April 24, 2013

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

FROM: Keith D. Crafton, Secretary
County Committee

SUBJECT: Cancellation of the May 1, 2013, Regular Meeting of the County Committee

The regular meeting of the County Committee scheduled for Wednesday, May 1, 2013, has been CANCELLED. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, June 5, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

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

Newspaper Articles

- A February 8, 2013, article from the Daily Breeze - “Wiseburn school district begins lengthy separation process from Centinela Valley.” (Attachment 2)

- A March 13, 2013, article from Westside Connect - “NCLUSD moving to trustee area elections.” (Attachment 2)

- A March 22, 2013, article from the Oakdale Leader – “District Elections Being Forced On City.” (Attachment 3)

- A March 28, 2013, article from the Patterson Irrigator – “City to study voting patterns.” (Attachment 4)

- A March 29, 2013, article from the Daily Breeze – “Wiseburn district eyes wow factor in creating new comprehensive high school.” (Attachment 5)
• An April 3, 2013, article from the Modesto Bee – “Modesto leaders weigh in on district voting process.” (Attachment 6)

• An April 9, 2013, article from the Kitsap Sun – “Judge Grants Delay of Anaheim Council Districts Lawsuit.” (Attachment 7)

• An article from the San Gabriel Valley Tribune – “Citrus College Board member Gary Woods accused of living outside of Azusa.” (Attachment 8)

Informational Correspondence

• An April 16, 2013, Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) Notice of Completion regarding Resolution No. 2013-04 Protest Resolution Ordering Annexation No. 2011-26 to the City of Santa Clarita (South Sand Canyon) (Attachment 9)

Legislative Review

Attached is a review of pending legislation related to school district organization. (Attachment 10)

School District Organization Proposals

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

• “Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals.” (Attachment 11)

• “Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals (excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District).” (Attachment 12)

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

KDC/AD:ah
Attachments
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Wiseburn school district begins lengthy separation process from Centinela Valley

By Rob Kuznia Staff Writer Daily Breeze

Posted: 02/08/2012 07:12:45 PM PST

After more than a decade of being stuck in what has resembled a bad marriage, the Wiseburn elementary school district serving part of Hawthorne and the wider Centinela Valley high school in which it sits are crafting the equivalent of an amicable divorce.

This week, in a remarkable move given their history of mutual hostility and legal battles, both the Centinela Valley school board and the Wiseburn school board separately passed a resolution that essentially begins the process of allowing Wiseburn to officially extricate itself from the Centinela high school district (composed of Hawthorne, Lawndale and Leuzinger high schools) and become its own unified K-12 school district.

Tuesday's move was only the first step in what is expected to be a 2 1/2 year process at a minimum, but the accord stands in striking contrast from the discord that has characterized the relationship of the two school districts.

"I have new respect for their attorneys," said Tom Johnstone, superintendent of the Wiseburn school district, speaking of Centinela's legal team. "Rather than us trying to defeat them and them trying to defeat us, our attorneys all worked together attacking a common problem."

However, while the former adversaries are finally on the same page, a new set of opponents has emerged: the other three elementary districts that feed into Centinela - Hawthorne, Lawndale and Lennox. Officials from these school districts want their residents to have a say in the matter.

At the core of the complex web is a simple enough notion espoused by the Wiseburn camp: ensuring fair taxation. Taxpayers, they say, shouldn't have to subsidize schools that their children aren't attending, especially if the community has demonstrated a willingness to create its own K-12 district.

(In a move seen as a referendum on unification, Wiseburn voters in November of 2010 overwhelmingly passed a ballot initiative to build a new public high school from the ground up.)
Under the current setup, families in the Wiseburn district - which consists of the Hawthorne neighborhood of Holly Glen and unincorporated Los Angeles County neighborhoods of Del Aire and Wiseburn - must pay into construction bonds to build new schools in Centinela Valley.

(Even though students from Dana Middle School in Wiseburn are officially supposed to matriculate into one of the three Centinela schools, only about 5 percent actually do. The majority attend either Da Vinci charter high school in the Wiseburn neighborhood or one of the beach city high schools.)

But complicating the matter is a host of legal monkey wrenches. First off, some fear that Wiseburn's departure could potentially cause taxes to go up for residents in Hawthorne, Lawndale and Lennox, as they would have to make up for Wiseburn's absence.

And then there is the issue of the extremely lucrative El Segundo business corridor. Composed of corporate giants such as Mattel, Northrop Grumman, Raytheon, AIG, Xerox and others, this pot of gold is officially part of the Wiseburn school district. In theory, this means that if Wiseburn leaves, it could take its pot of gold with it, reducing Centinela's tax base by more than a third.

Finally, school officials are concerned that the more affluent Wiseburn district would poach the best students from Leuzinger, Lawndale and Hawthorne high schools.

To get around these and other sticking points, the so-called "joint powers agreement" approved Tuesday night by both the Centinela Valley and Wiseburn school boards is seeking to come up with a solution that is palatable to both parties. This means sides both must give a little.

Wiseburn, for starters, would agree to continue paying its share of two school construction bonds passed in 2008 and 2010. In total, that amounts to about $87 million, or nearly half of the amount levied by the sum of those two bonds.

Wiseburn also would agree to share the business corridor with Centinela. To address the concern about poaching the best students, Wiseburn would agree to accept no more than 450 students from the Centinela Valley district.

On the other side of the ledger, Centinela Valley would agree to forfeit the tax dollars it receives from the residential portion of Wiseburn in future bond initiatives. This would reduce its take-home by about 9 percent. (The last bond, passed in 2010, reaped $98 million. A similar one would therefore yield about $90 million.)

Underscoring the mind-numbing complexity of the process is how Tuesday's agreement is just one of three prongs to the plan. The other two involve passage of a piece of state legislation that would essentially codify Wiseburn's concessions and then approval from the California Department of Education.
And the process wouldn't stop there. The next step would involve allowing the voters of the Wiseburn district to approve unification. If all goes as planned, it would all be finished sometime in the year between July 2014 and July 2015.

The leaders of the dissenting elementary districts have several gripes. Chief among them is the idea that Wiseburn would be able to separate without the say of voters in Hawthorne, Lawndale and Lennox.

"I think it should be an area-wide vote," said Ellen Dougherty, superintendent of the Lawndale school district. "There are 20,000 other students that will be affected."

Helen Morgan, superintendent of the K-8 Hawthorne school district, said she also worries that the terms of the current agreement could change under new leaders.

"I don't think anybody here is trying to pull one over," she said. "I think the intention of the Wiseburn community is to honor the bonds that have been passed. But I can't predict the future."

Wiseburn nearly succeeded in extricating itself in a much less compromising way many years ago. In 2004, three years after the process was initiated, the California Board of Education unanimously approved Wiseburn's request to ask its voters to unify. But Centinela Valley gummed the gears by suing the state board on the grounds that Wiseburn hadn't conducted the proper environmental studies.

In 2008, the studies were done and the state board took up the issue again. This time, it ruled that unification would have to be approved by all voters in the Centinela Valley. Wiseburn considers this an impossible hurdle, and the current process is an attempt to satisfy all parties.

robnkuznia@dailybreeze.com
http://www.westsidemedia.com/2013/03/13/nclusd-moving-to-trustee-area-elections/

NCLUSD moving to trustee area elections

By Mattos Newspapers

March 13, 2013 | Posted in: News, Schools | 0 Comments

NEWMAN – Faced with the threat of a voting rights lawsuit, the Newman-Crows Landing Unified School District is moving toward trustee-area school board elections.

That transition is spurred by a Latino advocacy group's contention that the current at-large election system violates state and federal voting rights laws.

A Feb. 6 letter to the district from the Latino Community Roundtable of Stanislaus County demanded that the district take immediate action to abolish the at-large elections and implement trustee zones. Failure to do so, the letter warned, would result in a lawsuit being filed against the district.

Superintendent Ed Felt said several county school districts are taking similar steps to avoid costly litigation.

"To the best of my knowledge, districts which have fought this in court have lost," Felt commented. "They have lost the expenses involved, and have moved to trustee area elections in the end. When you look at the history of the litigation and the cost to public entities, we just don't have the type of money to fight this even if we chose to."

The demand letter from the Roundtable contends that the at-large system does not afford Asian, Latino and African-American residents equal representation in the process. The letter states that the California Voting Rights Act prohibits at-large elections because they "impair the ability of a protected class to elect candidates of its choice or its ability to influence the outcome of an election."

The letter goes on to contend that the demographics of properly-designed trustee zones would "allow non-white citizens an adequate opportunity to elect candidates of their choice, or to impact the election of board members in future school board elections."
The letter, signed by Roundtable President Maggie Mejia and Legislative Chairperson Rosalinda Vierra, characterizes the current system, which lacks term limits or campaign finance limits, as "an incumbent protection-voting scheme."

The shift to trustee-area elections will fundamentally change how voters in the Newman-Crows Landing district elect school board representatives.

Instead of a single, districtwide election held every two years for open school board seats, five trustee zones will be created and each will essentially hold its own election to fill a single board seat. Candidates must reside within the zone, and only voters from the zone can participate in that election.

To prepare for the transition, the school board last week approved a change which pushes the election schedule back one year and gives the district adequate time to create and implement the trustee zones.

As a result, there will be no school board elections this year and the term of each incumbent board member is essentially extended one year.

The terms of Kerry McWilliams and Paul Wallace will now expire in 2014 – the first year zone voting is anticipated. The terms of RoseLee Hurst, Janice Conforti and Tim Bazar will expire in 2016.

The board voted 4-0, with Hurst absent, to reschedule the board elections. Trustees also gave Felt direction to begin the process of moving toward trustee area elections.

"It is pretty inevitable," Felt conceded.

A group of county schools making the same transition will work collectively on the process to minimize expenses. Still, Felt said, he expects the shift to cost the district about $25,000. Felt said the demand letter came as no surprise.

He said he briefed trustees in executive session last spring as an anticipated litigation matter, and again last week.

While intended to foster diversity, Felt said, one concern with the trustee area elections is that geographic restrictions may in fact limit candidate pools.

"The goal is to give everyone opportunities to get elected, but you can't force people to run for office," the superintendent pointed out. "You can create what are considered fair trustee areas, but you still have to have people who are going to be willing to run. It reduces the area to pull those people from."

School Board President McWilliams noted that the board has had a variety of minority representation in the past. He said no formal analysis has been conducted to determine if racially
polarized voting exists in the district – adding that such a study would be pointless. “It seems like the tide is coming in whether or not we find evidence (of polarized voting),” he commented.

McWilliams said he believes the new format may indeed open up new opportunities for people to participate – but also shared concerns that lack of candidate interest might be a response in some election cycles.

“I don’t necessarily have a problem with it,” he said of trustee area elections. “We may see some benefits, but we may see some burdens as well.”
District Elections Being Forced On City

Richard Paloma
rpaloma@oakdaleleader.com
209 847-3021 ext 8136
March 22, 2013

In a move it is referring to as an “advisement,” but taken as “extortion” by some city officials, a Latino organization is recommending that the pint-sized six square mile town of Oakdale implement district elections for its city council and school board elected offices.

The Latino Community Roundtable, an assembly of elected and appointed officials in Modesto, sent a letter to both the city and school district in February demanding that council members and school board trustees be elected to represent specific districts within the city, replacing the current at-large election process.

When contacted, Maggie Mejia, president of the Latino Community Roundtable, cited the 2001 California Voting Rights Act that made it easier for minority groups to sue governments that use at-large elections on the grounds that they dilute the strength of minority votes.

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

“If we had written a mushy letter with love and kisses, it wouldn’t have been taken seriously,” said Mejia. “I had to send a harsh letter for them to wake up and smell the coffee.”

The sometimes divided city council members of Oakdale are all showing a unified opinion in opposition to the proposal that they’ve all said puts them in a “no-win” situation because of the mandates placed on the much geographically larger and heavily Hispanic populated jurisdictions of Modesto and the Madera School District which have fought and lost in the courts.
“This is a matter of extortion,” said Councilman Don Petersen. “They’re telling us, ‘Do as we tell you or you’re going to spend massive amounts of money to defend your actions.’ I think we’re being forced to do something stupid and spend money we don’t have.”

Petersen said the city would either have to pay money on a consultant to draw up district boundaries or pay an attorney to fight the matter.

Mayor Pat Paul identified a number of problems with the proposal ranging from no one definite “Hispanic area of town” to a contingency if no one from one designated district would run for office.

“How many voters do we have in this town?” Paul asked. “What do we really gain with this? It’s a trap. We don’t have money to fight it and those that have tried, have lost in the courts.”

Councilman Tom Dunlop brought up another hindrance of the plan that would affect a city of Oakdale’s small-in-comparison size.

“What you end up getting is a council representative that doesn’t worry about the city as a whole, but only his district,” said Dunlop. “Citizens get a ‘not-in-my-district’ type representative or someone who starts looking out for only their area’s interests. Politicians then start making deals to support each other’s proposals rather than looking out for the entire city.”

For the entire story, read the March 27 edition of The Leader.
City to study voting patterns

by Nick Rappley | Patterson Irrigator

03.28.13 - 05:15 am

Patterson will find out more about the demographic makeup of the city's voters, motivated by the threat of a lawsuit from a group of Latino leaders regarding voter rights.

Mayor Luis Molina said that the Patterson City Council in closed session March 19 directed city staff to organize a study to describe what ethnic groups make up the city and where they vote.

“This type of analysis is recommended anytime there is a state voting rights claim,” said Deputy City Attorney Doug White. “It creates a baseline determination to find if you should be concerned or not.”

The Latino Community Roundtable, a group of elected and appointed officials, sent letters to school districts and city councils throughout Stanislaus County — including the Patterson City Council — on Feb. 6. The letters demanded that council members be elected to represent specific districts within the city, replacing the at-large election process.

The letter to the Patterson City Council claimed that the city violates the federal 1965 Voting Rights Act and the 2001 California Voting Rights Act by having at-large, rather than by-district, elections.

The letter also stated that the group would take legal action to ensure district elections were put in place in Patterson, if the council did not act immediately to do so.

White has said that no government has challenged this type of lawsuit successfully, and the monetary damages have been large.

Modesto lost a challenge to a lawsuit making similar claims in 2007 and paid a $3 million settlement to a San Francisco law firm.

The Patterson Joint Unified School District recently decided to institute district elections for its seven
trustees. The change must be approved by the State Board of Education, which is expected in May.

White contends that the demographic information would equip the council to decide whether to change the way council members are elected.

No decision about switching to districts has been made, he said.

The city has not yet selected a firm to conduct the study, he said. A meeting with school district officials is scheduled to look for ways to share study costs with the school district, which is months ahead of the city in the process, White said.

Rod Butler, Patterson city manager, said the city was watching the school district closely and looking for ways to avoid duplicating efforts.

Phil Alfano, superintendent of the Patterson Joint Unified School District, said Tuesday, March 26, that he had not yet been contacted but had some reports he could share.

Alfano said the total bill for the school district's election switch is expected to be about $15,000, which includes a demographic study of the district and attorney fees.

He said that the school district began work on the issue in the fall, ahead of the demand letters that were sent out.

"The law is pretty clear," he said. "The only way to avoid being sued for racially polarizing voting is to go to district elections."

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

© pattersonirrigator.com 2013
Wiseburn district eyes wow factor in creating new comprehensive high school

By Rob Kuznia Staff Writer

rob.kuznia@dailybreeze.com @robkuznia on Twitter

Posted: 03/29/2013 03:40:17 PM PDT

The Wiseburn school board has found a new site for its future Wiseburn High School. The district plans to renovate the El Segundo location that was recently vacated by Northrop Grumman. As is, the four-story building is so huge you could put one-and-a-half soccer fields on every floor. (Stephen Carr / Staff Photographer)

Just a few months ago, the four-story monolith located in the heart - or shall we say brain - of El Segundo's aerospace corridor was most assuredly a place where the highest-ranking U.S. military officials held secret meetings about espionage and other sensitive intelligence.

But if the Wiseburn school district has its way, the building formerly leased by Northrop Grumman will, in just three years time, become a comprehensive high school complete with
bustling hallways, college-prep classes, athletic events, prom, school plays, cliquey squabbles and all the other trappings of the American tradition.

Regardless of where the school is ultimately situated, Wiseburn High School will be the South Bay’s first newly minted comprehensive high school to come online in half a century. (The most recent addition was Rolling Hills High, built on the Palos Verdes Peninsula in 1964 and renamed Peninsula High in 1991.)

Last week, the Wiseburn school board took a major step toward converting the office building into a school by approving the environmental studies and closing escrow on the $46 million sale of the property at 201 N. Douglas St. near El Segundo Boulevard. "When this process is done, we will have one of the best high schools in the nation," asserted Wiseburn school board member Susan Andricacchi. "I've been in this community for 17 years and this has been a topic of conversation since I came, and before, I'm sure."

But the Wiseburn school district might still be one fight away from the finish line.

The city of El Segundo, which stands to lose a significant chunk of tax revenue over the deal, is raising stiff objections, and could very well file a lawsuit. The city has 30 days from Wiseburn’s March 21 approval of the project to do so. El Segundo City Manager Greg Carpenter, who submitted a letter of opposition, didn’t return multiple calls for comment.

If the Wiseburn school district prevails in occupying the building, which is across the street from the Los Angeles Air Force Base, the resulting wow factor is expected to be significant.

For starters, the edifice is large enough to fit one and a half soccer fields on each of its four floors. The school district would use only about two-thirds of the building and lop off the rest, although it would add a separate auditorium and a gymnasium.

Preliminary renderings of Wiseburn High depict a futuristic building with plenty of natural lighting, an abundance of glass and a square atrium cutting down the middle of all four floors.

"You might have a private conference - nobody is going to be able to hear you, but they are going to see you," said Tom Johnstone, the school district’s superintendent. The school will be designed by Gensler, one of the largest architecture firms in the United States. Gensler’s credits include the Shanghai Tower in China - which, when completed, will be the second tallest skyscraper in the world. Gensler also has been selected to design Farmers Field, the proposed football stadium in downtown Los Angeles.

Johnstone said Gensler’s own downtown Los Angeles headquarters, with its open layout, glassy interior and ample natural lighting, offers a glimpse of the spirit in which Wiseburn High will be built.

"You can see exactly what everybody is working on," he said. "It creates its own synergy and energy."
Since its inception in 1896, the Wiseburn School District has been a K-8 entity located in the Hawthorne neighborhood of Holly Glen and unincorporated Los Angeles County neighborhoods of Del Aire and Wiseburn. The district also extends into the aerospace and commercial district of El Segundo, which has zero residents but is prized by government entities for its extremely lucrative tax base and bonding capacity.

For decades, Wiseburn residents have been keen on converting their school system into a K-12 unified school district with a comprehensive high school.

The district is already home to a twin pair of charter high schools - Da Vinci Science and Da Vinci Design - but these are specialized learning centers that do not offer all of the features of a traditional high school experience. (Both schools will relocate to the new school.) Wiseburn High, by contrast, will have performing arts extracurriculars and sports teams that will compete in California Interscholastic Federation leagues, better known as CIF.

And, Wiseburn officials say, the new school would keep students from scattering to the wind after and before junior high school.

This dissipation happens because Wiseburn families tend to avoid the two comprehensive high schools to which they are assigned - Hawthorne and Lawndale - in the Centinela Valley Union High School District.

"Centinela Valley hasn't provided the education we're looking for for our kids," said Wiseburn school board member Israel Mora. "Since the 1980s, their quality of education has dropped tremendously. They are trying to bring it back up, but it's a struggle for them."

As for the objections lodged by the city of El Segundo, they have centered on the usual technical quibbles over parking, noise and traffic. But Johnstone said it's largely about lost tax revenue.

"It basically takes 13.71 acres off their tax rolls," he said. "They aren't loving that."

He added: "From our perspective, we really want to work things out with the city; we want to get a win-win."

Tax records show that the property owners paid $482,000 in taxes last year; it's unclear how much of that went to the city of El Segundo. Because schools, churches and parks do not pay property taxes in California, if the sale to the Wiseburn school district goes through, the amount will shrink to zero.

To Wiseburn officials, the property is a perfect fit. The multifloor building is stacked on a 2-acre footprint, leaving ample room for parking and athletic fields. Its proximity to aerospace companies will smooth the relationship the district already enjoys with aerospace engineers who volunteer as tutors.

But the city of El Segundo isn't Wiseburn's only obstacle. The site also harbors an underground plume of methane gas that is trapped beneath the parking lot, probably the result of an
underground Chevron oil field. Even though the plume is about 100 yards from the structure, the gas - whose concentration exceeds the acceptable limits in one area - needs to be diluted via a venting system in order for the district to appease the state Department of Toxic Substances Control.

Given its history, the building itself exudes a certain intrigue. Johnstone said it contained several rooms that existed primarily to host classified meetings - "top secret type stuff."

With the building's handy proximity to not only the Los Angeles Air Force Base but also the base's research-and-development arm, the nonprofit Aerospace Corp., it's easy to imagine high-level, closed-door meetings about drone strikes or missile systems.

"It's exciting to be on Douglas Street," Johnstone said. "That's where it all started."

The building was leased by Northrop until January, when the roughly 1,000 employees packed up and moved into another space owned by the company in Redondo Beach.

"The whole sequestration thing was probably weighing on their head," Johnstone surmised, referring to the automatic federal spending cuts that took effect March 1.

Also mysterious is the owner of the building. On Jan. 13, it changed hands twice in one day, from the opaqueley named Douglas Property Holdings Co., LLC to Continental Development Corp. ""owned by Richard Lundquist, one of the wealthiest landowners in El Segundo - to Wiseburn. Even Johnstone doesn't know exactly why the transaction took place in this fashion, or who "Douglas Property Holders" really is.

In any case, the $46 million to purchase the site and the estimated $32 million it will take to build the school both come from an $87 million construction bond approved overwhelmingly by Wiseburn voters in 2010. A good 80 percent of that money comes not from residents but the businesses in the El Segundo commercial district - a section that includes, in addition to aerospace companies, other corporate behemoths like Mattel, Xerox and AIG.

This corporate corridor is the chief reason all four of the district's schools are nearly brand new.

"We've been abundantly blessed, and we know it," Johnstone said. "We want to develop the next generation of engineers."

Johnstone is hoping the school will open in the spring of 2016. That means today's high school freshmen stand a chance to spend their last couple months of high school in a brand new school.

"We just think it would be an added bonus and a wonderful parting gift - to be in a brand-new, world-class high school for the last part of their senior year," he said.
Modesto leaders weigh in on district voting progress

last updated: April 03, 2013 08:11:43 PM

George A. Petrukas: it could be worse

The lopsided passage of Measure N in 2008 by Modestans brought immediate benefits to the city of Modesto.

When more than 70 percent of Modesto voters implemented district elections, it helped bring to an end expensive litigation the city faced under the California Voting Rights Act.

As The Bee reported on Feb. 7, 2008, the city had spent more than $1.7 million fighting the 2004 lawsuit. Appealed all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court, the adoption of Measure N stopped that spending.

The measure also boosted the respect of voters for City Hall.

Pre-election polling conducted by the campaign committee for Measure M, a companion to N, showed that while individual city councilmembers — and certainly Mayor Jim Ridensour — were popular, the Modesto City Council as a collective entity was not. Also, many voters felt Modesto was on the wrong track.

The passage of the two measures brought forward by the Charter Review Committee assuaged concerns in the short run.

How have district elections worked in Modesto since these early benefits?

In preparing my December testimony for the city of Anaheim's Advisory Committee on Elections, I had the opportunity to assess the results so far.

Some findings:

The value of a vote diverges greatly in Modesto. If you live in the low-turnout Modesto district where just over 1,000 people vote, your vote arguably is worth more than 4½ times what it would be in the four high-turnout districts where about 4,600 to 4,700 voters vote.

If you wanted more minority candidates elected to office, you have been disappointed so far. Perhaps not enough attention has been paid to the Citizens' Districting Commission, created by Measure N to draw the district lines. Any politician knows that district lines can seal their fate.

Finally, while the barriers to election have fallen significantly since it takes a lot less time and money to effectively campaign, the number of candidates running in open seats has often been less than under the previous at-large system.

These results may change over time.

Also testifying at the Anaheim hearing was Loyola Law School Professor Justin Levitt. In providing guidance on the California Voting Rights Act, Levitt cited evidence that voting in historically disadvantaged neighborhoods should increase over time as individuals learn that their vote now "matters."

In addition, he schooled Anaheim in the more exotic remedies available under the California Voters Right Act that allow the imposition of European-style (and now San Francisco-style) voting systems on all of us.

District elections may not yet be working in Modesto as intended, but it could be worse. Much worse.

Petrukas, a Modesto lawyer, chaired the most recent Modesto Charter Review Committee.

Joan Cieniadz: Follow lead of Ceres school board

The issue of school districts and cities switching from at-large to by-district elections is emotionally charged and riddled with conflict and hazards.
The city of Modesto was challenged by the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights, using the loosely worded language of the California Voting Rights Act, to implement some form of by-district elections. The city eventually lost the court battle and began a process that resulted in district elections. Now the county school boards have to deal with the same band of lawyers.

I opposed the change because I believed that collegiality was as important as any benefit from the change. Almost every vote cast by the City Council affects the entire city. Why wouldn’t you want the decision-makers to have been elected citywide?

I’m also offended by the process. The Voting Rights Act allows an out-of-area group of lawyers to send “demand” letters to cities and school districts to force them to make a decision that should be made by the local jurisdictions at a time of their own choosing. I believe in the democratic process and that citizen governing boards need to have “fair community representation.”

The decision to run for any elective office is a personal decision. Citizens run or don’t run for myriad personal and political reasons. I believe the reason Latinos and African-Americans are not on these boards because running for office is an expensive and time-consuming process — and that’s before you win. There are some who argue that even if elected, they would be outvoted by a white majority.

A recent demand letter prompted six Stanislaus County school districts to postpone their school board elections until November 2014. They acted both too late and too soon. The members of those boards whose terms expire in 2013 granted themselves an extra year in office. Was the vote to change the election date a conflict of interest? Will the votes they cast next year be challenged? Empire, smartly, is studying its options.

I believe the Ceres School District board elections process is the fairest way to go given the CVRA objective, which is to give “minority voters a better chance of electing candidates of their choice.” The Ceres blend of two at-large seats and the remainder by-district elections produces a balanced board. My advice to those six districts and others that are dealing with this issue — take a look at Ceres.

Clendenin, a delegate to the 2012 Republican National Convention, has long been active in Stanislaus County Republican politics.

Dale Butler: Greater diversity will come soon.

Some of the arguments put forth by many who supported by-district elections during the 2008 City elections were that 1) the makeup of our council would become more diverse, 2) campaign-related costs would be reduced, and 3) constituents would have improved representation and access to city government.

While council diversity (gender and ethnic) under by-district elections has not improved compared to most pre-2009 at-large councils, I believe the future bodes well for these and other underrepresented groups. This is especially true in districts with high underrepresented populations, as long as constituents vote.

As for lower campaign-related costs under by-district elections, analysis should show, I believe, that smaller geographical areas mean reduced expenditures for staff, materials, and travel. Some candidates will still splurge to get elected, but the fact remains that higher spending is no longer necessary, unless, of course, one is running in countywide, state and federal races.

By-district elections have also improved representation and access for constituents to city services. Constituents tend to feel more at ease in expressing concerns to councilmembers who live in their neighborhoods, and councilmembers tend to do more outreach within smaller districts.

Litigation against the city of Modesto aside, I am glad voters approved by-district elections in 2008. While a more inclusive and diverse council has not yet materialized, I have every expectation that this will happen soon.

Butler is a Latino community leader.

On mobile? Click here for a PDF of winning candidate summaries before district elections. Click here for a PDF of Modesto council member election experience.
Judge Grants Delay of Anaheim Council Districts Lawsuit

By ADAM ELMAHREK - writer (AP)

Tuesday, April 9, 2013

Orange County Superior Court Judge Franz E. Miller Tuesday afternoon issued a ruling postponing until July a lawsuit against the city of Anaheim demanding the implementation of a new City Council election system, saying that a committee studying the electoral process should be allowed to finish its work.

The American Civil Liberties Union last year filed a lawsuit on behalf of Latino activists against the city alleging that its at-large council election system violates the 2001 California Voting Rights Act, which requires adequate council representation minorities.

Anaheim is 54 percent Latino, but few council members in the city's history have been Latino. Currently, all five council members are white and hail from either Anaheim Hills, the city's affluent Eastern sector or the Colony District, another well-heeled area. The ACLU proposes a switch to a council-districts system, whereby residents would only elect representatives of their districts.

The city challenges the validity of the lawsuit in court documents, arguing that members of minority groups have consistently been elected to City Council. According to the city, ten seats have been up for election since 2002, with seven of those seats filled by either "Asian" or "Hispanic" council members.

One of those council members is former Councilwoman Lorri Galloway, who is Spanish and Filipina, a mix that ACLU attorney Robert Ruben has said doesn't meet the criteria for Latina under the voting rights act.

The city's attorneys argue in court filings that a citizens advisory committee which faces a May 31 deadline on its recommendations -- that was formed to study council elections might conclude that the city should change its council election system. Given that possibility, the court should allow the democratic process its course, the city argues in court documents.
Miller agreed and said that the court should be open to a democratic solution to constitutional questions. With arguments in the U.S. Supreme Court that states should be allowed to legislate same-sex marriage before the nation's highest court steps in, this concept is "well grounded" in the nation's justice system, Miller said.

"As is the concept justice delayed is justice denied," replied ACLU attorney Robert Rubin. Miller said that three months "in the scheme of things" seemed reasonable. "It's not lost on me that we're talking about a city that for many years has been Hispanic and has only had three Hispanic council members in that time," he said.

Miller also said that the citizens advisory committee at the very least would provide information important to a judicial ruling. He referenced national voting rights cases in the 1960s and 1970s that Southern courts wrestled with and said judges in those cases would have benefited from similar studies.

Miller decided to postpone the case and setting a conference with attorneys for July 9 to hear the city's plan for addressing the ACLU's complaint.

ACLU attorneys expressed concern that the city could not have a feasible plan for implementing council districts in time for the 2014 general election.

And even if the city did complete the process, the civil rights lawyers argue in court filings that voters could reject the proposed system, which would leave only five months to litigate the issue before the general election.

Similarly, if voters approved a council-districts plan in June, 2014, that would allow only a few months to carve up the districts and have candidates file before the general election, ACLU attorney Bardis Vakili said after the court proceedings.

"That's cutting it close," Vakili said. "I'm curious to see how they're going to address that." Meanwhile, a handful of Latina residents in attendance said they were disappointed by the judge's decision.

Mariana Rivera, a resident in the Guinida neighborhood of South Anaheim, blames Latinos' lack of representation for what she says is an unequal distribution of city resources between areas like Anaheim Hills and the city's mostly working-class flatlands area.

"We feel we don't have so much time. We need our voices to be heard now," Rivera said.

Please contact Adam Elmahrek directly at elmahrek@voiceofoc.org and follow him on Twitter: twitter.com/adamelmahrek.
Citrus College Board member Gary Woods accused of living outside of Azusa

By Melissa Masatani, Staff Writer twitter.com/mmasatani San Gabriel Valley Tribune

On the heels of recent allegations that the Citrus College Board of Trustees violated the state's open meeting law, the teachers' union leveled new accusations against longtime Trustee Gary Woods at Tuesday afternoon's board meeting.

Representatives of the Community College Association, the community college affiliate of the California Teachers Association, helped conduct a nearly two-month investigation into Woods, who is accused of living outside of the area he represents.

CCA President Ron Reel and Citrus Faculty Association President John Fincher spoke during the public comment portion of the meeting, presenting evidence they say proves that Woods lives in Sierra Madre rather than in Azusa.

Woods, whose four-year term expires Nov. 30, has served on the board since 1982 and was most recently re-elected in 2009. He represents Area 1, which covers Azusa, Covina, Glendora and Irwindale, and lists an apartment at 450 N. Soldano Ave. in Azusa as his residence.

Information from the CCA, posted at firegarywoods.com, shows a grant deed from April 2011 for Gary Woods and Guo Ping Wu at a residence in Sierra Madre. The site also has photo and video surveillance of the Sierra Madre residence, purportedly showing Woods' vehicle at the home at night and in the morning.

The California Education Code states that an elected member of a community college governing board must live within established trustee areas, clarifying that the person's listed address must be their "domicile," or main place of residence.

"Everybody has a domicile and that's what counts," Citrus faculty president Fincher said in an interview. "You have to be domiciled in the district to run for the district."

Woods denied Sierra Madre was his primary residence.

"I own several properties and I can live where I want," he said. "Azusa has been my main domicile since '81 or '82."

The union's investigation was spurred in January by a letter from a former postal employee, saying he remembered delivering mail to an apartment in Azusa that would only be emptied every few weeks. The letter prompted the CTA to hire a private investigator and attorney, according to the website.

In his comments, Fincher proposed the board retain legal counsel and, if the group's findings prove to be correct, vote to make Woods' position vacant at the April 2 meeting.
"We have always been concerned that the people of Azusa are not being fairly represented by one of their own," Fincher said. "The whole election process is in jeopardy if somebody can simply find a place, run for office in that city and have no roots or connection to that city."

After the meeting, Woods warned the union to back off.

"I don't think it's the board's place (to retain legal counsel) ... If they want to take action, I'll take action against them," he said.
NOTICE OF COMPLETION: CITY OF SANTA CLARITA

Proceedings for the following described change of organization were completed, and the subject territory became a part of the City of Santa Clarita when the Certificate of Completion was executed by this office and recorded with the County Recorder on April 16, 2013, as Instrument No. 20130562395:

LAFCO RESOLUTION No. 2013-04 – PROTEST RESOLUTION ORDERING ANNEXATION NO. 2011-26 TO THE CITY OF SANTA CLARITA (South Sand Canyon)

Number of Registered Voters: 36
Acres: 692.15 acres

RELATED JURISDICTIONAL CHANGES: Unless otherwise specified, these changes are effective on the date shown above:

Annexation to:
The City of Santa Clarita
Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District (Parcel 1 only)

Detachment from:
County Road District No. 5
County Lighting and Maintenance District 1687
County Public Library System
County Lighting District LLA-1, Unincorporated Zone

DATED: April 16, 2013
EXHIBIT "A"

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

ANNEXATION NO. 2011-26 TO
THE CITY OF SANTA CLARITA
"SOUTH SAND CANYON"

Parcel 1:

Those portions of Sections 1, 2, 11 and 12 in Township 3 North, Range 15 West, San Bernardino Meridian in the County of Los Angeles, State of California described as follows:

Beginning at the Center of said Section 12; thence (L1) along the southerly line of the northwest quarter of said Section 12 South 88°55'44" West 1162.49 feet to the westerly line of parcel 1 as described in document recorded April 28, 1994 as instrument no. 94-818523 of Official Records, in the office of the County Recorder of said county; thence (L2) along said westerly line North 00°14'28" West 2659.52 feet to the southwesterly corner of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of said Section 1; thence (L3 along the westerly line of parcel 11 as described in document recorded April 22, 2005 as instrument no. 05-0943244 of said Official Records, North 00°19'41" East 1372.20 feet to the northwesterly corner of said southeast quarter of the southwest quarter; thence (L4) along the southerly line of parcel 1 as described in document record
Official Records, South 89°06′32″ West 1136.49 feet to the
easterly line of the southeast quarter of said Section 2; thence
(L5) along last said easterly line South 00°23′15″ West 1345.26
feet to the southeasterly corner of said Section 2; thence
(L6) along the southerly line of the southeast quarter of said
Section 2 North 89°20′10″ West 674.28 feet to the easterly line of
parcel 5 as described in said document recorded April 22, 2005;
thence
(L7) along last said easterly line South 00°17′18″ West 1346.09
feet to the southerly line of said parcel 5; thence
(L8) along last said southerly line North 89°24′23″ West 1348.60
feet to the westerly line of said parcel 5; thence
(L9) along last said westerly line North 00°17′26″ East 1347.75
feet to the southerly line of the southeast quarter of said
Section 2; thence
(L10) along last said southerly line South 89°20′10″ East 337.14
feet to the westerly line of parcel 4 as described in said
document recorded April 22, 2005; thence
(L11) along last said westerly line North 00°31′30″ East 1346.96
feet to the southerly line of parcel 1 as described in document
recorded December 2, 2002 as instrument no. 02-2914078 of said
Official Records; thence
(L12) along last said southerly line North 89°16′41″ West 1009.49
feet to the westerly line of the northwest quarter of the
southeast quarter of said Section 2; thence
(L13) along last said westerly line North 00°36′27″ East 1347.98
feet to the northeast corner of the southwest quarter of said
Section 2; thence
(L14) along the northerly line of said southwest quarter of
Section 2 North 89°13′10″ West 1328.21 feet to the westerly line
of the land described in document recorded June 07, 2006 as instrument no. 06-1253118 of said Official Records; thence
(L15) along last said westerly line and its northerly prolongation North 00°21′14″ East 774.87 feet to a point on the centerline of Placerita Canyon Road being a point on a curve concave northwesterly having a radius of 1500.00 feet, a radial line through last said point bears North 05°10′01″ West; thence
(C16) northeasterly along said curve and said centerline through a central angle of 27°11′33″ an arc distance of 711.90 feet to a point on the westerly line of the east half of the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of said Section 2 as described in document recorded July 12, 2007 as instrument no. 20071654941 of said Official Records; thence
(L17) along last said westerly line North 00°28′55″ East 318.70 feet to a point on the southerly boundary of Parcel Map No. 7096 as shown on map filed in Book 108 pages 33 and 34 of Parcel Maps, in said office of the County Recorder; thence
(L18) along last said southerly boundary South 89°30′04″ East 667.02 feet to the easterly boundary of said Parcel Map No. 7096; thence
(L19) along last said easterly boundary North 00°36′27″ East 219.37 feet to a point on said centerline of Placerita Canyon Road; thence
(L20) along last said centerline the following seven courses, North 50°56′00″ East 684.39 feet to the to the beginning of a tangent curve concave southeasterly having a radius of 1000.00 feet; thence
(C21) northeasterly along last said curve through a central angle of 17°49′10″ an arc distance of 311.01 feet; thence
tangent to last said curve North 68°45’10” East 165.73 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northwesterly having a radius of 800.00 feet; thence
(C23) northeasterly along last said curve through a central angle of 16°03’00” an arc distance of 224.10 feet; thence
(L24) tangent to last said curve North 52°42’10” East 101.75 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave southeasterly having a radius of 500.00 feet; thence
(C25) northeasterly along last said curve through a central angle of 36°17’40” an arc distance of 316.73 feet to a point on the boundary of the City of Santa Clarita as the same existed February 14, 2011; thence
(L26) continuing along said centerline and said boundary and tangent to last said curve North 88°59’50” East 1072.47 feet to an angle point in said boundary on the centerline of Sand Canyon Road; thence
(L27) along said boundary and said centerline of Sand Canyon Road the following 11 courses and curves, South 11°09’05” East 473.95 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northeasterly having a radius of 300.00 feet; thence
(C28) southeasterly along last said curve through a central angle of 78°45’40” an arc distance of 412.39 feet; thence
(L29) tangent to last said curve South 89°54’45” East 166.04 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northerly having a radius of 1000.00 feet; thence
(C30) easterly along last said curve through a central angle of 25°44’50” an arc distance of 449.37 feet; thence
(L31) tangent to last said curve North 64°20’25” East 213.03 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northwesterly having a radius of 200.00 feet; thence
(C32) northeasterly along last said curve through a central angle of 31°14'10" an arc distance of 109.03 feet; thence (L33) tangent to last said curve North 33°06'15" East 95.70 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave southeasterly having a radius of 200.00 feet; thence (C34) northeasterly along last said centerline and last said curve through a central angle of 42°50'20" an arc distance of 149.54 feet; thence (L35) tangent to last said curve North 75°56'35" East 670.82 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave southerly having a radius of 300.00 feet; thence (C36) easterly along last said curve through a central angle of 33°20'30" an arc distance of 174.58 feet; thence (L37) tangent to last said curve South 70°42'55" East 108.17 feet to the easterly line of the west half of said Section 1; thence (L38) leaving said City Boundary and along last said easterly line South 00°16'15" West 5075.48 feet to the south quarter corner of said Section 1; thence (L39) along the easterly line of the northwest quarter of said Section 12 South 00°46'56" East 2628.75 feet to the point of Beginning.

Containing 634.47 acres, more or less.

PARCEL 2:

Lots 3 and 4 in Section 36, Township 4 North, Range 15 West, San Bernardino Meridian in the County of Los Angeles, State of California according the official plat thereof on file in the Government Land Office described as a whole as follows:
Beginning at the southeast corner of said Section 36; thence
(L1) along the southerly line of said Section 36 South 87°04'10" West 2267.96 feet to the westerly line of said Lot 3; thence
(L2) along said westerly line North 03°26'48" West 1144.26 feet to the north line of said Lot 3; thence
(L3) along the northerly lines of said Lots 3 and 4 North 89°48'42" East 2350.47 feet to the easterly line of said Section 36; thence
(L4) along said easterly line South 00°55'26" West 1034.10 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Parcel 2 containing 57.68 acres, more or less.

Parcels 1 and 2 contain 692.15 acres, more or less, in their aggregate.
Distribution for Annexation No. 2011-26 to the City of Santa Clarita (South Sand Canyon)

COUNTY DEPARTMENTS
AGRICULTURAL COMMISSIONER
ANIMAL CONTROL
AUDITOR-Tax Section
CONSUMER AFFAIRS
FORESTER-FIRE WARDEN
HEALTH SERVICES-Solid Waste
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE- Leasing & Revenue
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE-Pipeline Franchises
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE-Space Management
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION-Glock Grants
INTERNAL SERVICES-911 Plans & Est.
LIBRARY-Admin. Services
PARKS & RECREATION-Mgmt. Serv.
PUBLIC WORKS-Mapping Services
REGIONAL PLANNING-Mapping Services, Room 1101
REGISTRAR-RECORDER
SHERIFF-Contract Law
TREASURER-TAX COLLECTOR-Bus Lic.
TREASURER-TAX COLLECTOR-Utility Tax

OTHER
ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL
AT&T
AUTO CLUB OF SO. CALIF
BUREAU OF LAND RECLAMATION
CALTRANS
COMPASS MAPS INC.
CONDUCTING AUTHORITY
CHP
VERIZON
METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT
MCI
PACIFIC BELL – TAX DIRECTOR
SBE LOCAL TAX UNIT
SO. CALIF. EDISON CO.
SO. CALIF. GAS CO.
STATE FINANCE-DEMOGRAPHIC RESEARCH
THOMAS BROS. MAPS
U.S. POSTAL SERVICE
LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION
(COUNTY COMMITTEE)
LEGISLATIVE REVIEW - MAY 2013

BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR:
Senate Bill 41/Wright

INTRODUCTION DATE:
12/12/12

LAST ACTIVITY/DATE:
04/09/13: Enrolled and presented to the Governor.

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

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

RECOMMENDED POSITION
Staff recommends the following position:

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

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

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

Please direct all comments to Mr. Keith D. Crafton, Secretary to the County Committee, at (562) 922-6144.
BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR: Assembly Bill 450/ Jones-Sawyer

INTRODUCTION DATE: 02/19/13

LAST ACTIVITY/DATE: 04/09/13: Referred back to committee for further review.

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

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

RECOMMENDED POSITION
Staff recommends the following position:

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

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

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

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

May 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 April 18, 2013.

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

Status: Final petition submission pending.
Status Date: June 26, 2007

OTHER INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last nine 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)

May 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 April 18, 2013.]

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

On May 16, 2001, the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) received a request from the Citizens for a Wiseburn Unified School District organization to prepare a petition (25 percent of the registered voters) proposing to form a Wiseburn USD from existing territory of the Wiseburn SD. The proposed formation territory was 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. There was

* Indicates update from previous summary.
no date set for the petition to be reviewed by the SBE at that time. The EIR contained in the revised petition was 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 was anticipated that another regional meeting will be scheduled and that it will be facilitated by LACOE staff.

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

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

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

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

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

On October 7, 2011, staff was notified by representatives of the Wiseburn SD that the Hawthorne, Lawndale, and Lennox SDs had communicated to Wiseburn SD that their boards have decided not to participate in any additional regional meetings, and that they were not in

* Indicates update from previous summary.
favor of the unification proposals reviewed to date (including the proposed legislation circulated by the Wiseburn SD). The three districts submitted an October 19, 2011, letter to the County Committee reiterating this decision. During the following week (October 10-14, 2011), staff was notified by representatives of the Wiseburn SD and the Centinela Valley UHSD that they are continuing to hold discussions regarding a proposed agreement and possible legislation supporting unification. Staff requested that district or board representatives communicate any agreements and/or decisions in writing to the County Committee and to LACOE.

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

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

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

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

At the May 2, 2012, County Committee meeting, representatives from the Centinela Valley UHSD, Hawthorne, Lawndale, and Wiseburn SDs were present to provide an update on the petition and negotiations among the districts. The County Committee was informed that the Lennoxx 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 that 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 resided within the Wiseburn SD), along with the creation of a revenue sharing JPA as described above. The Wiseburn SD requested that the County Committee submit a letter to the SBE expressing support of the pending local solution and legislation.

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

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

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

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

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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
financial staff in the gathering of documents the CDE requested related to the Wiseburn SD and the Centinela Valley UHSD.

At the January 9, 2013, meeting of the County Committee, the committee discussed its continued support for the Wiseburn unification and directed staff to review the options for communicating that support to the SBE prior to their consideration of the matter (currently expected to be in May 2013). At the February 6, 2013, meeting of the County Committee, staff provided an update on the process. On March 21, 2013, the Wiseburn SD hosted a hearing on the final CEQA study, presented by Terry Hayes and Associates (environmental consultants). On March 25, 2013, LACOE staff concluded its analysis of the Blended Revenue Limit (BRL) for the proposed Wiseburn USD and conveyed it to the CDE.

*Status:* Legislation to facilitate formation of the Wiseburn USD signed by the Governor; process to adopt EIR underway with CDE; clean-up legislation introduced December 12, 2012; petition scheduled for review by the SBE in May, 2013.

**Status Date:** April 10, 2013

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

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

*Status:* Petition in circulation.

**Status Date:** April 10, 2013

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

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

Please note that this is a separate petition, distinct from the other petitions requested by Mr. Mendoza, requesting some of the same changes within the Pomona USD (the addition of two governing board members and the creation of trustee areas). It was submitted under EC §5019 and §5020 and requires valid signatures from ten percent of the registered voters.

* Indicates update from previous summary.
within the petition area (approximately 6,100 signatures in the case of the Pomona USD, based on the most recent count of registered voters). If valid and certified by the County Committee, this petition would trigger a ballot initiative (as opposed to a reference report and vote by the County Committee).

**Status:** Petition in circulation.

**Status Date:** June 20, 2012

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

On January 17, 2006, LACOE received a request for a petition from chief petitioners Ms. Maurice Morse, Ms. Shirlee Smith, and Mr. Bruce Wasson, three community members who are residents of the area known as Altadena. The chief petitioners want to form an Altadena USD from territory within the boundaries of the Pasadena USD. The petition request was returned to the chief petitioners on January 20, 2006, because it lacked an adequate description of the area pursuant to EC §35700.3.

On February 10, 2006, LACOE received a revised request for a petition. Staff reviewed the request and forwarded a draft petition to County Counsel on February 22, 2006, for a legal compliance review regarding format and content. We received notification on March 6, 2006, from County Counsel informing us that the draft petition was legally acceptable.

On March 7, 2006, staff forwarded the draft petition to the Registrar-Recorder for verification that the description of the proposed boundaries of the Altadena USD was sufficiently clear (so that registered voters residing within the proposed petition area could be identified with specificity). The Registrar-Recorder confirmed that the description was sufficient on March 10, 2006.

The petition was mailed to the chief petitioners on March 14, 2006, for circulation within the petition area. The Registrar-Recorder estimated the chief petitioners will need to collect approximately 7,000 valid signatures in order to meet the criteria set forth in EC §35700(a).

On September 23, 2010, chief petitioners delivered signed petitions to LACOE. Staff submitted the petitions to the Registrar-Recorder on September 27, 2010, for signature verification. On October 22, 2010, the Registrar-Recorder notified staff that there were insufficient valid signatures (less than the required 25 percent of the registered voters within the petition area). Staff notified the chief petitioners of the insufficiency, and at Mr. Wasson’s request, returned the petitions to the Registrar-Recorder for a signature audit. Staff also advised the chief petitioner regarding the collection of additional signatures. Upon notification by the Registrar-Recorder of a sufficient number of valid signatures, staff will present the petition to the County Committee at the next regular meeting.

On January 4, 2011, staff conferred with a representative from the Registrar-Recorder's office, who informed us that no audit of petition signatures had been done yet, and they clarified the cost of signature verification. On February 15 and March 1, 2011, staffs contacted the Registrar-Recorder.
Recorder and were informed that the signature audit had still not been done. On May 12, 2011, staff from the Registrar-Recorder's office advised LACOE that an audit of the petition’s signatures was underway. On November 28, 2011, the chief petitioner Mr. Wasson notified LACOE of the death of one of the co-chief petitioners, Ms. Morse. Mr. Wasson stated that another chief petitioner would not be named.

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

Status Date:  December 5, 2011

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

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

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

Status:  Petition in circulation.

Status Date:  August 20, 2009

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

Status:  Petition currently in circulation.

Status Date:  February 21, 2008

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

Status:  Petition in circulation.

Status Date:  May 11, 2007

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

Status:  Petition in circulation.

* Indicates update from previous summary.
Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals
(excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District)
May 2013
Page 11

Status Date: March 20, 2007

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

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

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

Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: October 2, 2006

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RECENT INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION

Unification Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Malibu USD (Santa Monica-Malibu USD)/November 2011

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Temple City USD to Arcadia USD/March 2012

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None

Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

- ABC USD/January 2013

* Indicates update from previous summary.