December 21, 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, January 4, 2012

The next regular meeting of the County Committee will be held at 11:00 a.m. on Wednesday, January 4, 2012, in the Board Room of the Los Angeles County Office of Education, located at 9300 Imperial Highway in Downey. Please note the later starting time for this annual organizational meeting. Reserved parking spaces will be available on the east side of the building just south of the main entrance for County Committee members.

Attached is the agenda for the meeting of January 4, 2012.

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
January 4, 2012
11:00 a.m.

I. Information
D Discussion
A Action
* Sent to Committee

I. CALL TO ORDER—Chairperson Mr. John Nunez

II. FLAG SALUTE—Mr. Nunez

III. RESULTS OF THE ANNUAL COUNTY COMMITTEE ELECTION OF MEMBERS CONDUCTED ON OCTOBER 20, 2011-Secretary
Mr. Matt Spies

The Secretary will provide the results of the annual election of members to the County Committee that was conducted at the fall meeting of the Los Angeles County School Trustees Association on October 20, 2011.

IV. ADMINISTRATION OF OATH OF OFFICE—Mr. Nunez

Mr. Nunez will administer the oath of office to the newly elected County Committee members for the Third Supervisorial District and the At-Large seat.

V. NOMINATING COMMITTEE—NEW OFFICERS

The Nominating Committee, consisting of Mr. Frank Bostrom (Chair), Mr. Owen Griffith, and Mr. AJ Willmer, will submit its recommendation for chairperson and vice chairperson for 2012. The County Committee will vote on the nominating committee’s recommendation. The new officers will assume their duties immediately.

VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of the County Committee, held on
November 2, 2011, will be submitted for approval.

VII. COMMUNICATIONS—Mr. Spies

Correspondence

- A November 16, 2011, City of Malibu Council Agenda Report regarding a proposed petition to form a school district. (Attachment 1)
- A November 16, 2011, letter from the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors regarding approval of the transfer of territory from the Mount San Antonio Community College District (CCD) to the North Orange County CCD. (Attachment 2)

Newspaper Article

- A November 14, 2011, article from the Los Angeles Times—“Firms turning to environmental law to combat rivals.” (Attachment 3)
- A November 27, 2011, article from the Los Angeles Times—“Public schools, private donations.” (Attachment 4)
- A December 1, 2011, article from the Malibu Surfside News—“City Council United in Effort to Explore Secession Feasibility.” (Attachment 5)
- A December 1, 2011, article from the Malibu Surfside News—“It’s time for Transparency in Malibu Public Education.” (Attachment 6)

VIII. PRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

Any persons present desiring to address the County Committee on any proper matter may do so at this time. (Form must be completed and submitted to the Secretary.)
IX. EVALUATION OF THE SECRETARY AND STAFF TO THE COUNTY COMMITTEE

The County Committee will adjourn to closed session pursuant to Government Code §54956.9(e) to discuss the PUBLIC EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION. The Evaluation Committee, consisting of Ms. Maria Calix (Chair), Ms. Suzan Solomon, and Mr. Maurice Kunkel, will present an evaluation recommendation to the County Committee. The County Committee may take action to either modify the evaluation or to accept the evaluation as presented.

X. RECONVENE IN OPEN SESSION

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

XI. UPDATE ON THE PETITION PROPOSING TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN AND TO ESTABLISH TRUSTEE AREAS WITHIN THE POMONA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (USD)

The Secretary will update the County Committee on the petition for governance change in the Pomona USD, including a review of a proposed Request for Information template to be utilized when soliciting additional information from districts or petitions proposing governance changes. The secretary will also poll members on possible public hearing dates for February 2012.

XII. DISCUSSION OF THE CALIFORNIA VOTING RIGHTS ACT (CVRA) AND TRUSTEE AREA ISSUES

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

XIII. UPDATE ON LOS ANGELES USD REORGANIZATION PROPOSALS

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

(Attachment: “Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals”)
XIV. UPDATE ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY SD REORGANIZATION PROPOSALS EXCLUDING THOSE AFFECTING THE LOS ANGELES USD

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

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

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

XVI. ADJOURNMENT
Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals

January 2012

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

South Gate SD-Los Angeles USD/October 2011

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

None

* Indicates update from previous summary.
Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals
(Excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District)

January 2012

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals (exclusive of those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District [USD]) that were at various stages in the school district reorganization process as of December 21, 2011.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

On October 22, 2009, the CDE notified LACOE that the petition hearing before the SBE was scheduled for the SBE's January 7-8, 2010, meeting. On December 8, 2009, the CDE notified LACOE that the petition hearing before the SBE would not be heard until March 11, 2010. On
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January 6, 2010, the CDE notified LACOE that the petition would not be heard until some time in July 2010. On March 25, 2010, the CDE notified LACOE that the petition would be heard at the May 12-13, 2010, meeting of the SBE. On April 30, 2010, the CDE issued its revised feasibility study on the Wiseburn SD unification petition. On May 3, 2010, the Wiseburn SD requested that the SBE remove the review of the petition from its May 2010 agenda. Presently, there is no date set for this petition to be reviewed by the SBE. The EIR contained in the revised petition has not yet been adopted by the SBE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
On October 7, 2011, staff was notified by representatives of the Wiseburn SD that the Hawthorne, Lawndale, and Lennox SDs had communicated to Wiseburn SD that their boards have decided not to participate in any additional regional meetings, and that they were not in favor of the unification proposals reviewed to date (including the proposed legislation circulated by the Wiseburn SD). The three districts submitted an October 19, 2011, letter to the County Committee reiterating this decision. During the following week (October 10-14, 2011), staff was notified by representatives of the Wiseburn SD and the Centinela Valley UHSD that they are continuing to hold discussions regarding a proposed agreement and possible legislation supporting unification. Staff requested that district or board representatives communicate any agreements and/or decisions in writing to the County Committee and to LACOE.

*Status: Petition on hold; Wiseburn SD discussing proposed agreement and possible legislation with Centinela Valley UHSD.

Status Date: November 8, 2011

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 August 18, 2010, 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 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, 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 August 15, 2011, the chief petitioner submitted signed petitions for review. On August 16, 2011, staff conveyed the signed petitions to the Registrar-Recorder for signature verification. On August 29, 2011, the Registrar-Recorder reported that the petitions contained 697 valid signatures, out of 753 signatures submitted. The Registrar-Recorder also reported that the number of registered voters in the Pomona USD was 63,963. Under the guidelines of EC §5019(c), the petition contains enough valid signatures to move forward to review at a public hearing and a vote by the County Committee.

The petition was presented to the County Committee at its November 2, 2011, regular meeting. The Secretary communicated that the Pomona USD was currently studying the issue of trustee
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areas in light of the California Voting Rights Act and may develop a plan to implement them prior to any public hearing on this petition. The Secretary has communicated this information to the chief petitioner as well. Staff will inform the County Committee of the district’s progress at the next meeting and make plans to study the petition proposal and schedule a public hearing within the Pomona USD boundaries.

*Status:* Petition was presented to the County Committee at its November 2, 2011, regular meeting; preparations for a public hearing are underway.

**Status Date:** November 10, 2011

**PROPOSED TRANSFER OF TERRITORY FROM THE MOUNT SAN ANTONIO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT (CCD) TO THE NORTH ORANGE COUNTY CCD**

On September 6, 2011, LACOE staff received notice of a petition to transfer certain territory currently within the Mount San Antonio CCD to the North Orange County CCD. The petition was presented via resolutions by the board of trustees of both colleges. Under EC §74104, if a territory petitioned for transfer contains less than five percent of the adult age population of a district, it is considered a “minor” transfer of territory and does not require review by the County Committee. The Education Code requires a review by the County Superintendent and the petition is then forwarded directly to the Board of Supervisors (BOS) for both impacted counties (in this case, Los Angeles and Orange Counties). Staff discussed this petition with the County Committee at its November 2, 2011, regular meeting to provide information on its progress. Staff submitted the petition to the Los Angeles County BOS on November 7, 2011. It is expected that the petition will be heard by the Los Angeles County BOS on November 15, 2011.

*Status:* Petition was approved by the Los Angeles County BOS on November 15, 2011.

**Status Date:** November 15, 2011

**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.

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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, staff contacted the Registrar-Recorder and were informed that the signature audit had still not been done. On May 12, 2011, staff from the Registrar-Recorder's office advised LACOE that an audit of the petition's signatures was underway. On November 28, 2011, the chief petitioner Mr. Wasson notified LACOE of the death of one of the co-chief petitioners, Ms. Morse. Mr. Wasson stated that another chief petitioner would not be named.

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

Status Date: December 5, 2011

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

On July 13, 2009, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §5019 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
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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 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

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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN WITHIN THE MOUNT SAN ANTONIO CCD

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

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

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

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

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

OTHER INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last six months)

Unification Proposals/Last Activity Date

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

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Monrovia USD to Arcadia USD/May 2011

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None

Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

- ABC USD/June 2011
- Compton CCD/June 2011
- Cerritos CCD/July 2011

* Indicates update from previous summary.
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION (RFI) FROM THE POMONA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (USD) RELATING TO THE PETITION TO ESTABLISH TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING, AND TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN

The following RFI has been prepared to gather information related to the petition to establish trustee areas and trustee area voting, and to increase the number of trustees from five to seven within the Pomona USD. Responses submitted will be used in preparing an informational analysis of the petition for the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee).

Respondents are requested to complete the applicable sections of this RFI and to return it no later than February 3, 2012, to:

Mr. Matthew F. Spies
Division of Business Advisory Services
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242-2890

1. Please state the official enrollment of the Pomona USD for the past ten years (2002-03 through 2011-12). If average daily attendance is used, please identify the number of part-time and full-time students included in the enrollment figures.

2. Please identify the areas of residence for currently enrolled students (by county, city or other regional identifier, as available), as a percentage of total enrollment. For example, which percentage of currently enrolled students reside in the City of Pomona? Which reside in other cities, if known?

3. If the governing board of the Pomona USD has taken any action or passed any resolution related to this petition, please list/describe them below and provide copies for the County Committee to review.

4. Please identify a general circulation newspaper(s) in which the announcement regarding a public hearing(s) in this matter can be placed. Staff of the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) will place a notice within ten days of the scheduled public hearing(s).
5. Please identify, by name and home address, anyone who has served on the Pomona USD governing board, from the 2002-03 term through the start of the 2011-12 term. Please note that addresses will not be listed in any report or study completed and/or distributed by staff. This information will be used to compare against LACOE records of past and current board members, and to analyze where within the Pomona USD past and present governing board members reside. Please repeat the information for members who continue to serve through multiple terms and use the “Other” line to list any newly elected or appointed members who join the board while the term is underway. Include any notes about each term, such as indications of members who resigned or served partial terms. For your reference, you may use the following chart to provide the requested information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Board Member Name</th>
<th>Board Member Address</th>
<th>Elected or Appointed</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Board Member Name</td>
<td>Board Member Address</td>
<td>Elected or Appointed</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Please provide a report describing the district’s approach and specific activities undertaken which address the requirements of the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA). In this response, please address/include the following information:

   a. Identification of any professionals consulted or contracted to assist the district in CVRA matters, and their firm or organizational specialties, including the scope of the engagement and whether it has concluded or is ongoing;

   b. A declaration or certification by such professionals and adopted or accepted by the district’s governing board, that any map and trustee area plan submitted and the process undertaken to develop them complies fully with the requirements of the CVRA, the California Education Code, the Federal Voting Rights Act, as well as any requirements of the Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk’s office (Registrar-Recorder);
e. Any analyses conducted and methodologies used related to the 2010 U.S. Census, and any relevant findings;
d. Any demographic (racial/ethnic) analyses conducted and methodologies used, and any relevant findings;
e. Any voting pattern/voting history analyses conducted and methodologies used, and any relevant findings;
f. Any rationale/findings related to the inclusion or exclusion of board incumbents, the preservation or division of existing community groups, an accommodation of unusual geographical landmarks, and other issues related to the development of trustee areas and trustee area voting plans;
g. Any public awareness and community involvement activities conducted (such as the formation of community or board committees, the holding of public hearings, the holding of board/community study sessions, the provision of redistricting mapping training to the community, the development and publicizing of a submission process for alternative mapping plans); and a review of information presented to the board via these efforts;
h. Copies of any official district/board documents related to CVRA issues, including agendas, minutes, resolutions, and relevant correspondence;
i. Explanation of the process the district utilized or is using to develop and adopt an official map and plan for trustee areas and trustee area voting, including any analyses of alternative maps (both those developed by the district and/or its consultants and those developed and submitted by other parties or members of the public);
j. A description of the district’s intent to seek waivers of any sections of the California Education Code, and the relevant sections related to such waiver requests;
k. Outline of the expected timeline for implementing trustee areas and trustee area voting, including potential waivers, elections, phasing in, and other relevant issues, including certification or declaration that such timelines comply with the requirements and policies of LACOE, the Registrar-Recorder, the County Committee, the California Department of Education, and the California State Board of Education;
l. A catalogue of any local media coverage pertaining to the district’s approach to CVRA issues;
m. An accounting of the district’s expenses related to responding to CVRA issues; and,
n. Identification of a district contact person specifically for CVRA issues.

7. Please provide any additional information that you believe will assist the County Committee in reviewing the specific issues contained in this petition.
REQUEST FOR INFORMATION (RFI) FROM THE CHIEF PETITIONER RELATING TO THE PETITION TO ESTABLISH TRUSTEE AREAS AND TRUSTEE AREA VOTING, AND TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN IN THE POMONA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (USD)

The following RFI has been prepared to gather information related to the petition to establish trustee areas and trustee area voting, and to increase the number of trustees from five to seven within the Pomona USD. Responses submitted will be used in preparing an informational analysis of the petition for the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee).

Respondents are requested to complete the applicable sections of this RFI and to return it no later than February 3, 2012, to:

Mr. Matthew F. Spies  
Division of Business Advisory Services  
Los Angeles County Office of Education  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, CA 90242-2890

1. Please identify a general circulation newspaper(s) in which the announcement regarding a public hearing(s) in this matter can be placed. Staff of the Los Angeles County Office of Education will place a notice within ten days of the scheduled public hearing(s).

2. Please provide any additional information that you believe will assist the County Committee in reviewing the specific issues contained in this petition.