October 26, 2012

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

FROM: Keith D. Crafton, Secretary
County Committee

SUBJECT: Cancellation of the November 7, 2012, Regular Meeting of the County Committee

The regular meeting of the County Committee scheduled for Wednesday, November 7, 2012, has been CANCELLED. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, December 5, 2012.

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

Staff Activities

• Staff is continuing preparations for the 2012 election of members to the County Committee, from the First, Fourth and Fifth Supervisory Districts. Many districts have already submitted their ballots. The election will culminate at the annual meeting of the Los Angeles County School Trustees Association scheduled for October 29, 2012 in Gardena.

• Staff hosted a meeting of Secretaries to County Committees on October 5, 2012 and had the opportunity to confer with colleagues around the state on issues related to school district organization.

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

Correspondence

• A letter to the State Board of Education in support of the unification of Wiseburn Unified School District (USD). (Attachment 1)

Newspaper Articles

• An October 7, 2012, article from the Press Democrat —“Santa Rosa’s voting practices could be target of suit.” (Attachment 2)
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- An October 8, 2012, article from the Californian-“Historic election for 2 new SVMH
districts.” (Attachment 3)

- An October 11, 2012, article from the Contra Costa Times-“Measure B asks voters to change
the way San Mateo County supervisors get elected.” (Attachment 4)

- An October 12, 2012, article from the Daily Journal-“College district considers election
changes.” (Attachment 5)

- An October 20, 2012, article from the Daily Democrat-“Woodland City Council could be
elected by district voting.” (Attachment 6)

- An October 23, 2012, article from the Inland Valley Daily Bulletin-“Pomona’s Measure T
called undemocratic and a step back by opponents.” (Attachment 7))

Legislative Review

Attached is a review of pending legislation related to school district organization. (Attachment 8)

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 9)

- “Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals (excluding those
affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District).” (Attachment 10)

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

KDC/AD:ah
Attachments
October 23, 2012

Dr. Michael Kirst, President
California State Board of Education
1430 N Street, Suite 5111
Sacramento, CA 95814

Formation of the Wiseburn Unified School District

Dear President Kirst:

I serve as Chairperson of the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee), the elected body charged with oversight of matters relating to the school district organization process in Los Angeles County. The County Committee is supported by staff from the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE). LACOE staff are supervised by Mr. Keith Crafton, who serves as designee Secretary to the County Committee under appointment by Dr. Arturo Delgado, the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools.

I am writing to convey the support of the County Committee for the recent developments in the process to create the Wiseburn Unified School District (USD).

After many years of review through both local and state processes, the five impacted districts (Centinela Valley Union High School District (HSD), Hawthorne School District (SD), Lawndale SD, Lennox SD and Wiseburn SD) have reached a series of agreements that they believe best achieve what has been termed a “local solution.” The Wiseburn SD and the Centinela Valley Union HSD have formed a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) to manage the distribution of current and future tax and bond revenue assigned to each district. In addition, legislation was signed by Governor Brown in September to start the process that will lead to the creation of the Wiseburn USD in mid-2014. Further, all five districts have formed a second JPA to develop and share parcel tax revenue area-wide. The various components that make up the local solution will be validated with several rounds of voter approval.

The County Committee has followed the process of proposals and reviews very carefully over the years since it approved the first petition more than a decade ago. Most recently, the County Committee spoke directly with the Superintendents of all five impacted districts during its regular meeting on October 3, 2012. The County Committee was assured by all present that the
local solution is workable, both fiscally and operationally, that it serves the best interests of the students of all districts, and that it will ultimately gain broad public support.

In light of those assurances, the County Committee would like to commend all parties for their persistence in ultimately achieving a workable local solution. We encourage the State Board of Education (SBE) to provide the additional support necessary to bring the locally endorsed solution to full fruition, culminating in the launching of the Wiseburn USD.

One of the remaining components of the SBE’s endorsement of the formation of the Wiseburn USD is the adoption of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) which was developed during one of the prior review processes. EIRs require timely adoption to remain useful to the review process for which they were intended and this one is no exception. It is a critical component of the more lengthy unification journey that the districts have been through. The County Committee encourages the SBE to adopt the current EIR (which was prepared under the guidance of staff from the California Department of Education) as soon as possible so that the unification may go forward without this outstanding issue causing any delays or complications.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please feel free to contact me through Mr. Crafton at (562) 922-6144. Thank you for your consideration and for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Maria Calix
Chairperson

KDC/AD:ah

cc: County Committee Members
    Mr. Fernandez, Centinela Valley Union HSD
    Dr. Johnstone, Wiseburn SD
    Dr. Morgan, Hawthorne SD
    Dr. Dougherty, Lawndale SD
    Dr. Flores, Lennox SD
    Dr. Delgado, LACOE
    Dr. Ybarra, LACOE
    Dr. Cherniss, LACOE
    Ms. Gibbs, LACOE
    Mr. Simmons, LACOE
    Ms. Dunn, LACOE
    Mr. Crafton, LACOE
    Dr. Deegan, LACOE
Santa Rosa's voting practices could be target of suit

By KEVIN MCCALLUM
THE PRESS DEMOCRAT
Published: Sunday, October 7, 2012 at 4:02 a.m.

One of the most vexing disputes over district elections focuses on the level of risk facing Santa Rosa for being sued under the California Voting Rights Act for having "racially polarized voting."

The law, passed in 2001, made it easier for minority groups to prove their votes were being overwhelmed by those of white voters. Several communities have since been sued, including Hanford, Modesto and Madera, in some cases resulting in the cities paying millions in legal fees and being required to switch to district elections.

"We're seeing these sweep the state," said Douglas Johnson, president of National Demographics Corporation.

Supporters of Measure Q on the Nov. 6 ballot say that instead of waiting to be sued, the city should switch to district elections now, which would protect it from such action.

"My opinion is there is a real vulnerability to the city," said former Sonoma County Counsel Steven Woodside, who lives in Fountaingrove.

The fact that so few Latinos have been elected to public office in the city (Ernesto Olivares became the first Latino council member in 2008) and that higher concentrations of Latinos live on the city's west side would likely make it easier for attorneys to make their case, Woodside said.

Also given demographic trends, it is clear Latinos will continue to make up a larger percentage of the population, he said.

"This is, in my view, inevitable, so why not take care of it now?" Woodside said.

But Herb Williams, the political consultant helping direct the Measure Q opposition, is among those who call this a "scare tactic." They say there is no evidence of racially polarized voting in the city.

Determining whether such a pattern exists is complicated, and to date no one has attempted it in Santa Rosa, said attorney and Santa Rosa Schools board member Bill Carle.
Experts would need to do a complex analysis comparing voting patterns with demographic data to determine whether the pattern exists. Absent that, no one can say for sure, he said.

"There is no evidence that would suggest that we are in danger of being sued, just like there is no evidence that we are clean of racially polarized voting," Carle said.

Nor is there any suggestion that the city is being considered as a target for a suit in the near future, largely because there are other communities with greater histories of racial imbalances, Johnson said.

"Santa Rosa is not on anyone's bright-red target list," he said.

Williams said he supported putting district elections on the ballot even though he opposes them in practice because he believes if voters were given the chance to weigh in on the subject, the legal risk to the city would be lessened even if district elections are rejected.

"That's exactly the opposite of reality," Johnson said.

Putting district elections to a vote is "dangerous" because if Latinos vote for it and the whites vote it down, that provides evidence of a problem.

"Allowing the majority to show its prejudice by voting against what the Latinos want does not help your defense," Johnson said.

You can reach Staff Writer Kevin McCallum at 521-5207 or kevin.mccallum@pressdemocrat.com. OnTwitter @citybeater

Copyright © 2012 PressDemocrat.com — All rights reserved. Restricted use only.
Historic election for 2 new SVMH districts

By Andy Stiny
astiny@thecalifornian.com

10:25 PM, Oct. 8, 2012

For the first time in 60 years, and with the advice of a consultant and the United States Department of Justice, two members on the Salinas Valley Memorial Hospital District’s Board of Directors will be elected in November by district instead of at large.

After about a year of study and so that the large Salinas Hispanic population “are getting represented the way they should be,” the consultant “recommended the board go to elections by zone instead of at large,” said SVMH president and interim Chief Executive Officer Lowell Johnson.

The board studied and adopted the recommendations. The board had been advised that without district elections they would be leaving themselves open to lawsuits for possible violations of the 1965 federal Voting Rights Act, which essentially eliminated discriminatory voting. It became easier for minorities in California to prove that their voting impact had been watered down with the passage of the California Voting Rights Act of 2001.

“With the advice of the U.S. Department of Justice, we selected Zones 2 and 3 (for the elections), which have the highest percentage of Hispanic citizens and Hispanic voters,” Johnson said. The terms of board members Patrick Egan and Nathan Olivas were both up in November, and Johnson explained that neither one lives in Zones 2 or 3.

Zone 3 extends roughly east from the Del Monte Avenue, Townt Street and Laurel Drive areas to its easterly boundary at North Main Street from Chaparral to San Juan Grade Road. Zone 2 extends along Highway 101 from Airport Boulevard to Market Street and west to Highway 183.

Egan and Olivas, who live in Zones 5 and 4, respectively, can run for the board again when the other three zones are scheduled for elections in 2014, Johnson said.

Two candidates are vying for the Zone 3 position: Rafael Garcia and Orlando “Orly” Jimenez. Only one candidate, Victor Rey, filed for the Zone 2 job, so he is not on the ballot and is automatically elected.

Orlando “Orly” Jimenez has no experience in health-care matters but says his experience in insurance management qualifies him to be on the board of directors.
“I’m running because I have over 27 years in management as district manager of one of the largest insurance companies in the United States (Woodmen of the World).”

Jimenez referred to problems surrounding the hospital district that have been the subject of media coverage over the past year. The hospital got a critical report from the California State Auditor’s Office and agreed to make all changes in business procedures that the audit recommended. Asked about specific problems, he mentioned the laying off of employees and said he wants to avoid it.

When asked about the hospital losing money, Jimenez said it was “because of some discrepancies. The top executives were paid a lot of money and retirement benefits.

“That’s the reason I am running ... Salinas Valley Memorial Hospital is an extremely valuable community asset; we need to make it as accessible and available to all the residents of the district. Our community deserves high quality health care.”

We need “to make sure the budget is beneficial for the hospital and not special interests,” he said.

“I am happy to serve as a board member of Salinas Valley Memorial Hospital because I can use my over 37 years of management experience.”

Rafael Garcia, a mortgage loan officer, did not immediately return phone calls for an interview.

According to his statement filed with the Monterey County Registrar of Voters: Garcia was born and raised in Salinas and graduated from Alisal High School and Hartnell College. He has a B.A. in social work from San Jose State University. He is active in and currently vice president of the board of directors of the Alisal Eagles Youth Football League. He is also founder of the Salinas Music and Arts Summit.

Rey, born and raised in Salinas, said he wants to be involved in the community.

“I have always had an interest, not necessarily in politics but community affairs,” Rey said.

He said he kept track of events in the community while away at school. “It seemed like an interesting way to get involved in a positive way in the community.”

Rey has not had any direct experience in health care but he works in the food safety aspect of agriculture, which he said touches on similar things.

He was asked how he would deal with some of the difficult challenges that SVMH has experienced.

“Like any other business with a sense of looking at everything with analytical methods and efficiencies in mind,” he said. “At the same time it’s not any other business ... and lives are on the line.”
Not being on the board yet, Rey said he does not have specific changes in mind for the way things are done. "Impartiality is a big thing I am going to try and bring into my role."

Asked if he was concerned about assuming a role in an organization that has had its share of controversy, he responded: "Not really. Obviously, there are opportunities there for improvement ... . It is what it is and somebody has got to tackle that."
CONTRA COSTA TIMES
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Measure B asks voters to change the way San
Maeo County supervisors get elected

By Bonnie Eslinger

Daily News Staff Writer

Posted: 10/11/2012 09:28:43 PM PDT
Updated: 10/12/2012 01:06:35 AM PDT

Measure B on San Mateo County's November ballot proposes to change a system for electing supervisors that proponents say essentially guarantees victory for incumbents and has produced only two minorities in the past two decades.

But opponents of the measure argue that the current system of electing supervisors countywide rather than by district works well and forces supervisors to consider the needs of all residents, not just those in the geographical areas they represent.

"I think it's a governance issue," Supervisor Carole Groom said Thursday in explaining why she opposes Measure B and signed the ballot argument against it. "You really do have to know as much about East Palo Alto as Hillsborough, as much about the coastside as Belmont. If you run countywide you are forced to understand the different geographies and different people who live in this county."

Of California's 58 counties, San Mateo is the only one that does not elect its supervisors by district. County voters rejected ballot measures in 1978 and 1980 that would have made the switch to district elections.

Supervisor Dave Pine, who is campaigning for Measure B, disputes the suggestion that district representatives can't consider the needs of everyone in the county while representing their own constituents. He notes that most board decisions concern the entire county and rarely a specific area. "And if it does come up, I think it's totally appropriate for a representative of a district to advocate for that district's interests," he said Thursday.

At-large elections discourage potential candidates because many simply can't afford to run countywide campaigns, Pine said, and that gives incumbents a big advantage.
To underscore his point, Pine notes that an incumbent has never been unseated in the last 30 years in San Mateo County. And even when seats opened up because the incumbents were termed out or left, there was little to no competition half the time, Pine said. Jerry Hill, Mark Church and Adrienne Tissier all ran unopposed for open supervisor seats when they won their first terms, in 1998, 2000 and 2004, respectively.

"A countywide system creates enormous barriers for candidates to step forward and run because of the number of voters that have to be reached and the cost involved," Pine said. "In a district system you can mount a grassroots campaign, no question about it, because the voter population drops from 330,000 to 65,000.

"When you don't have elections you don't have a dialogue about the issues," he added.

But the last three races to fill the seats of Rich Gordon, Mark Church and now Rose Jacobs Gibson all have drawn multiple candidates. And for some of the candidates, campaign fundraising soared into the six-figure realm.

Running for a seat on the board of supervisors should be difficult, Groom says.

"Democracy is not supposed to be a snap of the fingers," she said. "If you have to run a campaign you have to work hard at it. And that includes raising money."

According to a lawsuit filed in April 2011 by civil rights attorneys on behalf of nine residents, the at-large system violates the California Voting Rights Act because it dilutes the voting power of Latino and Asian-American residents, who make up about half of the county's population.

That case will go to trial in February. County Counsel John Beiers has said the current system can be legally defended because there's no evidence it diminishes minority votes.

In the last 20 years, there has only been one Latino, former supervisor Ruben Barrales, and one African American, Jacobs Gibson, on the board. There have been no Asian Americans.

Jacobs Gibson will term out in December.

Groom said she expects to see more minority representation on the board in the future because most supervisors started their political careers on city councils, school boards or commissions and those bodies are becoming increasingly diverse.

"They will be the next people to run for the board of supervisors," Groom said.

Email Bonnie Eslinger at beslinger@dailynewsgroup.com; follow her at twitter.com/bonnieeslinger.
College district considers election changes

October 12, 2012, 05:00 AM By Heather Murtagh Daily Journal Staff

District elections could be in the county's community college district's future after the board discussed a tentative district map during a study session Wednesday.

Board members of the San Mateo County Community College District are currently elected by voters countywide but there has been recent attention given to the process — including a pending lawsuit against the county for its own at-large rather than district supervisorial elections. Previously, the district was advised by the state chancellors to look at the way local elections are set up. Over the last month, the board held public hearings on the matter. On Wednesday, the board studied the matter and chose a possible district map.

"We have not made any decisions," said board President Dave Mandelkern.

At the next meeting Wednesday, Oct. 24, the board will review a finalized map. If it moves forward, the map would then be posted for a 90-day comment period. A vote on the map and changing to district elections could happen in January, at the earliest.

The district oversees three colleges and serves more than 40,000 students annually. Trustees for the five-member board are not required to live within a certain geographic area or district.

The differences in the two systems are primarily how many voters a candidate needs to convince and how much money it will cost to run. At-large elections ask voters to choose board members to represent the entire county instead of just the district from which they are elected. Proponents argue this makes members more accountable to all voters and limits factions on the board. Opponents, however, say the system tends to be more expensive because of the countywide campaigning required.

In district elections, voters only choose a representative from within specific boundaries which cuts down on campaign costs for candidates but which opponents say leave board members with a narrow focus on only the specific concerns of their district.

The California Voting Rights Act of 2001 prohibits at-large elections if they dilute the voting influence of minority groups. The act is largely the basis of the pending lawsuit against San Mateo County which elects its supervisors countywide to represent individual districts.

In response, county voters in November will be asked whether to keep the status quo or switch to district elections for members of the Board of Supervisors. San Mateo County voters rejected similar proposals to change the system in both 1978 and 1980.

But changing the college district's system will take more than just a vote to do so. The board will first need to draw district boundaries and decide whether to keep the current five members or expand to nine seats. With five trustees, each district would include 136,000 to 150,000 voters. A seven-member board drops the number of constituents to between 97,000 and 107,000.
A change could happen as soon as November 2013, depending on how long the drawing of boundaries takes. On that timeline, current trustees would finish out their terms but those with terms ending in 2013 would need to live within the new districts to seek re-election.

Heather Murtagh can be reached by email: heather@smdailyjournal.com or by phone: (650) 344-5200 ext. 105.
Woodland, California

Woodland City Council could be elected by district voting

By ELIZABETH KALFSBEEK/ckalfsbeek@dailydemocrat.com
Created: 10/20/2012 12:35:08 AM PDT

By the 2016 election, Woodlanders could be voting for City Council candidates by district.

Woodland officials and staff are taking a good look at how council members are elected in the city, and they may switch to district voting from the present "at large" method of voting.

Woodland elects its council members at large, meaning that any registered voter anywhere in the city has a say on the entire makeup of the board.

The other option is to use district-based elections, in which officials are required to be from a specific geographic area and can only be voted on by voters residing in that same area.

The possibility of shifting came after "a member of the community requested that the city shift to district-based elections," according to an Oct. 18, 2011 staff report to Woodland City Council members.

"Following state law is the No. 1 priority; the request is to have the city review it for compliance," said former Mayor Art Pimentel, who is one of the sponsors of the proposal. "We just need to determine if the city of Woodland is following the California Voting Rights Act. It's just a simple question. It has nothing to do with our current city leadership."

The process began last October during the mayoral tenure of Pimentel when Woodland City Council members received a report from staff explaining the California Voting Rights Act, a state law from 2002.

Council members wanted to look at the issue more seriously when the city had a permanent city manager.
"It could potentially have some significant benefit on how we elect city leadership in the future," Pimentel said. "This is not anything to do with our current leadership, which I have the utmost respect for.

"(The point) is about whether the city is following the current state law and I hope that's what can be determined by the city looking into it further. I think the question needs to be posed."

Woodland Joint Unified School District recently went through a vote-by-district process.

In the past, all five Woodland council members have lived within blocks of each other, Pimentel said.

"I don't think it's in the best interest (of the city) to have that happen," said Pimentel Friday. "It's better to live in different parts of the city for all different perspectives to be heard. That's only one of the benefits that could come out of districting."

By council members living in a cluster, it could come across as a city divided and not co-existing, Pimentel said.

While there are several layers to the process of determining whether or not to vote by district, it could ultimately end up in the hands of Woodland voters to decide on a 2014 ballot.

According to the California Voting Rights Act, if there is "evidence" to show that there is a pattern of election results that result in the legislative body (city or school district) not representing the ethnic diversity of the electorate (i.e. community of interests are not represented on the council), then a citizen (or group) could challenge the current "at-large" election system and ask the courts to mandate a switch to district elections, explained City Manager Paul Navazio in an email to The Democrat.

"With the passage of the California Voting Rights Act, it became easier for citizens to sue cities, school districts, community college districts and special districts if these public entities elect their members to its governing body through 'at-large' elections, and if it can be proven that the votes of minority voters are being diluted," said city attorney Andrew Morris in the 2011 report.

"The California Voting Rights Act does not mandate the abolition of at-large election systems, but makes the use of at-large election systems more susceptible to a legal challenge," Morris said.

One benefit of voluntarily changing the method of City Council elections is that it would permit elected representatives and local voters to control the redistricting process, rather than allowing a court to do so, Morris said.

Follow Elizabeth Kalfsbeek at twitter.com/woodlandbeat
Pomona's Measure T called undemocratic and a step back by opponents

Monica Rodriguez, Staff Writer
Posted: 10/23/2012 09:31:46 PM PDT
Updated: 10/23/2012 10:55:26 PM PDT

Inland Valley Daily Bulletin


Pomona City Council member Cristina Carrizosa speaks against Measure T Tuesday.
(Will Lester/Staff Photographer)

POMONA - A group calling itself the Pomona Coalition to Defeat Measure T urged residents on Tuesday to go to the polls Nov. 6 and vote down a measure that would change the way City Council members are elected.

Coalition members, which include community activists, Pomona and regional political and civil rights groups as well as labor organizations, said if approved the measure would set Pomona back more than two decades.

Measure T calls for reverting back to a council election system in which candidates living in each district are nominated by voters from that district but are elected at-large.
Currently candidates are nominated by voters in the district where they live and are elected only by district voters.

The measure is undemocratic and if approved will send a negative message to voters, particularly those who are beginning to participate in the electoral process, said Angela Sanbrano, vice president of the Latino/Latina Roundtable of the Pomona and San Gabriel Valleys.

"It's sending us a message that our vote does not count. They want to minimize our power by setting us back 20 years," Sanbrano said after the coalition's announcement.

However, Vernon Price, Measure T's proponent, said if approved the measure would serve to unite the city beginning with the council.

"The city right now is separate and divisive," Price said.

Approving Measure T would make council members "accountable to all of us. Right now they are not."

Under an at-large system, council members must focus on the needs of the entire city, he said.

Under the district system, council members focus on their districts' needs and rarely participate in activities tied to other districts.

"How are they going to know what's going on?" he asked.

Measure T won't solve all of the city's problems, Price said, but it would be the "start of getting things fixed."

Years prior to voters approving going to district elections, a group of residents filed a lawsuit challenging the use of the at-large system.

The city fought the suit and invested large sums of money in legal costs before the U.S. 9th Circuit Court of Appeals ruled against mandatory district creation.

In 1990, the matter was put before Pomona voters.

Creating districts opened up opportunities to minority groups and gave voters a chance to determine "who are the best leaders for their community," said Tomas Ursua, who participated in the 1990 suit and is running for mayor.

At-large elections require large sums of money to run an election while district elections make it possible for candidates with small budgets to run for office, Ursua said.

Councilwoman Cristina Carrizosa said an at-large election system would make it hard for her to run a campaign. Her campaigns are run with the help of volunteers, she said.
Carrizosa said Measure T is part of a "a concerted effort to get rid of people like Cristina Carrizosa," who has taken positions in opposition to controversial issues such as traffic checkpoints.

Coalition members said among the supporters of the measure is a group called the Pomona Police Officers Association Issues Committee.

Others expressed concern about a pro-Measure T flier that shows six raised hands of which five are dark colored and one is white.

Below the graphic is text that reads "Only 1 in 6 has a voice in Pomona City Elections."

The graphic is "clearly racist in so many ways," said John Nolte, a council candidate for District 1. "To me it represents everything behind this measure."

Price said the graphic is not racist.

"I never intended it to be that," Price said. "It could have been red, it could have been another color."

Cities around California are now working to establish district elections - decades after Pomona moved to that system, Nolte said.

"In so many ways we led into the future," Nolte said. "We don't need to turn back the clock."

________________________________________
Reach Monica via email or call her at 909-483-9336.
LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION
(COUNTY COMMITTEE)
LEGISLATIVE REVIEW-NOVEMBER 2012

BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR:
Senate Bill 477/Wright

INTRODUCTION DATE:
02/18/11
Amended 06/11/12

LAST ACTIVITY/DATE:
09/28/12: Approved by the Governor; Chaptered by Secretary of State (Chapter 730, Statutes of 2012).

DESCRIPTION OF BILL
This bill specifies the manner in which the liability for taxation, bonding capacity, permitted use of existing bond proceeds, and the allocation of authorized but unsold bonds, will be administered among the Wiseburn School District (SD) and the Centinela Valley Union High School District (UHSD) after the Wiseburn SD is reorganized to form the Wiseburn Unified School District (USD). Under this bill, after the formation of the Wiseburn USD, the Centinela Valley UHSD shall retain the right to bond based on the assessed valuation of all non-residential property within the Wiseburn USD. Residential property within the Wiseburn USD will remain part of that district’s bonding capacity assessed valuation. In addition, the Wiseburn USD will receive a payment of $4,000,000 from the Centinela Valley UHSD for approved but unissued bonds, and will retain liability for bonds issued before January 2012.

The bill authorizes the creation of the Local Public Schools Funding Authority (LPSFA), a joint powers authority created by the Centinela Valley UHSD and the Wiseburn SD (and post-reorganization, by the Wiseburn USD) to issue bonds pursuant to laws governing the issuance of school facilities construction bonds by school districts.

This bill also determines the blended revenue limit per average daily attendance (ADA) for the newly formed Wiseburn USD upon reorganization.

POTENTIAL IMPACT OF BILL ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE, SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION PROCESS AND/OR LOS ANGELES COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS
This bill will impact the Wiseburn SD, which will cease to exist and become the Wiseburn USD after reorganization. It will also impact the Centinela Valley UHSD, as it alters that district’s physical territory. The potential financial impact on the Centinela Valley UHSD is addressed directly in the legislation.

The Governor approved the bill on September 28, 2012, and included the following signing message:
“I am signing Senate Bill 477 with a commitment from the author and the Wiseburn School District to introduce clean-up legislation to correct the revenue limit calculation in the bill, and with the understanding that the Centinela Valley School District is supportive of the narrowed election area.”

This bill may also impact the Hawthorne, Lawndale and Lennox SDs, given that their territories are also part of the Centinela Valley UHSD. However, those districts have formed an additional joint powers authority to address any potential impacts.

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 Crafton, Secretary to the County Committee, at (562) 922-6144.
Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals

November 2012

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District (USD) that were at various stages in the school district organization process as of October 24, 2012.

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

Status: Final petition submission pending.

Status Date: June 26, 2007

OTHER INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last six months)

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Inner City Unified School District/July 2012

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None

* Indicates update from previous summary.
Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals
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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 October 24, 2012.

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

On May 16, 2001, the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) received a request from the Citizens for a Wiseburn Unified School District organization to prepare a petition (25 percent of the registered voters) proposing to form a Wiseburn USD from existing territory of the Wiseburn SD. The proposed formation territory currently lies within the boundaries of the Centinela Valley Union High SD (UHSD). The petition was provided to the chief petitioners on June 20, 2001.

On November 9, 2001, the chief petitioners submitted a signed petition to the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools (County Superintendent) to determine if the petition was sufficient and signed as required by law pursuant to Education Code (EC) §35700(a). In accordance with EC §35704, the County Superintendent found the petition to be sufficient and signed as required by law on December 4, 2001. On December 5, 2001, the petition was presented to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) at its regular meeting and transmitted to the State Board of Education (SBE). Pursuant to EC §35705, a public hearing was conducted within the Wiseburn SD and Centinela Valley UHSD on January 23, 2002, at Richard Henry Dana Middle School in the Wiseburn SD.

At its regular meeting on March 6, 2002, the County Committee was presented with a preliminary feasibility report concerning this proposal. The final feasibility report was presented to the County Committee at its regular meeting on May 1, 2002. At that meeting, the County Committee recommended approval and took action to recommend approval of the proposal to the SBE to form a Wiseburn USD from the existing boundaries of the Wiseburn SD within the Centinela Valley UHSD. The County Committee further recommended that the election area be the entire Centinela Valley UHSD.

The County Committee’s plans and recommendations were transmitted to the SBE and the California Department of Education (CDE) on June 18, 2002. On June 19, 2003, the CDE requested additional statistical information from the impacted districts and notified LACOE staff that the petition would be heard in November 2003.

On September 2, 2003, the CDE notified LACOE that the petition hearing before the SBE would be delayed until January 7-8, 2004. The CDE cited budget constraints and staff cutbacks as reasons for the hearing delay. On December 1, 2003, the CDE notified LACOE of a second delay for the petition hearing before the SBE, postponing it until March 10-11, 2004. The CDE cited current state fiscal circumstances as the reason for the further delay. On January 21, 2004, the CDE notified LACOE of a third delay for the petition hearing before the SBE, postponing it until May 12-13, 2004. On April 16, 2004, the CDE notified LACOE that the petition hearing would be held on May 13, 2004.

* Indicates update from previous summary.
On April 27, 2004, LACOE received a copy of the CDE's final feasibility study. On April 29, 2004, LACOE received notice from the CDE that the petition hearing had been delayed indefinitely at the request of the Wiseburn SD. Subsequently, the Wiseburn SD requested that the SBE hear the petition, along with its request for two waivers. A hearing was scheduled for July 7, 2004. On July 7, 2004, staff was notified by the CDE that Centinela Valley UHSD requested a delay in review by the SBE. Wiseburn SD agreed to withdraw its petition for consideration before the SBE to accommodate additional review requested by Centinela Valley UHSD. Subsequent to granting this delay, legal counsel to Wiseburn SD and Centinela Valley UHSD presented additional information (at the CDE's request) regarding the legality of Wiseburn SD residents maintaining responsibility to pay Centinela Valley UHSD's tax obligations following any unification of a Wiseburn SD.

On August 31, 2004, staff received notice that Ms. Karen Steenofte, Chief Counsel for the SBE, recommended that certain waivers submitted with the Wiseburn SD petition could be determined by the SBE at the time of the hearing. Subsequently, the CDE rescheduled the petition to be heard before the SBE on September 9, 2004.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
there is no date set for this petition to be reviewed by the SBE. The EIR contained in the revised petition has not yet been adopted by the SBE.

On July 23, 2010, Superintendents from the Wiseburn, Hawthorne, Lennox, and Lawndale SDs submitted a request to the County Superintendent to host a joint meeting where they could discuss a local solution to the school district organization issues within the area. The first of these meetings took place on August 19, 2010, with representatives from the four districts in attendance, along with the County Superintendent and LACOE staff serving as facilitators and observers.

On September 16, 2010, LACOE was notified of a change in the chief petitioner for this petition. Mr. Daniel Juarez was replaced by Ms. Shavonda Webber Christmas as one of the chief petitioners for the Wiseburn SD unification petition.

On October 5, 2010, the Superintendent for the Wiseburn SD contacted LACOE to request additional assistance to facilitate a meeting among all five of the impacted school districts (the Centinela Valley UHSD, Hawthorne, Lawndale, Lennox, and Wiseburn SDs), this time including the Centinela Valley UHSD. The second joint meeting, at which all five districts were in attendance, was held on December 9, 2010. At that meeting, district representatives discussed the history of school district organization efforts within the region and agreed to meet again at a later time for further discussion. A LACOE staff member facilitated this meeting.

On January 11, 2011, staff was notified that a third meeting was scheduled among the five districts in the region. On February 25, 2011, staff met with representatives of the Wiseburn SD to discuss the petition status.

On March 17, 2011, all five districts attended another regional meeting at the Hawthorne SD. LACOE staff attended to observe and facilitate. At that meeting, representatives from the Wiseburn SD discussed the possibility of a legislative solution, whereby Wiseburn SD would unify and allow all of its commercial property to continue to be assessed within the Centinela Valley UHSD. They also discussed the option of Wiseburn SD residents continuing to pay on any outstanding debt obligations to the Centinela Valley UHSD.

On April 4, 2011, LACOE received a copy of draft legislation proposed by Wiseburn SD, which was circulated to all five districts via e-mail from Wiseburn SD’s Superintendent, Mr. Tom Johnstone. Staff discussed this proposed legislation with the County Committee at its April 6, 2011, regular meeting. The County Committee directed staff to prepare correspondence to each of the five impacted districts to convey its concerns about the length of time that has elapsed since the original petition and initial approval by the SBE.

On May 9, 2011, staff received a copy of a letter from attorneys for the Centinela Valley UHSD to the Wiseburn SD stating that Centinela Valley UHSD was not in agreement on the proposed legislation and would require any future proposal to be put before all of the voters in the impacted districts (meaning all four feeders and Centinela Valley UHSD), and not just before voters from the Wiseburn SD. The five districts scheduled another regional meeting for May 19, 2011, but it was cancelled due to scheduling conflicts. It is anticipated that another regional meeting will be scheduled and that it will be facilitated by LACOE staff.

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

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

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

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

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

On October 7, 2011, staff was notified by representatives of the Wiseburn SD that the Hawthorne, Lawndale, and Lennox SDs had communicated to Wiseburn SD that their boards have decided not to participate in any additional regional meetings, and that they were not in favor of the unification proposals reviewed to date (including the proposed legislation circulated

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The County Committee agreed to send a letter of support to the SBE, which was distributed on October 23, 2012.

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

**Status Date:** October 25, 2012

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

On June 6, 2012, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §5019 and §5020 to increase the number of trustees from five to seven, to establish trustee areas, and to require trustee area voting within the Pomona USD. The request was submitted by chief petitioner, Mr. John Mendoza. The petition was forwarded to County Counsel to determine the legal compliance of format and content. On June 19, 2012, County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient; staff returned the petition to the chief petitioner on June 20, 2012, for circulation.
Please note that this is a separate petition, distinct from the other petitions requested by Mr. Mendoza, requesting some of the same changes within the Pomona USD (the addition of two governing board members and the creation of trustee areas). It was submitted under EC §5019 and §5020 and requires valid signatures from ten percent of the registered voters within the petition area (approximately 6,100 signatures in the case of the Pomona USD, based on the most recent count of registered voters). If valid and certified by the County Committee, this petition would trigger a ballot initiative (as opposed to a reference report and vote by the County Committee).

**Status:** Petition in circulation.

**Status Date:** June 20, 2012

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

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

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

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

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

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

Status Date: December 5, 2011

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

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

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: August 20, 2009

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

Status: Petition currently in circulation.

Status Date: February 21, 2008

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: May 11, 2007

* Indicates update from previous summary.
FORMATION—LA MIRADA USD (CURRENTLY LIES WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE NORWALK—LA MIRADA USD)

Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: March 20, 2007

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PROPOSAL TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN, TO ESTABLISH TRUSTEE AREAS, AND TO REQUIRE THAT EACH GOVERNING

* Indicates update from previous summary.
BOARD MEMBER RESIDE IN AND BE ELECTED BY THE REGISTERED VOTERS OF EACH PARTICULAR TRUSTEE AREA WITHIN THE MOUNT SAN ANTONIO CCD

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

OTHER INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last six months)

Unification Proposals/Last Activity Date

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

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

• Temple City USD to Arcadia USD/March 2012

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

• None

Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

• None

* Indicates update from previous summary.