March 25, 2011

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

FROM: Matthew F. Spies, Secretary
County Committee

SUBJECT: Regular Meeting of the County Committee - Wednesday, April 6, 2011

The next regular meeting of the County Committee will be held at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, April 6, 2011, in the Board Room of the Los Angeles County Office of Education, located at 9300 Imperial Highway in Downey. Reserved parking spaces will be available on the east side of the building just south of the main entrance.

Attached is the agenda for the meeting of April 6, 2011.

If you have any questions, please call me at (562) 922-6336.

MFS/AD:mb
Attachments
AGENDA

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

Regular Meeting

Los Angeles County Office of Education
Board Room
April 6, 2011
9:30 a.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER—Chairperson Mr. John Nunez

II. FLAG SALUTE—Mr. Nunez

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of the County Committee, held on January 5, 2011, will be submitted for approval.

IV. COMMUNICATIONS—Secretary Mr. Matt Spies

Newspaper Articles

• A February 22, 2011, article from The North County Times—“OCEANSIDE: OUSD board votes to study election rules.” (Attachment 1)

• A March 10, 2011, article from the Los Angeles Times—“Merger of 2 organizations would create California’s largest charter school operation.” (Attachment 2)

• A March 17, 2011, article from The North County Times—“POWAY: School board OKs study of elections process.” (Attachment 3)

V. PRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

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

VI. DISCUSSION OF THE CALIFORNIA VOTING RIGHTS ACT (CVRA), TRUSTEE AREA ISSUES, AND U.S. CENSUS DATA

Mr. Spies will discuss recent developments related to the CVRA and trustee area issues that have arisen around the state, and the impact of recently released data from the 2010 U.S. Census.

VII. REVIEW OF REGIONAL ISSUES RELATED TO THE PROPOSED FORMATION OF A WISEBURN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (USD)

The Secretary will provide the County Committee with an overview of recent activities and issues related to the proposed formation of a Wiseburn USD and discussions among impacted districts in the region.

VIII. REVIEW OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

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

IX. UPDATE ON LOS ANGELES USD REORGANIZATION PROPOSALS

The Secretary will provide the County Committee with an update on school district reorganization proposals affecting the Los Angeles USD.

(Attachment: “Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals”)

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

The Secretary will provide the County Committee with an update on school district reorganization proposals affecting Los Angeles County school districts other than the Los Angeles USD.

(Attachment: “Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals [excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District]”)

XI. ADDITIONAL COMMUNICATIONS, CONCERNS, OR ITEMS FOR NEXT AGENDA
XII. ADJOURNMENT
The Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) met on Wednesday, April 6, 2011, at the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) in Downey. The meeting was called to order at 9:34 a.m. by Chairperson Mr. John Nunez, who lead the flag salute.

**Members Present**
- Frank Bostrom
- Maria Calix
- Lloyd de Llamas
- Owen Griffith
- Joan Jakubowski
- Maurice Kunkel
- John Nunez
- AJ Willmer

**Members Absent**
- Frank Ogaz
- Suzan Solomon

**Staff Present**
- Matt Spies, Secretary
- Allison Deegan, Staff
- Mary Bracamontes, Recording Secretary

It was **MOVED** by Mr. Bostrom and **SECONDED** by Mr. Griffith that the minutes of the regular meeting held on January 5, 2011, be approved. The motion **CARRIED** unanimously.

Mr. Spies reviewed and discussed correspondence contained in the County Committee agenda packets and member folders.

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

Mr. Nunez called on Mr. Spies to provide an overview of recent developments related to the CVRA and trustee areas, and the impact of the data released from the 2010 U.S. Census.

Mr. Spies stated that staff has continued to take steps to continue monitoring what is going on throughout the state concerning the CVRA as well as the steps needed internally within LACOE to update the Interim Superintendent. He commented that the Lawyers Committee did file an appeal against the Madera case and per the contact at Madera COE, the case could last approximately 18 months before a decision from the court.
Mr. Spies stated that on January 20, 2011, he and Ms. Deegan attended a workshop that was sponsored by the Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk’s (Registrar-Recorder) office. Attendees included representatives from school and community college districts, city, and other agencies that have elections. He stated that the speakers included Mr. Dean Logan, Registrar-Recorder, and some of his staff; an attorney from a major legal firm that has been providing guidance to several counties and school districts statewide; representatives of the Asian-Pacific American Legal Center; the National Association for Latino Elected and Appointed Officials; and the Rose Institute for State and Local Government at Claremont University. Mr. Spies stated that the workshop provided great insight and practical considerations in regards to compliance with the CVRA such as: trustee areas have to be equal in population and up to a ten percent variance, and if you have the variance it must be justified; and boundaries cannot dilute minority voters nor pack minority voters to create a “super” trustee area. He went on to state that per the Election Code, race cannot be a factor when establishing trustee areas, however, you can use such factors as common languages, occupations, or reliance upon similar services; trustee area lines can be drawn to avoid incumbents running against each other; and future development in the area must be considered. Mr. Spies stated that the speakers stressed getting the community involved in the process early on to avoid conflict and complications, and to expect community members to submit their own plans because of access to the internet. He stated that the Registrar-Recorder’s staff also spoke regarding their requirements and deadlines for changing their database and emphasized the need to have the data from the districts by March 2012 in order to be ready for the November 2013 election.

Ms. Calix arrived at 9:38 a.m.

Mr. Spies commented that internally at LACOE, a board member inquired regarding the role of the LACOE board and the CVRA. He stated that staff drafted a memo in March indicating to the board that as far as a legal perspective, they have a very limited involvement in the process because districts will submit plans to the County Committee to establish trustee areas and some may want to waive their upcoming election until the trustee areas are complete. Mr. Spies stated that the County Committee does not have the authority to seek waivers of the Education Code from the State Board of Education (SBE) so any request of waivers would have to go through the LACOE board on behalf of the school districts and/or the County Committee. He stated that the Director of Business Advisory Services, Mr. Mel Iizuka, spoke to the Interim Superintendent, Mr. Jon Gundry, concerning the CVRA issues and as a result, Mr. Gundry sent a letter to the County Committee members that should have been received already. Mr. Spies stated that as a result of the LACOE board’s inquiries, that he and Ms. Deegan will be doing a presentation to them on April 19, 2011, regarding the CVRA and the relationships that are in play between the LACOE board, LACOE staff, County Committee, and the districts.
He added that the presentation will also cover the law and challenges that are occurring regarding at-large elections, factors from the Registrar-Recorder’s workshop concerning studies, how to proceed once districts are notified, and whether they are choosing to establish trustee area elections or there are conditions and/or logic that they do not choose to do anything.

Mr. Nunez asked members if they had any questions or comments.

Mr. Bostrom stated that he had received and read Mr. Gundry’s letter but felt that some type of assessment was needed to determine compliance or non-compliance or if there was a potential. He went on to say that it seemed that LACOE was taking a position that there is no money to do any type of assessment so you wait for the consequences to come. Mr. Bostrom asked if it was possible to send a letter to the districts informing them of the issue and as a board we urge you to determine, through self-assessment, whether they are in compliance or non-compliant or if they have an issue.

Mr. Nunez asked if Mr. Bostrom was talking about school boards or county boards.

Mr. Bostrom responded that he was talking about school boards because it would be the appropriate pro-active thing to do to get the districts thinking about the issue so that they could do their own self assessment and decide what to do since districts have their own counsel for guidance.

Mr. Spies responded that the internal plan is to send communication to the districts to allow them to assess their own communities and what compliance means to them, and take action or not take action as necessary. He went on to say that the districts would be provided information background regarding what the law is, what has been going on in the state and why, as well as the basics of what a study of the community would mean, and what compliance means. Mr. Spies stated that this would include significant follow-up effort by staff to assure that they are doing their due diligence and if not, the issue could be submitted to the County Committee if they choose to do nothing since the County Committee has the authority to do this.

Mr. Bostrom concurred with Mr. Spies regarding LACOE’s approach to the issue.

Ms. Deegan added that a lot of the actions the districts may take in Los Angeles County, will be guided by what is provided by LACOE either by bulletin or correspondence. She added that the 2010 Census Data was released recently and districts who have been dealing with the issue were waiting for this information so that additional studies would not have to be done. Ms. Deegan commented that many county offices and/or districts are dealing with or not dealing with the issue in many different ways, and there may be even more now with the census data.
Ms. Deegan stated that staff’s role would be to ferry the information to the County Committee, and that the word “compliance” is not accurate to use because, at this time, no one is under a burden to comply with anything until a court verdict is made directing anyone on how to interpret the CVRA in this way, so it is still up in the air and still on a case by case basis. She stated that those who do move to establish trustee areas will never get a review from the Lawyers Committee or anyone else of their trustee areas, so that will be the greatest challenge because districts will not want to do another study or make any changes. She commented that if this is the case, then the County Committee may have to take a role to advise them to go through the process.

Mr. Nunez inquired that if a district needs to make an assessment of itself but decides not to and the County Committee directs the district to do the assessment, who pays to have this done?

Ms. Deegan responded that LACOE would pay for the assessment as an expense of the County Committee.

Mr. Nunez responded that if that is the case, then it would open a whole strange can of worms because what is the drive to make an assessment?

Mr. Spies responded that the County Committee could choose to pick up the cost to study the area or it can take an approach that from the perspective of covering themselves and doing their due diligence of advising the districts, you have a series of communications encouraging the districts to do this but if they chose not to and they get sued, the County Committee will cover themselves if included in the lawsuit; and can say we have sent several communications encouraging to do it and they chose not to which is their choice.

Ms. Deegan added that one other important issue that has not been settled, is the notion of permissive authority where if a district does not act the County Committee has a duty to act. She continued saying that the County Committee certainly has the duty to draw the lines if they choose to in the normal course of their authority as a County Committee, but in this instance with the CVRA it has not been settled that County Committees “shall,” therefore your drawn into the lawsuit. Ms. Deegan went on to say that if a district chooses not to act and the County Committee has communicated with them and encouraged them to do the study, that will be the County Committees due diligence.

Mr. de Llamas inquired about the state budget and asked whether this issue should be put off instead of giving the districts another issue to deal with, and he felt that it was unnecessary and the districts did not have time to deal with this until after the May Revision with the Governor and the state legislature?
Mr. Willmer responded that he understood Mr. de Llamas’ concerns, but with the information provided regarding the CVRA issue, he agreed with Mr. Bostrom that there is great concern to the County Committee and felt that the districts in Los Angeles County should know, in very explicit terms, what the concerns are instead of facing a district at a later time who says they were not told about the issue. He commented that he felt that something should go out earlier than later expressing the County Committee’s concerns, and that the districts should be made aware.

Mr. de Llamas stated that if the issue were approached in that since, then he would agree.

Mr. Nunez stated that staff had recently drafted a letter to Centinela Valley Union High SD (Centinela Valley UHSD) and he felt the letter was too vague and not strong enough, but after surveying board members it seemed that a strong letter was not needed. He went on to say that now in hearing the discussions being held, the districts need stronger communication so he feels that the County Committee needs to decide how strong they want to be in communicating with the districts.

Mr. de Llamas stated that was his point, the districts need the information but the information now is very vague. He agrees that the information should be sent to the districts but it should indicate what the issue is and what needs to be done, but not to demand that they do something.

Mr. Nunez reiterated that the County Committee needs to make a decision and agree on how to approach the communication sent to the districts.

Ms. Jakubowski stated that the districts need to be alerted about the CVRA issue and especially with the census data being released because she would hate to see a community member blindsiding a school board member and the school board member not being aware. She then asked for clarification concerning whether school boards could delay elections?

Mr. Spies responded that yes school boards could delay elections and that is part of the reason why the Lawyers Committee is focusing on school districts because they are the only government agency that can have an election waived. Ms. Jakubowski commented that she felt that was something, especially in these budget times, the districts might think that there will be an issue they might decide to waive their elections. She continued stating that they also need to know because what happens with the current board members and what is the process for keeping them in office and extending their term. Ms. Deegan responded that it was not that type of an election, it was an election concerning the establishment of trustee areas because you need to ratify the trustee areas not school board members, that was the type of election waiver involved.
Ms. Calix brought up the issue of Centinela Valley UHSD stating that the issue has been going on for such a long period of time and maybe the word “should” would work in this case, but in the case of trustee areas and having come from an at-large election, it is an individual school board member and a lot more expensive for board members in that district, so districts may choose to narrow it down so it will not be so expensive and especially because money is tight at this time, and it may be hard to get support for an election. Ms. Calix agreed that the information should be given to the districts and let them know what the concerns are and use the word “encourage” to have them look at the census data, and review and evaluate other information and let the districts decide on their own what the outcome will be. She feels that words of encouragement work better instead of using “should” or “should not.”

Mr. Nunez asked if she felt that the letter to Centinela Valley UHSD should be made “stronger” and more informational on a countywide letter, and is this something that the County Committee could look at?

Mr. Bostrom stated that he agreed that the bottom line is the census data, and this information coming together at the same time is a matter of timing, and his interpretation of the legal side of this is the need of the census data to justify the cause of action. He stated that it is an issue of timing because if the census data is being looked at, the districts should also keep in mind that the information is before them and they should be talking to counsel to see if they are potentially exposed and subject to this type of action even if a court decision has not been made, they should still be looking at it because the County Committee is looking at it. Mr. Bostrom went on to say that the issue of should they do an assessment or who does the assessment is premature and should be off the table, first of all the information needs to be out there so that they can be thinking about it then see what comes back.

Ms. Calix inquired about the timeframe and whether there is one?

Mr. Nunez responded that he felt a letter should be sent to county districts asking that they look at the CVRA issue because there can be legal ramifications if they don’t. He stated that most letters are directed to the superintendents but sometimes the superintendents do not pass the information along and he felt a stronger message is received when letters are addressed to board members and superintendents.

Mr. de Llamas asked if the letter would include an attached analysis so that the districts can understand what the issue is, what the criteria is to do an assessment, what things to look for, where the court case is going, what are the ramifications, or a general letter indicating that they have to review the information. He stated that if a letter is going to be sent to the districts, then give them something useful with a full analysis of what the issue is, here’s where it’s at, here’s the ramifications, an assessment is probably in order, and here’s the criteria when you do the assessment because this is what the courts are looking at—a useful tool.
Mr. Bostrom suggested that the board members be cc’d on the communication to show a sign of urgency.

Mr. Spies responded that the intent has always been to send a bulletin with appropriate attached documentation, but what he was hearing now is that the County Committee would like to be involved, and suggested that once the bulletin is mailed to the districts, that a letter from the County Committee be addressed to the board presidents referencing the bulletin and the County Committee’s concerns regarding district compliance.

Several County Committee members concurred with Mr. Spies approach to the districts.

Mr. Willmer stated that the timeline should be now because there is no other information being sent that will make a difference one way or the other and the concerns are now.

Mr. Nunez agreed that school board members need to know the information so that they can start asking questions about the CVRA process and requirements. He continued and asked what should be done with Centinela Valley UHSD and whether a stronger letter should be sent?

Mr. Bostrom and other members responded that they wanted to hear about what was discussed at the feeder district meetings before a decision was made.

Mr. Spies responded that he would provide the feeder district meeting information on the next agenda item.

Ms. Deegan asked to make final comments concerning the Lawyer’s Committee. She stated that at the Registrar-Recorder’s workshop they learned from the attorney speakers who are involved in litigations, that school districts were sought after for these actions because of their ability to waive approval of the lines. Ms. Deegan commented that another course of action was for them to target another entity like a city by doing all their R & D, all their research, and all their expensive expert fees which is what is bringing all the large settlements when the costs are so high and settling that one, then with the same research and effort sue the school district. She went on to say that the news reports out of northern California is that the city and school district are receiving letters and being targeted, which causes some concern regarding the City of Compton because they received a letter and have already entered into litigation, so it appears to be happening in our locality even if it seems that the school districts have not been targeted first; the technique is to do the research on one entity then sue the entity that borders around it. Ms. Deegan stated that no predictions can be made as far as what is going to happen but it does show the sense of urgency on the issue.

Mr. Nunez asked if Compton USD went beyond the City of Compton?
Ms. Deegan responded yes.

Mr. Nunez commented that if this is the case of Compton USDs boundaries, how will this be approached by the Lawyers Committee?

Ms. Deegan responded that it is unknown at this time because it’s anyone who has at-large elections, so even districts that have trustee areas are still subject to these actions.

Mr. Nunez inquired as to how many districts are voting at-large?

Ms. Deegan responded that there are approximately six districts and most are community college districts and the other 79 districts have no trustee areas. She commented that it is unpredictable and nothing could happen, but until the City of Compton happened nothing had happened even though the issue has been going around for two to three years throughout the state so you can’t predict, but when it hits there will be districts asking why they were not told so it is essential to be proactive at this time since the census data is available.

Mr. Nunez stated that in order to wrap this agenda item he wanted to confirm the process the County Committee members wanted to take as far as providing the information to the districts; first, a bulletin will be sent to all school district superintendents; second, a follow-up letter to the district board presidents from the County Committee referencing the bulletin in order to get the boards asking questions.

Mr. Spies responded that the documents would be drafted and sent to the members for their review.

It was **MOVED** by Mr. Bostrom and **SECONDED** by Ms. Calix to direct staff to develop a bulletin followed by a letter from the County Committee to all school districts concerning the CVRA issue and strongly encouraging the districts to take some type of action. The motion **CARRIED** unanimously.

Mr. Spies provided an overview of recent activities and issues related to the proposed formation of a Wiseburn USD and discussions among the impacted districts within the region. He stated that because there had been some confusion about how strong the letter to the Centinela Valley UHSD should be, he had made a judgment call to not send the letter because by the time follow-up work had been done on the letter, it was too close to the scheduled meeting of the feeder districts and he did not want the letter to be the focus and not a local solution. Mr. Spies stated that the scheduled meeting of the feeder districts was then delayed for a month and they met in March. He then called on Ms. Deegan to provide an overview of the meeting because he was on vacation at the time.
Ms. Deegan stated that all five districts were represented and LACOE employee Ms. Sharon Harvey, Staff Development/Diversity Coordinator, was the moderator, and that she attended as an observer and did not do any type of presentation nor did she speak. She went on to say that a lot of the discussion had to do with previous meetings since representatives of the Centinela Valley UHSD had not attended previous meetings, and there also seemed to be a lot of animosity due to issues from previous meetings. Ms. Deegan stated that Ms. Harvey tried to move the discussion to the subject at hand but four of the districts kept referring to the “Wiseburn deal,” and that Wiseburn SD had crafted some secret deal with Centinela Valley UHSD that they knew nothing about so that was the main topic of discussion as well as Wiseburn SDs litigation attempt (members had a copy of the language in their folders). She went on to say that the discussion focused on the assessed valuation and Wiseburn SD pulling away to unify while leaving the commercial assessed valuation with the high school district. Ms. Deegan stated that another topic of discussion referred to local collaboration, local cooperation, curriculum articulation between K-8 and the high school district, and she felt that they had made a lot of progress on that particular issue.

Mr. Spies commented that the copy of the draft legislation from Wiseburn SD had just been received the day before. He went on to say that the Wiseburn SD hired an attorney to draft language concerning the high school district retaining the assessed valuation from the industrial and commercial portion of the Wiseburn SD, and Wiseburn SD would retain the residential assessed value with conditions that in doing this, if the issue were brought before the SBE again then the SBE would restrict the area of election to the Wiseburn SD; otherwise if it’s an area wide election then Wiseburn SD does not want to proceed because they feel that it will be shot down due to the majority of voters being outside the district. He continued stating that the draft legislation was the districts first attempt to structuring language and they feel that they can get a local legislator to support it. Mr. Spies went on to say that he felt he was not sure if the district could get support for this because they are giving up a lot forever in regards to potential monies and financing options they may need in the future. He stated that he spoke to the Wiseburn SD Chief Business Official, Mr. Tom Cox, and told him that the issue would be discussed at the County Committee meeting and that the members could come up with other possible options for the district to consider. Mr. Spies went on to say that the long term petition was still a viable option to the district according to Mr. Larry Shirey, contact at the California Department of Education (CDE). He continued that because Centinela Valley UHSD had stopped the process due to a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) challenge that indicated the CDE did not do a scoping meeting to solicit possible environmental concerns of the community, the CDE responded by preparing a full environmental impact report that has a life span of five years and three years have already passed. Mr. Spies went on to say that Mr. Shirey indicated that the SBE would consider adopting the impact report if either Wiseburn SD, the
chief petitioners, or the County Committee would request that it be done. He continued and stated that it would be in the best interest of the district or encouragement to the district by the County Committee, to make the request to keep the window open for the petition so that if a solution to unify the area were agreed upon then the petition could move forward and eliminate a potential challenge Centinela Valley UHSD could have concerning environmental issues. Mr. Spies provided information concerning an e-mail message he received from Mr. Tom Johnstone, Superintendent of the Wiseburn SD, responding to Lawndale SD regarding whether or not Wiseburn’s proposal would require an election of the community (and it does); assessed value of proposal; and bond debt obligation to the Centinela Valley UHSD.

Mr. Nunez inquired whether Wiseburn SD citizens still had to pay for the bonds?

Ms. Deegan responded yes they would have to pay under this current formula.

Mr. Nunez asked whether this was taxation without representation?

Ms. Deegan responded that no it was not taxation without representation because what she learned at the CDE’s workshop she attended, under the Revenue and Taxation Code, parties involved in reorganization use to negotiate who would get what, it was not wherever the line was that indicated that particular address would be taxed to what area.

Mr. Spies added that at the last meeting of the districts involved, the Wiseburn SD superintendent was asked if they would participate in a local solution and he indicated they would to the extent that they could but with the understanding that their constituency has let it be known that they want to unify, so they have to consider that when they move forward and can not ignore what the community is telling them.

Ms. Bostrom inquired about the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and where Wiseburn SD stood on the issue?

Ms. Deegan responded that the district is interested in adopting and using the report because of the charter high school they intend to build. She continued that the CDE was surprised that the district is not requesting that the EIR report be adopted.

Mr. Bostrom commented that he felt that the EIR would have to be completed in order for the district’s legislation to move forward.

Mr. Spies commented that he was not sure that was the case but he too felt that the EIR report would have to be adopted and accepted before the district could move forward with its legislation.
Mr. Bostrom asked if Wiseburn SD understood what the adoption of the EIR meant?

Ms. Deegan responded that the CDE was not sure if they did or not but the subject was discussed with the Wiseburn SD because of the new charter high school they wanted to build. She went on to say that the contact at the CDE did mention that his office requested that the EIR be adopted, especially because of the new membership in the SBE, but that it was gaining no traction and that another agency or entity involved would have to make the request for adoption.

Mr. Bostrom commented that he felt the EIR was going to preempt everything once the recommendations and decisions were made because it would be hard to go against the report.

Mr. Nunez asked if there were other charter high schools in the area and how large they were, and also if these were comprehensive high schools.

Ms. Deegan responded that the high school in Wiseburn SD is in its second year with two schools and has approximately 100 to 150 students; the other schools are in Lennox and Lawndale and more established but she did not know the number of students; Hawthorne also had one. She went on to say that these are small academies that have a certain focus like science, environmental, design, etc.

Mr. Nunez asked if having a special focus was the only way a charter high school could be built.

Ms. Deegan responded that charter schools now have to be K-12 schools not just a high school.

Mr. Bostrom asked what staff’s opinion on the issue was.

Mr. Spies responded that he and Ms. Deegan had spoke about this and felt that possibly talking to Wiseburn SD to maybe have them change their approach because it seemed like they had done more harm to their case to unify by not letting the community vote on the proposal, and it has now been ten years since the proposal started. He went on to state that the main reason for the unification was due to education but yet the student test scores have not improved so the district should be focusing on moving the proposal forward to the SBE and request that the voting area be the Wiseburn SD only. Mr. Spies stated that the district could at least start with the CEQA then approach the SBE, and if they can not come to terms with just a Wiseburn SD voting then the petition would be done. He continued that if this happens, then the district could either initiate a new change or the local solution option by the districts involved.
Ms. Deegan commented that the initial petition was approved by the SBE with the decision to have Wiseburn SD be the voting area and sending some of the taxes back, but then Centinela Valley UHSD filed the CEQA lawsuit and the SBE rescinded its decision. She continued that when SBE reviewed the petition again, many years later and after the EIR, the SBE then had a different decision in that the petition be approved but with area wide voting instead of just Wiseburn SD area because Centinela Valley UHSD had incurred additional debt between the two review periods of the petition. Ms. Deegan went on to say that the SBE felt that because the assessed value would be taken away, Centinela Valley UHSD could not pay for their outstanding debt and it would be a real fiscal challenge. She stated that she asked the CDE contact that because three years have passed since the last review and some or all the feeder districts have passed bonds, would or could changes be made to the study, and he responded that yes changes could be made and a new study would have to be done and an area wide voting area could also change, and the SBE could disagree with the CDE’s recommendation. Ms. Deegan stated that was the reason Wiseburn SD did not want to move forward with the petition because of the fear of area wide voting.

Mr. Nunez asked that because there could be considerable changes, would the County Committee have to have another hearing on the petition?

Ms. Deegan responded that the County Committee could request that the petition come back to them and the SBE could agree to that and direct the County Committee to look at certain areas of the petition.

Mr. Bostrom inquired as to why the EIR was not moving forward, did someone stop it, and was it Wiseburn SD who stopped it?

Mr. Spies responded that Wiseburn SD requested that the petition be taken off the SBE’s agenda because their recommendation did not indicate Wiseburn SD as the voting area and the EIR may have been adopted if this had not occurred.

Ms. Deegan added that the EIR is part of the unification process but the CDE contact is suggesting that the EIR and petition be separated and let the EIR be adopted first then have the petition processed.

Mr. Bostrom asked whether the content of the EIR was still valid?

Ms. Deegan responded that per the CDE contact, the EIR is still valid and the feasibility study is different because it deals with more finance and other issues, and the EIR dealt more with the building of the high school as the main environmental impact of the area.

Mr. Spies commented that over the years when the petition was placed on the SBE’s agenda, the CDE requested updated information each time it went on the agenda for their feasibility study.
Mr. Bostrom asked what needs to be done to initiate the process to move forward on the petition.

Ms. Deegan responded that an interested party has to make a request to the SBE and the CDE contact felt that it should be the Wiseburn SD and/or the County Committee, but the district would probably be better. She went on to say that the contact did not understand why the district had not made the request, and because staff had just received the information, they had not had a chance to discuss the matter with the district.

Ms. Jakubowski asked if Wiseburn SD gives up all this money what does it do to their future fiscal accountability?

Mr. Nunez commented that with all the changes being made as far as district funds, the County Committee’s hearing on the petition years ago has changed completely.

Many members agreed with Mr. Nunez and commented that because of this, it would seem that the petition would be subject to EIR review and if this is the case then the County Committee needs to start all over again, and the question would then be who should do the EIR the County Committee or the SBE in order for it to be current, address the issues, and make a recommendation.

Ms. Deegan responded that the EIR is still in effect for two more years.

Mr. Spies added that he felt that if the EIR were adopted at this point, it would be difficult for Centinela Valley UHSD to challenge on environmental issues because there would be no Wiseburn SD students crossing the boundary into Centinela Valley UHSD.

Mr. Nunez asked the County Committee members what they wanted to do about sending correspondence to the involved districts concerning processing the unification petition for Wiseburn SD.

Ms. Jakubowski suggested sending a letter to the involved districts with a timeframe to find a solution due to the fact that it seemed like progress was being made at the joint meetings, but with the understanding that they find a solution within six months to a year or the County Committee will have to step in and find a solution for them.

Mr. Nunez asked if the timeframe would be enough and should they be allowed to continue meeting to find a solution for the two year period left on the EIR report.

Mr. Bostrom stated that this should not be the case, and felt that the letter should contain language to the effect that if they can not find a solution, the County Committee is prepared to step in and request that the EIR report be adopted and that new hearings will be scheduled, and also give them 360 days to find the solution which would be a very strong request.
Ms. Deegan commented that at the last meeting of the districts, it was made clear that the proposal would only move forward if there was a full agreement of funding distribution and/or language of legislation before it could be settled.

Members discussed the issue and agreed that student test scores have not improved and that the proposal had been going on long enough. They agreed that by giving the districts a year to find a local solution it would be too close to the deadline of the two years left on the EIR, and they were concerned about the proposed legislation being heard by the SBE because all bills had already been introduced for the current session.

Mr. de Llamas asked what authority the County Committee had to force a solution and if the proposal comes back to the County Committee can an election be forced to be held?

Ms. Deegan responded that yes the County Committee can impose an election be held by all five districts involved and it will only go back to the SBE if it is appealed.

Mr. Spies added that if it’s a unification, the County Committee only has recommendation authority that would go to the SBE, but if it was a territory transfer then the County Committee has legal authority to approve or deny a proposal.

Mr. de Llamas asked for clarification of the letter and what the committee should indicate in the letter as far as finding a solution and forcing the districts to move forward.

Members discussed how to approach the districts through a letter indicating a timeline, years of the proposal, student test scores, the County Committee processing the proposal, and how to force the SBE to hear the petition so that it can be concluded after ten years.

Ms. Deegan commented that there were two issues: 1) resolving the procedural question marks that have not been answered about the unification process, the EIR has not been adopted, and the legislation; 2) the core issue that prompted the petition of the academic status of Centinela Valley UHSD. She went on to ask what does the County Committee want to address in the letter?

Mr. Bostrom responded saying that he felt it was the process of bringing the proposal to a conclusion.

Ms. Jakubowski asked how can the County Committee force a conclusion?

Ms. Deegan responded that the County Committee can send a letter to the SBE requesting that they hear the petition, but they can refuse not to hear it or other parties involved or affected by the proposal can request that the SBE not hear the item, so the committees letter may not be enough.
Mr. Bostrom commented that the proposal may not be heard without the EIR being adopted.

Ms. Deegan responded that the EIR is complete and the CDE is just waiting for a request to adopt at least within the next two years. She added that a previous letter from the County Committee requesting that the SBE hear the proposal was sent and the SBE did respond by agendizing the item but then Wiseburn SD requested that it be taken off.

Ms. Jakubowski suggested that a follow-up letter be sent to the SBE requesting that the EIR be adopted, followed by another letter requesting that the proposal be agendized.

Mr. Bostrom asked how the County Committee could get the proposal back from the SBE?

Ms. Deegan responded that the County Committee would have to send a letter to the SBE requesting that the proposal be sent back to them because it has been over ten years and the SBE has not made a decision. She stated that if the SBE were to send the proposal back to the County Committee, then they could also direct the committee to only look at certain factors of the proposal, it is just unknown what they could be.

Mr. Spies asked the County Committee if they wanted staff to meet with the Wiseburn SD to find out if they really have any intent to continue to move towards having the petition go to a vote, and if yes then under what structure is it going to happen and when, and if its no then the County Committee can consider the options discussed?

Mr. Bostrom responded that a letter should be sent to the SBE indicating that the County Committee has done their fiduciary duty, test scores have not improved, ten years has gone by, voters demand an answer, it has been delayed long enough so do something with the EIR, and put it back on the agenda or send it back to the County Committee for further study.

Several members agreed with Mr. Bostrom’s approach to the letter especially the part of student test scores, and that the affected districts be cc’d on the letter so that they can be aware of the County Committee’s desire to get the proposal to a conclusion.

Mr. de Llamas asked that staff provide a detailed analysis to the County Committee of options available to process the proposal.

It was **MOVED** by Mr. de Llamas and **SECONDED** by Mr. Bostrom that a letter be sent to the SBE concerning the Wiseburn SD proposal and indicating a timeframe, student test scores, ten years lapsed, certification of the EIR, and that they have a responsibility to the students and the parties involved with cc’s to the affected districts. The second part of the motion is to have staff provide a detailed analysis to the County Committee of options available to process the proposal. The motion **CARRIED** unanimously.

*Motion #19*
Mr. Spies provided an overview of proposed legislation related to school district organization.

Mr. Spies stated that there were no updates on Los Angeles USD reorganization proposals.

Mr. Spies provided an update on school district reorganization proposals excluding those affecting the Los Angeles USD.

Mr. Bostrom inquired as to the status of Inglewood USD's financial issues.

Mr. Spies responded that Inglewood USD has been a priority of LACOE staff and that an administrator for the district had been hired to oversee their financial issues. He stated that the district was going to participate in a mid-year TRANs issue but could not show enough cash flow to demonstrate that they could pay back the TRANs so they dropped out, and are now in the process of making salary and non-salary cuts. Mr. Spies stated that staff is currently working with the district and CDE for some type of loan to keep the district going.

Mr. Bostrom asked if the loan would come from the county or the state?

Mr. Spies responded that the loan would come from the state and would require legislation to authorize the loan. He stated that the district’s building fund was also being looked at to borrow from but because of the cash flow ability to pay back it would be difficult to do.

Mr. Bostrom asked about County Counsel’s report on voting rights requested from the last meeting.

Mr. Spies responded that staff had just started working with LACOE’s County Counsel and she stated that she has experience concerning the CVRA so a report to County Committee will be forthcoming.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:09 a.m.
LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION
(COUNTY COMMITTEE)
LEGISLATIVE REVIEW-APRIL 2011

BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR: Senate Bill 821/Fuller
INTRODUCTION DATE: 02/18/11
LAST ACTIVITY/DATE: 03/10/11: Referred to Committee on Education

DESCRIPTION OF BILL

Under existing law, the process of school district reorganization begins with the submission of a petition that is reviewed by the county superintendent of schools (county superintendent) and, if sufficient, forwarded to the county committee on school district organization (county committee) and the State Board of Education (SBE) for additional review and public hearings.

The county committee is authorized to formulate plans and recommendations for the reorganization of school districts. The reorganization, if approved by the county committee or the SBE, is required to be voted upon during the next available election.

The reorganization plans are also required to meet specified requirements, and those impacting school districts with more than 500,000 pupils based on average daily attendance are required to satisfy additional conditions.

This bill would require that interim or governing boards of existing school districts (and, where applicable, the administrators of such districts) involved in a reorganization notify the county superintendent, in writing and with relevant documents and information provided, before taking any action on any matter that could have a material fiscal impact or incur debt or liability, including, but not necessarily limited to, the approval of a charter school in the existing, proposed, newly formed, or newly organized school district. The county superintendent’s review would determine whether that action would have a material fiscal impact or incur debt or liability. This notice must be provided to the county superintendent no less than ten school days before any action is proposed to be executed. This bill would provide the county superintendent with the authority to stay or rescind any action that he or she deemed unnecessary for the immediate functioning of the existing or newly formed school district.

This bill was prompted, according to the author, by the actions taken in the Sacramento County reorganization of Grant Union High School District (HSD) and some of its feeder elementary districts into the Twin Rivers Unified SD. The outgoing board of the high school district issued non-voter approved debt, entered into binding construction contracts, and awarded severance bonuses to administrators (which ended up in litigation after the Sacramento County Superintendent of Schools refused to issue warrants for the bonuses).

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

This bill provides expanded authority to the county superintendent to review and approve actions that may have a fiscal impact on reorganized school districts. In its role as the body that reviews reorganization petitions, the County Committee is already charged with examining the fiscal status of districts after reorganization but does not have authority to act or review the actions of an existing or newly formed district after reorganization has been approved. This bill highlights the critical component of post-
reorganization fiscal oversight and should have no adverse impact on the County Committee, the school district organization process, or Los Angeles County school districts. It does, however, convey additional responsibilities to county superintendents and expands their current fiscal oversight duties required under Assembly Bill 1200.

RECOMMENDED POSITION
Staff recommends the following position:

☒ Watch Bill should be monitored by County Committee staff, but no action should be taken at this time.
☐ Approve The County Committee supports the bill’s concept, but will not actively work for passage.
☐ Support The County Committee actively supports the bill.
☐ Oppose The County Committee actively opposes the bill.
☐ Disapprove The 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. Matthew Spies, Secretary to the County Committee, at (562) 922-6336.
Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals

April 2011

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 March 21, 2011.

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

None

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)

April 2011

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 March 21, 2011.

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

On January 17, 2006, the Los Angeles County Office of Education (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 Education Code (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 the Office of the Los Angeles County Counsel (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 Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk (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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
a sufficient number of valid signatures, staff will present the petition to the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) at the next regular meeting.

On January 4, 2011, staff conferred with a representative from the Registrar-Recorder’s office, who informed us that no audit of petition signatures had been done yet, and they clarified the cost of signature verification. On February 15 and March 1, 2011, staff contacted the Registrar-Recorder and were informed that the signature audit had still not been done.

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

**Status Date: March 1, 2011**

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

On May 16, 2001, 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. 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 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 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 Union High SD 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 Union High SD. The County Committee further recommended that the election area be the entire Centinela Valley Union High SD.

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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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.

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 Centinella Valley Union High SD 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 Centinella Valley Union High SD. Subsequent to granting this delay, legal counsel to Wiseburn SD and Centinella Valley Union High SD presented additional information (at the CDE’s request) regarding the legality of Wiseburn SD residents maintaining responsibility to pay Centinella Valley Union High SD tax obligations following any unification of a Wiseburn USD.

On August 31, 2004, staff received notice that Ms. Karen Steentofte, Chief Counsel for the SBE, recommended that certain waivers submitted with the Wiseburn USD 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 Centinella Valley Union High SD 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 provide 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 Registrar-Recorder's 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 will be placed before the electorate. The election will be held within the boundaries of the proposed Wiseburn USD. Should the electorate approve the proposal, the new district could become effective July 1, 2006.

On November 1, 2004, staff received a copy of a lawsuit filed by the Centinella Valley Union High SD 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. The Centinella Valley Union High SD, Wiseburn SD, and SBE began negotiations to delay the election in order to revisit the issues underlying the petition and

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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 County Counsel and was advised that neither the County Superintendent nor the SBE could order a delay of the election.

On Friday, December 10, 2004, in the case of Centinela Valley Union High SD (Petitioners) vs. the SBE, the Los Angeles Superior Court issued a preliminary injunction barring the conduct of the election regarding the formation of the Wiseburn USD on March 8, 2005. 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 will consult with the court’s clerk to re-schedule. This was done 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 Union High SD. On January 13, 2005, the CDE withdrew its approval of the Wiseburn USD petition and its request that an election be ordered. Staff at the CDE has informed us that they intend to redo the review process related to CEQA and to return the petition to the SBE for action (not to the County Committee).

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, on behalf of the CDE. A comment period for the draft EIR was opened from July 7, 2008, to August 21, 2008. A public hearing was held on July 22, 2008. Staff will keep the County Committee apprised of any additional developments.

On April 15, 2009, staff provided follow-up information to the CDE regarding the financial status of the Centinela Valley Union High SD.

On October 22, 2009, the CDE notified LACOE that the petition hearing before the SBE would not be heard until January 7-8, 2010. 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 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 feasibility study of the Wiseburn unification petition. On May 3, 2010, the Wiseburn SD requested that the SBE

* Indicates update from previous summary.
remove the item from the May 2010 agenda. Presently, there is no date set for this petition to be reviewed by the SBE.

On July 23, 2010, Superintendents from the Wiseburn, Hawthorne, Lennox, and Lawndale SDs submitted a request to the County Superintendent to meet and discuss a local solution to the school district organization issues within the area. That meeting took place on August 19, 2010, with representatives from the districts in attendance with the County Superintendent and LACOE staff.

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 the chief petitioner for this petition.

On October 5, 2010, the Superintendent for the Wiseburn SD contacted LACOE to request additional assistance to facilitate a meeting among all of the impacted school districts (the Centinela Valley Union High SD, Hawthorne SD, Lawndale SD, Lennox SD, and Wiseburn SD). Discussions are underway to plan that meeting. A 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.

On January 11, 2011, staff was notified that a third meeting will be held at the Hawthorne SD on February 17, 2011, at 5:00 p.m. On February 4, 2011, staff was notified that this meeting was postponed until sometime in March 2011. On February 25, 2011, staff met with representatives of the Wiseburn SD to discuss the petition status. On March 17, 2011, staff observed at the third meeting of the regional district group, hosted by Hawthorne SD. Representatives from all five districts were present.

*Status: Petition on hold; third joint meeting held March 17, 2011.

Status Date: March 18, 2011

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

On August 18, 2010, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §5019 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. John Mendoza. The petition was forwarded to County Counsel to determine its legal compliance regarding format and content. On August 27, 2010, County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient. Staff returned the petition to the chief petitioner on August 30, 2010, 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(c) and requires valid signatures from 500 registered voters within the petition area. If
valid and certified by the County Committee, this petition would trigger a feasibility study and ultimately a vote by the County Committee.

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: August 30, 2010

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 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(c) and requires valid signatures from 500 registered voters within the petition area. If valid and certified by the County Committee, this petition would trigger a feasibility study and ultimately a vote by the County Committee.

On July 14, 2010, the chief petitioner submitted signed petitions in this matter. On July 15, 2010, the chief petitioner submitted additional signed petitions. The petitions were forwarded to the Registrar-Recorder on July 23, 2010, for signature verification.

On August 12, 2010, the Registrar-Recorder completed its review of the petitions submitted. The chief petitioner submitted 733 signatures. Of that group, 680 signatures were found to be sufficient (complete and signed by registered voters). However, under EC §5019(c)(1), a petition seeking to change the trustee areas of a school district must be signed within 180 days of submission to the County Committee. Staff examined the petitions submitted and found that only 84 signatures submitted were signed within the mandated timeline. Thus, the petition is not sufficient and will not move forward. On August 16, 2010, the chief petitioner was notified of the petition insufficiency.

Status: Petition insufficient; action ended.

Status Date: August 16, 2010

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 COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT (CCD)

* Indicates update from previous summary.
On February 26, 2010, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §5019(a) and (c) to increase the number of trustees from five to seven, to establish trustee areas, and to require trustee area voting, within the Mount San Antonio CCD. 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 March 12, 2010, County Counsel notified staff that the petition was sufficient. On March 12, 2010, the petition was forwarded to the chief petitioner for circulation.

Please note that this is a new, additional petition, separate from other petitions requested by Mr. Mendoza, although it requests the same changes within the Mount San Antonio CCD (the addition of two governing board members and the creation of trustee areas with trustee area voting).

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: April 19, 2010

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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
FORMATION—ALTADENA USD (CURRENTLY LIES WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE PASADENA USD)

Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: May 11, 2007

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

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

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

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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: April 11, 2006

PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN WITHIN THE MOUNT SAN ANTONIO CCD
Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: July 21, 2003

PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN WITHIN THE POMONA USD
Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: June 16, 2003

PROPOSAL TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN, TO ESTABLISH TRUSTEE AREAS, AND TO REQUIRE THAT EACH GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER RESIDE IN AND BE ELECTED BY THE REGISTERED VOTERS OF EACH PARTICULAR TRUSTEE AREA WITHIN THE MOUNT SAN ANTONIO CCD
Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: August 20, 2001

OTHER INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last six months)

Unification Proposals/Last Activity Date
- None

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date
- Hermosa Beach City SD to Manhattan Beach USD or Redondo Beach USD/January 12, 2011

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date
- None

Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date
- None

* Indicates update from previous summary.