September 24, 2014

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

FROM: Keith D. Crafton, Secretary
County Committee

SUBJECT: Regular Meeting of the County Committee-
Wednesday, October 1, 2014

The next regular meeting of the County Committee will be held at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, October 1, 2014, in Conference Center B of the Los Angeles County Office of Education, located at 12830 Columbia Way in Downey. Please note the different building and address that this meeting will be at, due to the regular boardroom being under construction for the next several months.

Attached is the agenda for the meeting of October 1, 2014.

If you have any questions, please call me at (562) 922-6144.

EH:ah
Attachments
AGENDA

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

Regular Meeting

Los Angeles County Office of Education
Education Center West, Conference Center B
October 1, 2014
9:30 a.m.

I Information
D Discussion
A Action
* Sent to Committee

I. CALL TO ORDER – Chairperson Mr. Ben Allen

II. FLAG SALUTE – Mr. Allen

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES I, D, A*

The minutes of the regular meeting of the County Committee, held on September 3, 2014, will be submitted for approval.

IV. COMMUNICATIONS – Secretary Mr. Keith D. Crafton I, D*

Informational Correspondence

- An August 19, 2014, Notice of Filing from the Local Agency Formation Commission: Annexation No. 419 to County Sanitation District No. 22 (Attachment 1)

V. PRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC I, D, A

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. UPDATE ON ABC UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (USD) PETITION TO IMPLEMENT TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING

The Secretary will apprise the County Committee on the status of the petition received from the ABC USD.

VII. UPDATE ON EASTSIDE UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT (SD) PETITION TO IMPLEMENT TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING

The Secretary will apprise the County Committee on the status of the petition received from an elementary school district in the Antelope Valley.

VIII. UPDATE ON THE CALIFORNIA VOTING RIGHTS ACT (CVRA) AND TRUSTEE AREA ISSUES

The Secretary will discuss recent developments related to the CVRA and trustee area issues in Los Angeles County.

IX. NOMINATING COMMITTEE FOR NEW OFFICERS

Mr. Allen will appoint a Nominating Committee to recommend candidates to fill the positions of chairperson and vice chairperson for the 2015 year. The Nominating Committee will present its report at the January 7, 2015 regular meeting, at which time the County Committee will vote on the recommendations provided.

X. EVALUATION OF THE SECRETARY AND STAFF TO THE COUNTY COMMITTEE

Each member of the County Committee will be requested to complete a performance evaluation form concerning the secretary and staff to the County Committee. Mr. Allen will appoint a three-person Evaluation Committee who will receive the completed evaluation forms from the members, and consolidate the information into an evaluation report. The report will be presented to the County Committee for discussion/approval at a regular meeting designated by the chairperson.

XI. UPDATE ON COUNTY COMMITTEE WEBSITE DEVELOPMENT

The Secretary will give an update on the LACOE-hosted website for the County Committee.
XII. UPDATE ON REVIEW OF COUNTY COMMITTEE POLICIES  

At the Regular Meeting of the County Committee on November 6, 2013, a policy review subcommittee was appointed by former Chair AJ Willmer, consisting of Mr. Joel Peterson, Mr. Frank Bostrom, and Mr. Willmer. The subcommittee may provide an update on their preliminary review of the policies.

XIII. 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. (Attachment 2)

XIV. UPDATE ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY 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") (Attachment 3)

XV. UPDATE ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY 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 USD]”) (Attachment 4)

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

XVII. ADJOURNMENT
The Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) met on Wednesday, September 3, 2014, at the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) in Downey. The meeting was called to order at 10:08 a.m. by Ms. Maria Calix.

**Members Present**
- Frank Bostrom
- Maria Calix
- Ted Edmiston
- Owen Griffith
- John Nunez
- Suzan T. Solomon

**Members Absent**
- Ben Allen
- Joan Jakubowski
- Frank Ogaz
- Joel Peterson
- AJ Willmer

**Staff Present**
- Keith D. Crafton, Secretary
- Allison Deegan, Staff
- Eric Hass, Staff
- Diane Tayag, Staff
- Anna Heredia, Recording Secretary

Ms. Maria Calix led the flag salute.

It was **MOVED** by Mr. Frank Bostrom and **SECONDED** by Dr. Ted Edmiston that the minutes of the regular meeting held on June 4, 2014 be approved. Motion carried with one abstention: John Nunez.

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

There were no presentations from the public.

Mr. Crafton stated that we have a petition from ABC USD, we are in the process of scheduling a hearing in September. A colored map was distributed to the Committee.

Mr. Crafton reported that we have solicited requests from all petitioners. We are still in the process of collecting the information.
Mr. Crafton stated that we have received a new petition from Eastside Union School District. A copy of the petition was distributed to the Committee.

Dr. Allison Deegan added that this petition is a result of a settlement agreement from litigation.

Mr. Crafton stated that as of July 1, 2014, Wiseburn has become unified.

Mr. Crafton stated that the City of Palmdale is still dealing with litigation issues, the City of Whittier is also having activities in their city which could affect all of the school districts in the area as well.

Mr. Crafton stated that the website continues to be updated.

Mr. Frank Bostrom stated that there has not been a meeting to date, therefore, there is nothing to report.

Mr. Crafton stated that the only legislative activity is that of SB 1365, it involves potential CVRA activity. It is now currently at the Governor’s desk for signature.

No updates to report.

No updates to report.

Mr. Crafton informed the Committee that the County Committee elections will be held here at the Los Angeles County Office of Education on October 30, 2014, at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Bostrom will follow up with Mr. AJ Willmer to schedule a meeting to review the County Committee policies.

11:02 a.m.
NOTICE OF FILING

Los Angeles County Supervisor (Fifth District)
Los Angeles County Chief Executive Office
Consolidated Fire Protection District
Los Angeles County Office of Education
United States Department of the Interior-Bureau of Reclamation
City of Azusa
San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District
Azusa Unified School District

LAFCO File: Annexation No. 419 to County Sanitation District No. 22

Pursuant to Government Code Section 56658, notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexation listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO). The application proposes to annex approximately 1.8± acres of uninhabited territory to the City of Azusa. The affected territory is generally located on Ranch Road approximately 1, 500 feet north of Sierra Madre Avenue, all within the City of Azusa.

The proposal application, map, and legal description are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by September 19, 2014.

Pursuant to Government Code section 56662(a) the Commission may make determinations upon the proposed annexation without notice and hearing and may waive protest hearing if the affected territory is uninhabited, no affected local agency has submitted a written demand for notice and hearing during the 10-days following this notice, and satisfactory proof has been provided to LAFCO that all the landowners within the affected territory have given their written consent to the proposed annexation.

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

Date: August 19, 2014

Amber De La Torre
Government Analyst

Enc.
APPLICATION TO INITIATE PROCEEDING FOR CHANGE OF ORGANIZATION/REORGANIZATION/
SPECIAL REORGANIZATION
(Pursuant to the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000,
Division 3, Title 5 Commencing with Section 56000, of the Government Code)

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO.: A-22-419

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)

1. County Sanitation District No. 22 of Los Angeles County
2. __________________________

RELATED JURISDICTIONAL CHANGES
(Annexation, Detachment, Sphere of Influence Amendment, etc.)

1. Annexation
2. __________________________

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

APPLICANT: Grace Robinson Hyde
TITLE: Chief Engineer and General Manager

CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER: County Sanitation District No. 22 of Los Angeles County

ADDRESS: P.O. Box 4998 CITY: Whittier STATE: CA ZIP CODE: 90607-4998

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: Donna J. Kitt TELEPHONE: (562) 908-4288 ext. 2708
E-MAIL ADDRESS: d.kitt@lacsd.org

By submitting this Application to Initiate Proceedings, the applicant acknowledges receipt of the "Instruction for Filing Application for Change of Organization/Reorganization/Special Reorganization" and agrees to be bound by same, including, but not limited to the provisions contained therein regarding filing and processing fees, and defense and indemnification of the Commission.
As a condition of any LAFCO approval, the applicant shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless LAFCO and its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against LAFCO or its agents, officers, and employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul the approval of LAFCO concerning the processing of the proposal or any action relating to, or arising out of, such approval. At the discretion of the Executive Officer, a deposit of funds by the applicant may be required in an amount sufficient to cover the anticipated litigation costs.

**Signature:** 

**Date:** July 30, 2014

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:**

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

Thomas Brothers Map Page 568, Grid J3

Located on Ranch Road approximately 1,500 feet north of Sierra Madre Avenue, all within the City of Azusa.

**TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:**

1.8 acres or 0.0028 square miles

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

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

**GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION**

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

   The subject territory consists of two proposed single-family homes and is located within vacant residential areas.

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

   The topography is flat.

**POPULATION AND HOUSING**

1. What is the current population of the subject territory?
   
   7

2. If the proposal includes development, what is the estimated population of the proposed area?
   
   7

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

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory.
   
   2
5. What is the proximity of the subject territory to other populated areas?
   N/A

6. What is the likelihood of significant growth in the area; and in adjacent incorporated and unincorporated areas within the next ten years?
   N/A

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:
   0

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

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

LAND USE AND ZONING

1. What is the assessed land valuation of the subject territory (give source and date of information)?
   The assessed valuation per the Assessor's current tax roll is $685,504

2. What is the current land use and zoning designation within the subject area?
   The present land use is vacant residential. The current zoning is Moderate Density Residential - Azusa [MDR-Azusa].

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

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

5. What is the land use in the surrounding area? Be specific.
   The land use in the surrounding territory is residential, agricultural, and commercial.

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

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

8. Will this proposal result in development of property now or in the near future? Describe the type of development proposed (type of business or industry, single-family or multi-family residential, etc., and number of units or facilities).
   The territory is being developed to include two proposed single-family homes.
9. What effect would denial of this proposal have on the proposed development, if any?

Denial would prevent said territory from obtaining off-site sewage disposal services from the Sanitation District. There are no other local agencies providing off-site sewage disposal services. Therefore, property owners can request permission from their local jurisdiction to construct a septic system.

10. Is the subject territory currently within a redevelopment area or proposed to be included within a redevelopment project area upon completion of this proposal?

No

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

No

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

All of the owners of real properties within the territory proposed to be annexed have requested, in writing, that their properties be annexed to County Sanitation District No. 22 so that said district can provide off-site sewage disposal service to said properties.

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

   a. Adjacent areas:
      N/A
   
   b. Mutual social and economic interests:
      N/A
   
   c. The local government structure of the County:
      No effect.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

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

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

   The wastewater generated by the proposed project will be treated by the Joint Outfall System (JOS), which is comprised of 6 upstream water reclamation plants and the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant. The JOS has a design capacity of 630.2 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 411.53 mgd. The District's sewerage facilities have adequate capacity to collect, treat, and dispose of the wastewater to be generated by the subject territory.

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

   Although the present area is not currently serviced by the District, the area was included in the future service area that might be served by the District. The District’s future wastewater management needs were addressed in the Joint Outfall System 2010 Master Facilities Plan.
3. If the proposal includes incorporation, formation, or annexation, what will be the effect of this proposal or exclusion and of alternative courses of action on the cost and adequacy of services and controls in the proposed area and adjacent areas?

N/A

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

The current permitted capacity of the JOS is 630.2 mgd. On July 12, 1995, the Board of Directors of District No.2 approved the 2010 Master Facilities Plan and certified the associated EIR. The 2010 Plan addresses the sewerage needs of the JOS service area through the year 2010 and the services planned to meet those needs. The 2010 plan allows the capacity of the JOS to increase to 630.2 mgd by 2010.

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

The property owner will be paying a service charge for the District's services.

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

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

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

   Yes  X  Name of Agency: County Sanitation District No. 22 of Los Angeles County  No  

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

   N/A

BOND INDEBTNESS

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

   Yes. The District only has outstanding revenue bonds. These are not general obligation bonds subject to taxation.

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

   Because all of the District’s existing bonded indebtedness is in the form of revenue bonds, liability for payment of the debt is apportioned to and collected from every parcel pursuant to the terms of the District’s Service Charge Program and not as a separate property tax levy. The District’s Master Service Charge Ordinance provides that local governmental parcels are exempt as long as they continue to be used for local governmental purposes. Likewise, the Ordinance provides an exemption for parcels that are not connected to the sewerage system (e.g. open space) until such time as they connect to the sewerage system.

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

   Until revenue bond is paid in full.

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

   N/A
NOTIFICATION

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donna J. Kitt</td>
<td>P.O. Box 4998, Whittier, CA 90607-4998</td>
<td>(562) 908-4288 ext. 2708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT "A"

ANNEXATION NO. 419
TO COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 22
OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

That certain parcel of land being a portion of Lot 6, of
Section 22, Township 1 North, Range 10 West, S.B.M.,
according to the Official Plat of said land filed in the
District Land Office, October 30, 1884, as described in
deed to Timothy Carl and Juanita Arietta ET UX as Trustee
of the Arrieta Family trust Dated March 9, 1999, recorded as
Instrument No. 04-3152407 of Official Records in the Office
of the Recorder of the County of Los Angeles and in deed to
Ernestine Vasquez as Trustee of the Ernestine Vasquez
Revocable Trust dated January 12, 2000, recorded as
Instrument No. 04-3152409, of Official Records in said
Office of the Recorder, situated in the City of Azusa, of
said County, State of California, described as follows;

Beginning at the southwest corner of Section 23, of said
Township and Range, said southwest corner being the
southeast corner of said Lot 6 of Section 22, as described
in deed to Dolores M. Figueroa and Ventura I. Cisneros, wife
and husband, recorded as Instrument No. 20131078191, of
Official Records in said Office of the Recorder, thence
North 00°17'20" West 178.50, along said easterly line of Lot
6 to the northeast corner of Parcel 3 of Parcel Map 15853,
filed in Book 171, Page 81 of Parcel Maps, in the Office of
said Recorder, said northeast corner being the southeast
corner of said certain parcel of land described in Instrument No. 04-3152409 said southeast corner being an angle in the boundary of County Sanitation District No. 22 of Los Angeles County as same existed on May 13, 2014 and the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING;

Thence, along the southerly line of said Instrument No. 04-3152409 and said district boundary the following described courses;

Thence, (L1) North 81°44’20" West 125.43 feet, more or less, along the southerly line of said Instrument No. 04-3152409, to the most northerly angle in the northerly line of said Parcel 3;

Thence, (L2) South 10°57’20" West 15.50 feet, along said southerly line to the most southerly angle in said northerly line of Parcel 3;

Thence, (L3) North 79°16’20" West 205.60 feet, continuing along said southerly line through the northeast corner of Parcel 1 of said Parcel Map, to a line measured at right angles from the westerly line of said Lot 6, having a bearing of North 03°53’00" West as described in said Instrument No. 04-3152409, and passes through the northwest corner of said Parcel 1;

Thence, (L4) South 86°07’00" West 20.00 feet, along said line measured at right angles to said westerly line of Lot 6;

Thence, (L5) North 03°53’00" West 234.71 feet, along said westerly line of Lot 6 of Section 22, through the southwest
corner of said certain parcel of land as described in Instrument No. 04-3152409, and through the southwest corner of said certain parcel of land described in Instrument No. 04-3152407 to the northwest corner of said certain parcel of land as described in Instrument No. 04-3152407;

Thence, (L6) leaving said district boundary (L6) South 80°51'10" East 370.73 feet, to the northeast corner of said certain parcel of land as described in Instrument No. 04-3152407, said northeast corner also being a point in said easterly line of Lot 6;

Thence, (L7) South 00°17'20" West, 214.96 feet, along said easterly line of Lot 6, and continuing in a direct line through the southeast corner of said certain parcel of land as described in Instrument No. 04-3152407, to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING.

Containing 1.847 ± acres
Los Angeles County Committee on
School District Organization

Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee)
Legislative Review – October 2014

BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR:
Senate Bill 1365 / Padilla

INTRODUCTION DATE:
02/21/14

LAST ACTIVITY/DATE:
Aug. 18 Enrolled and presented to the Governor

DESCRIPTION OF BILL
This bill would require a court to implement specified remedies upon a finding that a district-based election was imposed or applied in a manner that impaired the ability of a protected class to elect candidates of its choice or otherwise influence the outcome of an election. The bill would also direct a court to implement a redistricting plan if it would provide redress, as well as allow the court to increase the size of the governing body, delay an election, or require elections to be held on the same day as a statewide election.

POTENTIAL IMPACT OF BILL ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE, SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION PROCESS AND/OR LOS ANGELES COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS
This bill would likely result in increased activity related to the California Voting Rights Act, which has had significant impact on school districts statewide.

RECOMMENDED POSITION
Staff recommends the following position:

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

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

CORRESPONDENCE REQUIRED

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

Please direct all comments to Mr. Keith D. Crafton, Secretary to the County Committee at (562) 922-6144.
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 September 22, 2014.

RECENT INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last two years)

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None
Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals (Excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District)

October 2014

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals [exclusive of those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District (USD) that are at various stages in the school district reorganization process as of September 23, 2014.]

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

This petition was presented to the County Committee at its June 4, 2014 meeting. The district passed a board resolution to implement its trustee area plan after having done significant community outreach, hired a demographer, examined five different trustee area plans and maps, and had public hearings. On September 22, 2014, the County Committee held a public hearing on this petition in the ABC USD. Staff is working on a feasibility study on the issues to be presented to the County Committee at an upcoming meeting.

*Status: Public hearing held September 22, 2014
Status Date: September 23, 2014

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 January 27, 2014, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §5019 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 its legal compliance regarding format and content. On February 6, 2014,
County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient. Staff returned the petition to the chief petitioner on February 11, 2014, 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, based on the number of registered voters in the Pomona USD, requires valid signatures from at least 500 registered voters within the petition area. If valid and certified by the County Committee, this petition would trigger a feasibility study, public hearing, and ultimately a vote by the County Committee.

On Monday, September 15, 2014, the chief petitioner submitted signed petitions for review. On September 16, 2014, staff conveyed the signed petitions to the Registrar-Recorder for signature verification.

*Status: Petition signatures undergoing Registrar-Recorder verification.
Status Date: September 23, 2014

**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. In August of 2014, staff confirmed that petitioner is still interested in collecting signatures on this petition.

Status: Petition in circulation.
Status Date: June 20, 2012

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

On January 17, 2006, LACOE received a request for a petition from chief petitioners Ms. Maurice Morse, Ms. Shirlee Smith, and Mr. Bruce Wasson, three community members who are residents of the area known as Altadena. The chief petitioners want to form an Altadena USD from territory within the boundaries of the Pasadena USD. The petition request was returned to the chief petitioners on January 20, 2006, because it lacked an adequate description of the area pursuant to EC §35700.3.
On February 10, 2006, LACOE received a revised request for a petition. Staff reviewed the request and forwarded a draft petition to County Counsel on February 22, 2006, for a legal compliance review regarding format and content. We received notification on March 6, 2006, from County Counsel informing us that the draft petition was legally acceptable.

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

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

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

On January 4, 2011, staff conferred with a representative from the Registrar-Recorder’s office, who informed us that no audit of petition signatures had been done yet, and they clarified the cost of signature verification. On February 15 and March 1, 2011, staffs contacted the Registrar-Recorder 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.

In August of 2014, staff confirmed that petitioner is still interested in collecting additional signatures.

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).

In August of 2014, staff confirmed that petitioner is still interested in collecting signatures on this petition.

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

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

RECENT INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION

Unification Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Malibu USD (Santa Monica-Malibu USD)/November 2011
Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Lawndale SD to Wiseburn USD/July 2014
- Glendale USD to La Canada USD/May 2013
- Pasadena USD to La Canada USD/April 2013
- Temple City USD to Arcadia USD/March 2012

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None

Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

- None

This document was prepared by staff to the County Committee.