 1,000 completed homes sold to individual homeowners.
6. What is the likelihood of significant growth in the area; and in adjacent incorporated and unincorporated areas within the next ten years?

The overall community contains approximately 2,015 gross acres and is planned to be developed with approximately 5,200 dwelling units. There is to be a golf course, two schools, a fire station, 124 acres of parks and trails, and 637 acres of open space.

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:

N/A

8. Give a summary of regional housing needs and to what extent will the proposal assist in achieving its fair share of regional housing needs as determined by SCAG?

N/A

9. To what extent will this proposal promote "environmental justice" (fair treatment of people of all races, cultures and income) with respect to the location of public facilities and provision of public services?

School site will incorporate all races, cultures and income. The school will serve all residents equally.

LAND USE AND ZONING

1. What is the assessed land valuation of the subject territory (give source and date of information)?

$385,000.00

2. What is the current land use and zoning designation within the subject area?

School site, residential

3. What is the proposed planned land use of the subject area?

K-8 School
4. Describe any proposed change in land use and zoning as a result of this proposal (including, if applicable, pre-zoning by an affected city).

N/A

5. What is the land use in the surrounding area? Be specific.

Residential

6. If annexation to a city is involved as a part of this proposal, what is the city’s general plan designation for the area?

N/A

7. Is the proposal consistent with city or county general plans, specific plans, and or other adopted land use policies?

The City of Palmdale zoning designation is Anaverde Specific Plan and the General Plan designation is Specific Plan, and the subject property is identified as "School" on the Anaverde Conceptual Land Use Plan.

8. Will this proposal result in development of property now or in the near future? Describe the type of development proposed (type of business or industry, single-family or multi-family residential, etc., and number of units or facilities).

Yes, development of school site.

9. What effect would denial of this proposal have on the proposed development, if any?

Denial of water means no school site. Residents purchased homes, with promise of a neighborhood school.
10. Is the subject territory currently within a redevelopment area or proposed to be included within a redevelopment project area upon completion of this proposal?

N/A

11. Are there any agricultural or open-space lands within the proposal area? What is the effect of this proposal on agricultural or open-space lands?

N/A

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Explain in detail the reasons for this proposal and why it is necessary.

Obtain water to construct a new school.

2. What will be the effect of the proposal and of alternative actions on the following: (Include the names of other local agencies having the authority to provide the same or similar services as those proposed.)

a. Adjacent areas:

N/A

b. Mutual social and economic interests:

N/A
c. The local government structure of the County:

N/A

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

"Government services" refers to governmental services and whether or not those services would be provided by the local agencies subject to the proposal. It includes public facilities necessary to provide those services.

1. Estimate the present cost and describe the adequacy of government services and controls in the area.

N/A

2. Estimate the probable future need for government services (including public facilities) or controls in the area.

N/A

3. If the proposal includes incorporation, formation, or annexation, what will be the effect of this proposal or exclusion and of alternative courses of action on the cost and adequacy of services and controls in the proposed area and adjacent areas?

N/A
4. If, as a result of this proposal, increased service demand exceeds the existing capacity, describe what will be done by the service provider to increase capacity of services.

N/A

5. List any assessments, fees, or other charges to be levied as part of this proposal and or that may be levied in the near future.

Bond funds.

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

Provide the following information if the proposal requires a sphere of influence amendment.

1. Is the proposed area within the existing sphere of influence of the annexing agency?

   Yes ☑ Name of Agency Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40, Antelope Valley No ☐

2. List any communities of social or economic interest within the proposed area or immediately adjacent. To what extent will any of those communities of interest be affected by the proposal?

   N/A

3. If the proposal includes a request for a city sphere of influence update, provide a written statement on whether an agreement on the sphere change between the city and the county was achieved. Please provide a copy of the written agreement pursuant to Government Code Section 56425(b).

   N/A
BONDED INDEBTNESS

1. Do the agencies whose boundaries are being changed have any existing bonded debt?

   N/A

2. Will the proposal area be liable for payment of its fair share of this existing debt?

   N/A

3. To what extent will landowners within the proposal area be liable or remain liable for any existing indebtedness of the city or district?

   N/A

4. In the case of detachment requests, does the detaching agency propose that the subject territory continue to be liable for existing bonded debt?

   N/A

NOTIFICATION

1. List the name and address of any person(s), organization, community group, or agency known to you who may wish notification, or who may be opposed to this proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Provide the names and addresses of up to three persons who are to receive notice of hearing, staff report, and minutes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert W. Abel &amp; Wayne Trussell</td>
<td>41914 N. 50th Street West, Quartz Hill, CA 93536</td>
<td>661-722-0716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nellie Thomas &amp; Paula Sterk</td>
<td>41914 N. 50th Street West, Quartz Hill, CA 93536</td>
<td>661-722-0716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyndi Vidinha</td>
<td>41914 N. 50th Street West, Quartz Hill, CA 93536</td>
<td>661-722-0716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT 'A'
ANNEXATION No. 2012-20 40-141 (34-40)
"(ANAVERDE HILLS SCHOOL)"
TO LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS
DISTRICT NO. 40, ANTELOPE VALLEY

WESTERN 1/2 OF SECTION 32 AND THE EASTERN 1/2 OF SECTION 31, TOWNSHIP 6 NORTH, RANGE 12 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN, IN THE CITY OF PALMDALE, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS SHOWN ON MAP FILED IN BOOK 120 PAGES 63 THROUGH 67 INCLUSIVE OF RECORDS OF SURVEYS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING at the centerline of Greenbrier Street of Tract 54117-03, as shown on map filed in book 1317 page 63 inclusive of maps, records of said county, thence along said tract boundary south 27°00'18" west a distance of 32.00 feet to the True point of beginning;

L1. Thence, leaving said right-of-way, southerly along the westerly line of said lot 206, south 49°22'46" west 157.61 feet;

L2. Thence, continuing along said westerly line, south 35°24'57" west 231.57 feet to the beginning of a tangent 20.00-foot radius curve concave northerly;

C1. Thence, leaving said westerly line along said curve, through a central angle of 92°23'29" and an arc distance of 32.25 feet;

L3. Thence, tangent to said curve, north 52°11'34" west 149.81 feet to an angle point;

L4. Thence, north 53°16'36" west 141.81 feet to an angle point;

L5. Thence, north 50°26'50" west 83.76 feet to an angle point;

L6. Thence, north 56°00'02" west 174.72 feet to the beginning of a tangent 120.00-foot radius curve concave northeasterly;

C2. Thence, along said curve, through a central angle of 29°31'13" and an arc distance of 61.83 feet to the beginning of a tangent, reversing 700.00-foot curve concave southwesterly;

C3. Thence, along said curve, through a central angle of 27°30'29" and an arc distance of 336.07 feet;
L7. Thence, tangent to said curve, north 53°59'18" west 83.15 feet to the beginning of a tangent 840.00-foot radius curve concave southwesterly;

C4. Thence, along said curve, through a central angle of 04°59'27" and an arc distance of 73.17 feet to the beginning of a tangent, reversing 42.00-foot radius curve concave easterly;

C5. Thence, along said curve, through a central angle of 114°47'39" and an arc distance of 84.15 feet to the beginning of a tangent, compound 288.00-foot radius curve concave southeasterly;

C6. Thence, along said curve, through a central angle of 21°30'33" and an arc distance of 111.87 feet;

L8. Thence, north 00°50'57" east 21.18 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent 258.00-foot radius curve concave southerly, a radial to which bears north 01°31'11" east;

C7. Thence, along said curve, through a central angle of 08°16'24" and an arc distance of 37.25 feet to the beginning of a tangent, reversing 442.00-foot radius curve concave northerly;

C8. Thence, along said curve, through a central angle of 38°23'56" and an arc distance of 296.22 feet;

L9. Thence, tangent to said curve, north 61°23'39" east 32.89 feet to an angle point;

L10. Thence, south 77°09'22" east 19.49 feet to a non-tangent 392.00-foot radius curve concave northeasterly, a radial to which bears south 53°20'36" west;

C9. Thence, along said curve, through a central angle of 16°04'30" and an arc distance of 109.98 feet;

L11. Thence, tangent to said curve, south 52°43'54" east 258.29 feet to a tangent 358.00-foot radius curve concave southwesterly;

C10. Thence, along said curve, through a central angle of 20°41'44" and an arc distance of 128.31 feet;

L12. Thence, tangent to said curve, south 32°02'10" east 153.01 feet to a tangent 442.00-foot radius curve concave northeasterly;

C11. Thence, along said curve, through a central angle of 06°43'05" and a distance of 51.83 feet;

L13. Thence, non-tangent to said curve, south 56°01'50" east 39.12 feet to a non-tangent 432.00-foot radius curve concave northeasterly, a radial to which bears south 45°17'09" west;
C12. Thence along said curve, through a central angle of 16°09'15" and an arc distance of 121.80 feet to a tangent, compound 562.00-foot radius curve concave northeasterly;

C13. Thence, along said curve, through a central angle of 03°07'36" and an arc distance of 30.67 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning.

SAID PARCEL CONTAINS 10.54 ACRES (458,952 SQ. FT.), MORE OR LESS.

All as shown on a sketch attached hereto as Exhibit "B" and made a part herof for reference only.

End of Exhibit A

THIS DESCRIPTION IS BASED ON RECORD DATA ONLY, NO SURVEY WAS PERFORMED, AND IS NOT FOR THE CONVEYANCE OF LAND.
LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION
(COUNTY COMMITTEE)
LEGISLATIVE REVIEW-JANUARY 2013

BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR: Senate Bill 41/Wright
INTRODUCTION DATE: 12/12/12
LAST ACTIVITY/DATE: 12/12/12: From printer. May be acted upon on or after January 11.

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

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

RECOMMENDED POSITION
Staff recommends the following position:

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

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

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

Please direct all comments to Mr. Keith D. Crafton, Secretary to the County Committee, at (562) 922-6144.
CURRENT BILL STATUS

MEASURE : S.B. No. 41
AUTHOR(S) : Wright.
TOPIC : School district reorganization; base revenue limit:
        Wiseburn Unified School District.
HOUSE LOCATION : SEN

TYPE OF BILL :
Active
Urgency
Non-Appropriations
2/3 Vote Required
Non-State-Mandated Local Program
Non-Fiscal
Non-Tax Levy

LAST HIST. ACT. DATE: 12/12/2012
LAST HIST. ACTION : From printer. May be acted upon on or after January 11.

TITLE : An act to repeal Section 35583 of the Education Code,
        relating to school district reorganization, and
        declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect
        immediately.
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An act to repeal Section 35583 of the Education Code, relating to school district reorganization, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 41, as introduced, Wright. School district reorganization: base revenue limit: Wiseburn Unified School District.

Existing law requires plans and recommendations for the reorganization of school districts to include a computation of the base revenue limit per unit of average daily attendance that is based, in part, on the blended revenue limit per unit of average daily attendance of the affected school districts. Existing law requires the blended revenue limit to be computed by multiplying the base revenue limit per unit of average daily attendance for each affected district for the fiscal year 2 years before the fiscal year in which the reorganization is to be effective by the number of units of average daily attendance for the affected school district that the county superintendent of schools determines will be included in the proposed school district. For the Wiseburn Unified School District, existing law instead requires the blended revenue limit per unit of average daily attendance for the district to be calculated in a manner that is based, in part, on the revenue limit per unit of average daily attendance for the 2012-13 fiscal year of the Wiseburn School District and the Centinela Valley Union High School District.

This bill would repeal the provision requiring a special calculation of the blended revenue limit for the Wiseburn Unified School District.

This bill would declare that it is to take effect immediately as an urgency statute.


THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Section 35583 of the Education Code is repealed.

35583. For purposes of paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) of Section 35735.1, the blended revenue limit per unit of average daily attendance for the Wiseburn Unified School District shall be calculated as follows:

(a) Multiply the Wiseburn School District revenue limit per unit of average daily attendance for the 2012-13 fiscal year by nine.

(b) Multiply the Centinela Valley Union High School District revenue limit per unit of average daily attendance for the 2012-13 fiscal year by four.

(c) Add the products determined pursuant to subdivisions (a) and (b).

(d) Divide the sum determined pursuant to subdivision (c) by 15.
This amount shall be the blended base revenue limit per unit of average daily attendance for the Wiseburn Unified School District.

SEC. 2. This act is an urgency statute necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or safety within the meaning of Article IV of the Constitution and shall go into immediate effect. The facts constituting the necessity are:

In order to begin the reorganization of the Wiseburn School District and the Centinela Valley Union High School District before January 1, 2014, it is necessary that this act take effect immediately.
Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals

January 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 December 18, 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) 

January 2013

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals (exclusive of those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District (USD) that were at various stages in the school district reorganization process as of December 18, 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 Steentofte, Chief Counsel for the SBE, recommended that certain waivers submitted with the Wiseburn SD petition could be determined by the SBE at the time of the hearing. Subsequently, the CDE rescheduled the petition to be heard before the SBE on September 9, 2004.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

On October 22, 2009, the CDE notified LACOE that the petition hearing before the SBE was scheduled for the SBE’s January 7-8, 2010, meeting. On December 8, 2009, the CDE notified LACOE that the petition hearing before the SBE would not be heard until March 11, 2010. On January 6, 2010, the CDE notified LACOE that the petition would not be heard until some time in July 2010. On March 25, 2010, the CDE notified LACOE that the petition would be heard at the May 12-13, 2010, meeting of the SBE. On April 30, 2010, the CDE issued its revised feasibility study on the Wiseburn SD unification petition. On May 3, 2010, the Wiseburn SD requested that the SBE remove the review of the petition from its May 2010 agenda. Presently,

* 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 Superintendent of the Hawthorne and Lawndale SDs, which was addressed to the boards of the Wiseburn SD and the Centinela Valley UHSD. The letter stated that neither Hawthorne nor Lawndale SD was in agreement with the proposed legislation and pending joint powers agreement among the Wiseburn SD and the Centinela Valley UHSD. The letter raised concerns about distribution of potential revenue sharing under the proposed legislation and agreement.

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

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

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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
require specific legislation, as proposed earlier this year. District representatives stated that all of their boards had already approved the agreements or were scheduled to do so that week.

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

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

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

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

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

On December 5, 2012, staff met with representatives of the Wiseburn SD and their environmental consultants, Terry A. Hayes and Associates, along with a representative from the CDE, to review the procedures needed to facilitate the SBE’s adoption of the EIR previously developed for the Wiseburn unification petition. The environmental consultants will follow CEQA procedures and advise all parties on the steps necessary to align the adoption of the EIR with the SBE’s review of the unification petition. On December 12, 2012, SB 41 was introduced to clean up the revenue limit aspect of the original legislation approving the Wiseburn unification. If passed, this urgency bill would take effect immediately and would allow for the unification petition to be agendized by the SBE.

*Status: Petition on hold at the SBE; Centinela Valley UHSD, and Hawthorne, Lawndale, Lennox, and Wiseburn SDs participating in LCFA JPA; legislation to facilitate

* Indicates update from previous summary.
formation of the Wiseburn USD signed by the Governor; process to adopt EIR underway with CDE; clean-up legislation introduced December 12, 2012.

**Status Date:** December 18, 2012

**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.

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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, staff 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).

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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

* 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.