June 25, 2012

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

FROM: Matthew F. Spies, Secretary
County Committee

SUBJECT: Cancellation of the July 11, 2012, Regular Meeting of the County Committee

The regular meeting of the County Committee scheduled for Wednesday, July 11, 2012, has been CANCELLED. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, August 1, 2012.

The following is an update of relevant information as of June 25, 2012

Staff Activities

- Staff continues to consult with the Los Angeles County Office of Education legal counsel to assess the impact of the recent California Voting Rights Act court decision related to the Madera County Office of Education and the Madera Unified School District.

- Staff participated in a June 1, 2012 meeting of the statewide group of Secretaries to County Committees to discuss issues impacting the school district organization process.

- Staff continues to monitor revisions of Senate Bill 477, related to the proposed Wiseburn Unified School District, and is in discussions with representatives of the impacted districts and staff at the California Department of Education. Staff will keep the County Committee informed of developments.

- Staff processed a new request from Mr. John Mendoza for a petition seeking to increase governing board size from 5 to 7 members and to implement trustee areas and trustee area voting within the Pomona USD.

Newspaper Articles

- A May 25, 2012 article from the San Bernardino County Sun—“Differing views heard at meeting on expanding Pomona school board and creating trustee areas.” (Attachment 1)
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- A May 25, 2012, article from the San Gabriel Valley Tribune—“Plan turned down to expand Pomona school board, create trustee areas.” (Attachment 2)

- A June 6, 2012, article from the San Gabriel Valley Tribune—“Plan to expand Pomona school board, create trustee areas turned down.” (Attachment 3)

Informational Correspondence


- A June 18, 2012, LAFCO Notice of Completion regarding Resolution No. 2012-17PR-Protest Resolution Ordering City of Santa Clarita Annexation NO. 2010-10 (Copperstone) (Attachment 5)


School District Organization Proposals

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

- “Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals.” (Attachment 8)

- “Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals (excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District).” (Attachment 9)

Please call me at (562) 922-6336 if you have any questions or concerns.

MFS/AD:alh
Attachments
Differing views heard at meeting on expanding Pomona school board and creating trustee areas
Mounta Rodriguez San Bernardino County Sun
Posted: sgvtribune.com

POMONA - Increasing the size of the Pomona Unified School District board of education and creating trustee areas is an idea district residents apparently have diverse views about.

Wednesday night about 25 district residents attended a hearing held by members of the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization.

Four resident spoke in support of the idea resident John Mendoza is proposing and eight spoke against it. An member of the staff of Assemblywoman Norma Torres, D-Chino, attend the hearing and said Torres supported the idea.

Last year Mendoza submitted a petition to the Los Angeles County Office of Education calling for increasing the size of the school board from the current five seats to seven and establishing seven trustee areas. Voters would elect a candidate from the area they live in to represent them on the school board.

Currently school board members are elected at-large.

Before residents gave their opinions, Mendoza and district representatives were giving time to address the committee.

Mendoza said the school district studied the matter but it failed to look at significant issues.

The district "didn't do an adequate job of studying voting patterns," he said.

The district didn't review the voting patterns of individual precincts that would have shown there are large differences in voter turnout in some areas of the district, Mendoza said.

Had such analysis been done, the district would have found that areas in the central, southern and southeastern part of the city have low voter turnout in district elections.

In addition, those areas lack representation on the board because most board members come from the more affluent areas of the district including the Phillips Ranch neighborhoods of Pomona and from Diamond Bar, Mendoza said.

Kasey Haws, the school district's lawyer, said the California Voting Rights Act calls for studying how at-large elections impact protected classes and their ability to elect candidates.

Protected classes refers to a groups of voters who are members of a race, color or language minority group, according to the act.

The act is "not about voter turn out per say, it's about protected groups," Haws said.

In looking at election information for the six most recent election cycles, there were changes in school board members that took the board from one that was white and Latino to the current board made up of two Caucasians, an Asian, an African-American and a Latino.
Some committee members had questions about the areas in which most school board members reside and the absence of elected officials from certain parts of the district.

Committee members are expected to make a decision on Mendoza's petition at their June 6 meeting, said Matt Spies, assistant director of the division of Business Advisory Services with the Los Angeles County Office of Education.

If the petition is denied, the matter will end there, he said.

If Mendoza's petition is approved the committee will study the community, examine proposed district plans for trustee areas and order an election in which district residents would decide if they wish to have the size of the board increase and have trustee areas, Spies said.

The earliest the matter could go before voters would be spring 2013, he said.
Plan turned down to expand Pomona school board, create trustees areas
By Monica Rodriguez, Staff Writer San Gabriel Valley Tribune

DOWNEY - The Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization voted Wednesday to deny a Pomona resident's petition to expand the size of the Pomona Unified school board and establish trustee areas.

The committee voted 7-1 against the petition affecting Pomona Unified School District.

Last year, Pomona resident John Mendoza submitted a petition to the Los Angeles County Office of Education calling for increasing the school board from the current five members to seven and establishing seven trustee areas.

Under the current system, board members are elected at-large. With a trustee system, voters from each trustee area would elect a candidate from within the area to represent them on the school board.

Going to such a system would provide residents of the central, southern and southeastern parts of the district, which currently have low-voter participation, an opportunity to participate in the district's electoral process, Mendoza has said.

Those areas have large numbers of low-income residents and a change in the system would give them a voice on the school board and an opportunity to shape policies, he said.

Mendoza did not attend Wednesday's meeting.

On Wednesday afternoon, he said he was not present because he had addressed the committee at a public hearing in Pomona late last month and had submitted written material related to his proposal.

Mendoza said he thought the board would not approve his petition, as happened several years ago. Mendoza said he has no plans to pursue a legal challenge, although others in the district may do so.

Instead, by Wednesday afternoon, he had already started the process leading to circulating another petition.

This time, Mendoza said he plans to collect enough signatures to have an initiative that will go directly before Pomona Unified voters so they can approve the changes he sought without going before the county committee.

"It's going to take time and hard work," he said. "I'm just going to go to the voters ... I'll do what I do best and that's collect signatures."

Matt Spies, the assistant director of the Los Angeles County Office of Education's Business Advisory Services, said Wednesday that Mendoza's request to pursue another petition had arrived.
Plan to expand Pomona school board, create trustee areas turned down

Monica Rodriguez San Bernardino County Sun

DOWNEY -- The Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization voted today to deny a Pomona resident's petition to expand the size of the Pomona school board and establish trustee areas.

The committee voted 7-1 to "disapprove" the petition affecting the Pomona Unified School District.

By denying the petition, the process comes to a conclusion.

Last year, Pomona resident John Mendoza submitted a petition to the Los Angeles County Office of Education calling for increasing the school board from the current five members to seven and establishing seven trustee areas.

Under the current system board members are elected at-large. With a trustee system, voters from each trustee area would elect a candidate from within the area to represent them on the school board.

Mendoza did not attend today's meeting.
NOTICE OF COMPLETION: CITY OF SANTA CLARITA
(Uninhabited Territory)

Proceedings for the following described change of organization were completed, and the subject territory became a part of the City of Santa Clarita when the Certificate of Completion was executed by this office and recorded with the County Recorder on June 14th, 2012, as Instrument No. 20120894915:

LAFCO RESOLUTION No. 2012-13RMD – MAKING DETERMINATIONS AND APPROVING AND ORDERING CITY OF SANTA CLARITA ANNEXATION NO. 2010-08 (Soledad Commons)

Number of Registered Voters: 0
Acres: 13.2 acres

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

Annexation to:
The City of Santa Clarita

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

DATED: June 18, 2012
Distribution for City of Santa Clarita No. 2010-08

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

OTHER
ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL
AT&T
AUTO CLUB OF SO. CALIF
BUREAU OF LAND RECLAMATION
CALTRANS
COMPASS MAPS INC.
CONDUCTING AUTHORITY
CHIP
VERIZON
METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT
MCI
PACIFIC BELL – TAX DIRECTOR
RAND-MCNALLY
SBE LOCAL TAX UNIT
SO. CALIF. EDISON CO.
SO. CALIF. GAS CO.
STATE FINANCE-DEMOGRAPHIC RESEARCH
THOMAS BROS. MAPS
U.S. POSTAL SERVICE
EXHIBIT "A"

ANNEXATION NO. 2010-08
TO THE CITY OF SANTA CLARITA (SOLEDAD COMMONS)

That portion of the north half of Section 18, Township 4 North, Range 14 West, San Bernardino Meridian in the County of Los Angeles, State of California described as follows:

Beginning at the point of intersection of the westerly line of the northeast quarter of said Section 18 with the centerline of the Antelope Valley Freeway (State Highway 14), said point being on a curve concave southerly having a radius of 2000.00 feet, a radial line through said point bears South 07°14′43″ West; thence (C1) northwesterly along said centerline and along said curve through a central angle of 00°50′16″ an arc distance of 29.24 feet; thence (L2) along said centerline and tangent to said curve North 81°55′01″ West 554.69 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave southerly having a radius of 2000.00 feet; thence (C3) westerly along last said curve and along said centerline through a central angle of 18°32′35″ an arc distance of 647.27 feet to an angle point in the boundary of the City of Santa Clarita as the same existed on October 6, 2010; thence (L4) along said boundary North 03°23′40″ West 348.41 feet; thence (L5) continuing along said boundary North 27°56′30″ East 201.55 feet to a point at the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave southwestwardly having a radius of 1450.00 feet, a radial line through last said point bears North 10°25′12″ West; thence (C6) southeasterly along said boundary and along last said curve through a central angle of 47°34′39″ an arc distance of 1204.06 feet to the northerly boundary of said freeway; thence (L7) leaving said boundary of the City of Santa Clarita and along last said northerly boundary North 84°12′52″ West 32.34 feet to the first above described westerly line of the northeast quarter of Section 18; thence (L8) along said westerly line South 07°26′53″ East 329.96 feet to the point of beginning.

Containing 13.21 acres, more or less.
NOTICE OF COMPLETION: CITY OF SANTA CLARITA
(Inhabited)

Proceedings for the following described change of organization were completed, and the subject territory became a part of the City of Santa Clarita when the Certificate of Completion was executed by this office and recorded with the County Recorder on June 14th, 2012, as Instrument No. 20120894918:

LAFCO RESOLUTION No. 2012-17PR – PROTEST RESOLUTION ORDERING CITY OF SANTA CLARITA ANNEXATION NO. 2010-10 (Copperstone)

Number of Registered Voters: 590
Acres: 68.86 acres

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

Annexation to:
The City of Santa Clarita

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

DATED: June 18, 2012
Distribution for City of Santa Clarita No. 2010-10

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

OTHER
ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL
AT&T
AUTO CLUB OF SO. CALIF
BUREAU OF LAND RECLAMATION
CALTRANS
COMPASS MAPS INC.
CONDUCTING AUTHORITY
CHP
VERIZON
METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT
MCI
PACIFIC BELL - TAX DIRECTOR
RAND-MCNALLY
SBB LOCAL TAX UNIT
SO. CALIF. EDISON CO.
SO. CALIF. GAS CO.
STATE FINANCE-DEMOGRAPHIC RESEARCH
THOMAS BROS. MAPS
U.S. POSTAL SERVICE
EXHIBIT "A"

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

ANNEXATION NO. 2010-10 TO THE CITY OF SANTA CLARITA
"COPPERSTONE/COPPERHILL"

That portion of the Rancho San Francisco in the County of Los Angeles, State of California as shown on map recorded in Book 1 pages 521 and 522, of Patents, in the office of the County Recorder of said county described as follows:

Beginning at the point of intersection of the centerline of Copper Hill Drive with the centerline of Decoro Drive as shown on map of Tract No. 48202 filed in Book 1256 Pages 9 through 12 inclusive, of Maps, in said office of the County Recorder, said point being on a curve, in said centerline of Copper Hill Drive, concave northwesterly having a radius of 1750.00 feet, a radial line through said point bears North 33°12'46" West, said point also being an angle point on the boundary of the City of Santa Clarita as the same existed on October 14, 2010; thence (C1) leaving said boundary of the City of Santa Clarita and northeasterly along said centerline of Copper Hill Drive and said curve and along the centerline of Copper Hill Drive as shown on map of Tract No. 48202-04 filed in Book 1247 Pages 55 through 61 inclusive, of said Maps through a central angle of 27°05'20" an arc distance of 827.38 feet to the point of intersection of last said centerline with the northwesterly prolongation of the northeasterly line of Lot 37 of said Tract No. 48202-04; thence (L2) along said prolongation and along said northeasterly line South 60°18'06" East 127.90 feet to an angle point therein; thence (L3) along the northwesterly line of said Lot 37 North 73°46'19" East 1473.51 feet to the most easterly corner of said Lot 37 also being the northeasterly corner of Tract No. 48202-05 as shown on map filed in Book 1248 Pages 24 through 33 inclusive, of said Maps; thence
(L4) along the general easterly boundary of said Tract No. 48202-05 the following 25 courses, South 15°49′58″ East 204.97 feet; thence

(L5) South 49°23′06″ East 74.35 feet; thence

(L6) South 14°01′34″ West 77.56 feet; thence

(L7) North 83°05′11″ West 77.10 feet; thence

(L8) South 64°35′06″ West 80.82 feet; thence

(L9) South 09°26′04″ West 78.56 feet; thence

(L10) South 35°50′33″ East 50.72 feet; thence

(L11) South 72°56′22″ East 60.99 feet; thence

(L12) South 69°33′39″ East 58.92 feet; thence

(L13) South 36°38′59″ East 61.98 feet; thence

(L14) South 14°45′02″ East 56.66 feet; thence

(L15) South 07°42′25″ East 73.95 feet; thence

(L16) South 16°21′36″ East 86.43 feet; thence

(L17) South 05°08′45″ East 133.63 feet; thence

(L18) South 00°05′01″ East 76.93 feet; thence

(L19) South 03°03′57″ West 128.63 feet; thence

(L20) South 29°12′13″ West 41.03 feet; thence

(L21) South 52°42′43″ West 41.79 feet; thence

(L22) South 43°33′28″ West 59.61 feet; thence

(L23) South 09°21′05″ West 182.50 feet; thence

(L24) South 26°39′52″ East 45.35 feet; thence

(L25) South 41°05′24″ East 66.03 feet; thence

(L26) South 33°04′43″ East 128.67 feet; thence

(L27) South 17°13′33″ East 35.05 feet; thence

(L28) South 05°54′53″ East 362.09 feet to an angle point in the easterly line of Lot 10 of said Tract No. 48202-05; thence

(L29) along said easterly line and its prolongation South 02°39′35″ West 49.45 feet to a point of intersection with the centerline of Decoro Drive as shown on map of Parcel Map No. 24981 filed in Book 288 pages 51 through 53 inclusive, of Parcel Maps, in said office of the County Recorder; thence
(L30) along last said centerline North 87°20'25" West 126.05 feet to a point on said boundary of the City of Santa Clarita; thence
(L31) along said boundary North 02°39'35" East 40.00 feet to an angle point therein; thence
(L32) continuing along said boundary North 87°20'25" West 69.49 feet to an angle point therein; thence
(L33) continuing along said boundary North 87°21'30" West 128.32 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave northerly having a radius of 2560.00 feet; thence
(C34) westerly along said boundary and along last said curve and along the northerly line of said Decoro Drive through a central angle of 18°31'00" an arc distance of 827.33 feet to an angle point in said boundary; thence
(L35) along said boundary and radial to last said curve South 21°09'30" West 40.00 feet to an angle point therein on the centerline of said Decoro Drive also being a point at the beginning of a curve concave northeasterly having a radius of 2600.00 feet, to which last said course is radial; thence
(C36) northwesterly along said boundary and last said curve and along said centerline of Decoro Drive through a central angle of 30°46'52" an arc distance of 1396.80 feet; thence
(L37) along said boundary and tangent to last said curve North 38°03'38" West 92.97 feet to the point of beginning.

Containing 68.86 acres, more or less.
NOTICE OF COMPLETION: CITY OF SANTA CLARITA
(Uninhabited Territory)

Proceedings for the following described change of organization were completed, and the subject territory became a part of the City of Santa Clarita when the Certificate of Completion was executed by this office and recorded with the County Recorder on June 14th, 2012, as Instrument No. 20120894917:

LAFCO RESOLUTION No. 2012-13PR – PROTEST RESOLUTION ORDERING CITY OF SANTA CLARITA ANNEXATION NO. 2011-03
(Elsmere Canyon)

Number of Registered Voters: 0
Acres: 806.52 acres

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

Annexation to:
The City of Santa Clarita

Detachment from:
County Road District No.5,
County Public Library System

DATED: June 18, 2012
Distribution for City of Santa Clarita No. 2011-03

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

OTHER
ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL
AT&T
AUTO CLUB OF SO. CALIF
BUREAU OF LAND RECLAMATION
CALTRANS
COMPASS MAPS INC.
CONDUCTING AUTHORITY
CHP
VERIZON
METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT
MCI
PACIFIC BELL -- TAX DIRECTOR
RAND-MCNALLY
SBE LOCAL TAX UNIT
SO. CALIF. EDISON CO.
SO. CALIF. GAS CO.
STATE FINANCE-DEMOGRAPHIC RESEARCH
THOMAS BROS. MAPS
U.S. POSTAL SERVICE
EXHIBIT "A"

ANNEXATION NO. 2011-03 TO THE
CITY OF SANTA CLARITA

"ELSMERE CANYON"

Those portions of Section 7 and Section 18 in Township 3 North, Range 15 West and those portions of Fractional Sections 12 and 13 in Township 3 North, Range 16 West, San Bernardino Meridian, all according to the official plats thereof, in the unincorporated territory of the County of Los Angeles, State of California together with that portion of the Rancho San Francisco as shown on map recorded in Book 1 Pages 521 and 522 of Patents, in the office of the County Recorder of said County described as a whole as follows:

Beginning at the east quarter corner of said Section 7, said corner being a point on the boundary of the City of Santa Clarita as the same existed on January 11, 2011; thence

(L1) leaving said boundary and along the easterly line of the southeast quarter of said Section 7 South 00°59'21" West 2905.83 feet to the northeast corner of said Section 18; thence
(L2) along the northerly line of the northeast quarter of said Section 18 North 89°28'32" West 1083.57 feet to the northeasterly corner of the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of said Section 18 as described in Parcel 4 in deed to said City of Santa Clarita recorded October 29, 2010 as instrument no. 20101552982 of Official Records, in said office of the County Recorder; thence
(L3) along the easterly line of last said northwest quarter of the northeast quarter and along the easterly line of the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of said Section 18 as described in Parcels 3 and 4 of last said deed South 02°04'59" West 2607.54 feet to the
southeasterly corner of said southwest quarter of the northeast quarter; thence
(L4) along the south line of the northeast quarter of said Section 18
South 89°38’53” West 1220.49 feet to the southeasterly corner of the
northwest quarter of said Section 18; thence
(L5) along the south line of last said northwest quarter South
89°38’53” West 2548.87 feet to the west quarter corner of said Section
18; thence
(L6) along the south line of the northeast quarter of said Fractional
Section 13 North 86°39’15” West 973.29 feet to a point on the
centerline of the Antelope Valley Freeway (State Highway 14), also
being a point on the boundary of the City of Santa Clarita as the same
existed on January 11, 2011; thence
(L7) along said centerline and along last said boundary North
18°56’51” East 128.86 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve concave
westerly having a radius of 3500.00 feet; thence
(C8) northerly along said centerline and along last said boundary and
said curve through a central angle of 34°58’29” an arc distance of
2136.48 feet; thence
(L9) continuing along said centerline and last said boundary and
tangent to said curve North 16°01’38” West 1908.77 feet to the
beginning of a tangent curve concave easterly having a radius of
3000.00 feet; thence
(C10) continuing northerly along said centerline and last said boundary and
last said curve through a central angle of 40°52’22” an
arc distance of 2140.09 feet; thence
(L11) continuing along said centerline and last said boundary and
tangent to last said curve North 24°50’44” East 645.22 feet to an
angle point in said boundary of the City of Santa Clarita; thence
(L12) leaving said centerline and along last said boundary the
following 7 courses, South 89°09’09” east 872.20 feet; thence
(L13) South 83°22’14” East 1235.70 feet; thence
(L14) South 00°28’31” East 394.97 feet; thence
(L15) South 89°07'46" East 1291.28 feet; thence
(L16) South 89°07'39" East 1268.02 feet; thence
(L17) South 00°36'05" East 652.49 feet; thence
(L18) South 89°09'54" East 1250.57 feet to the point of beginning.

Containing 806.52 acres, more or less.
City of Santa Clarita
Annexation 2011-03 (Elsmere Canyon)
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The foregoing resolution was on the 21st day of February, 2012, adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles and ex officio the governing body of all other special assessment and taxing districts, agencies and authorities for which said Board so acts.

SACHI A. HAMAI, Executive Officer
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
of the County of Los Angeles

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

JOHN KRATTLI
Acting County Counsel

(Signed in Counterpart)
NOTICE OF COMPLETION: HAWTHORNE
(Uninhabited Territory)

Proceedings for the following described change of organization were completed, and the subject territory became a part of the City of Santa Clarita when the Certificate of Completion was executed by this office and recorded with the County Recorder on June 14th, 2012, as Instrument No. 20120894916:

LAFCO RESOLUTION No. 2012-22RMD -- MAKING DETERMINATIONS AND APPROVING AND ORDERING CITY OF HAWTHORNE ANNEXATION NO. 2010-07

Number of Registered Voters: 0
Acres: 1.36 acres

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

Annexation to:
The City of Hawthorne

Detachment from:
County Road District No.2
County Lighting and Maintenance District 1687
County Lighting District LLA-1, Unincorporated Zone

DATED: June 18, 2012
Distribution for City of Hawthorne No. 2010-07

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

OTHER
ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL
AT&T
AUTO CLUB OF SO. CALIF
BUREAU OF LAND RECLAMATION
CALTRANS
COMPASS MAPS INC.
CONDUCTING AUTHORITY
CHP
VERIZON
METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT
MCI
PACIFIC BELL - TAX DIRECTOR
RAND-MCNALLY
SBR LOCAL TAX UNIT
SO. CALIF. EDISON CO.
SO. CALIF. GAS CO.
STATE FINANCE-DEMOGRAPHIC RESEARCH
THOMAS BROS. MAPS
U.S. POSTAL SERVICE
EXHIBIT “A”

ANNEXATION NO. 2010-07
To City of Hawthorne
County of Los Angeles

That certain parcel of land being a portion of Section 8, Township 3 South, Range 14 West, S.B.M., situated in the Unincorporated Territory of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at the point of intersection of El Segundo Boulevard (formally Ballona Avenue of Tract No. 5755 in the Unincorporated Territory of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, as per map recorded in Book 63, Pages 10 through 11 inclusive of Maps) and Ocean Gate Avenue, thence North 89° 47' 25" West a distance of 466.00 feet along the centerline of El Segundo Boulevard, thence North 62° 13' 26" East a distance of 107.82 feet to the intersection of the Northwesterly line of the Pacific Electric Railway Company (Union Pacific Railway) Right-Of-Way and the northerly line of El Segundo Boulevard as shown on Tract No. 12987, as per map recorded in Book 259, pages 17 through 18 inclusive of Maps, and the True Point of Beginning:

Course 1. South 00° 12' 35" East a distance of 50.00 feet along a line perpendicular to the northerly line of El Segundo Boulevard to the centerline of El Segundo Boulevard described as Ballona Avenue as shown on Tract No. 5755, last said centerline also being parallel to the northerly line of El Segundo Boulevard, thence

Course 2. South 89° 47' 25" West a distance of 278.78 feet along said centerline of El Segundo Boulevard to a point lying 65.00 feet southerly of a point on Lot 148 of said Tract No. 12987, said point on Lot 148 being the intersection of the northerly line of the Union Pacific Right-of-Way as shown on Right-of-Way map No. F-1922-1 recorded October 21, 1969 in the State of California, Department of Transportation, and the northerly line of El Segundo Boulevard, thence

Course 3. North 00° 12' 35" West a distance of 65.00 feet along last said perpendicular line to last said point on Lot 148, thence

Course 4. North 11° 52' 55" East a distance of 196.19 feet along the easterly Right-of-Way line of the San Diego Freeway, thence

Course 5. South 69° 39' 57" East a distance of 103.06 feet along the southerly line of lot 142 and continuing in direct line to the southwest corner of lot 141 of said Tract 12987, thence

Course 6. South 69° 39' 57" East a distance of 151.20 feet to point where the northeasterly line of said Lot 148 intersects the Union Pacific Railway Right-of-Way, thence

Course 7. South 11° 38' 58" East a distance of 83.12 feet to the True Point of Beginning.

Total computed acreage containing 1.172 acres (51,049.740 sq. ft.) more or less.
As shown on Exhibit ‘B’ attached hereto and made a part herof.
Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals

July 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 June 18, 2012.

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

Status: Final petition submission pending.

Status Date: June 26, 2007

**OTHER INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last six months)**

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- 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)

July 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 June 20, 2012.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

On August 31, 2004, staff received notice that Ms. Karen 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 began negotiations to delay the election in order to revisit the issues underlying the petition and subsequent lawsuits. The SBE requested that the County Superintendent delay the election to allow for this negotiation process to run its course. Staff consulted with the Office of the Los Angeles County Counsel (County Counsel) and was advised that neither the County Superintendent nor the SBE could order a delay of the election.

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

On January 6, 2005, County Counsel met with the County Committee in closed session to discuss the lawsuit. Later at the same meeting, Dr. Don Braun, 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 re-do the review process related to CEQA and to return the petition to the SBE for action at a later time (not to the County Committee). Subsequently, the SBE rescinded its previous approval of the Wiseburn SD’s unification petition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

On June 11, 2012, Senate Bill 477 was introduced by Senator Rod Wright. The bill language seeks to create a Wiseburn USD (pending approval by the voters who currently reside within the Wiseburn SD), along with the creation of two JPAs as described above. The Wiseburn SD informed staff that it is currently revising the language of the proposed legislation under the guidance of Senator Wright and district advisors. Staff requested that the districts keep them informed of their progress and to report back to the County Committee.

*Status: Petition on hold; Hawthorne, Lawndale, Lennox, and Wiseburn SDs negotiating legislation and agreements with Centinela Valley UHSD; staff to provide an update at the next County Committee meeting.

Status Date: June 18, 2012

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

On 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.

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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 areas in light of the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA) and may develop a plan to implement them prior to any public hearing on this petition. The Secretary communicated this information to the chief petitioner as well. Staff informed the County Committee of the district’s progress at its January 4, 2012, regular meeting, where a district representative provided details about recent activities and coming plans to conduct demographic studies, hold public hearings, and present alternative trustee area plans in compliance with the CVRA. Staff informed the chief petitioner of developments and advised him of the status of the petition review by the County Committee, as well as upcoming agenda items for review by the Pomona USD governing board.

Pomona USD held three public hearings on this matter on February 7, 9, and 15, 2012, at local schools within the district. At the hearings, staff presented overview information about the County Committee and the CVRA as it impacts the current petition. District staff and their attorney presented additional information and answered questions from attendees in the audience. The chief petitioner was present and spoke at all of the hearings.

At the March 7, 2012, meeting, attorney Mr. Kasey Haws addressed the County Committee as a representative of the Pomona USD to provide an update on progress. He stated that the Pomona USD board would review various trustee area proposals at an upcoming meeting and would provide the County Committee with its decision about whether to move forward with a trustee area plan (and which plan), election or other scenario related to these issues. The district would also participate in any public hearing scheduled by the County Committee.

At the May 2, 2012, County Committee meeting, Mr. Haws presented a PowerPoint describing the demographic studies that the district has conducted (utilizing the services of a consultant). The district does not believe that there is racially polarized voting within the Pomona USD, and thus does not believe it is required to move to trustee area voting under the CVRA. Mr. Haws reported that on May 1, 2012, the Pomona USD governing board unanimously voted to oppose the pending petition. Mr. Haws stated that the district would participate in the public hearing.

The County Committee requested that the public hearing be conducted before the end of the school year to maximize community participation. The public hearing was scheduled for May 23, 2012, in the Pomona USD. On May 11, 2012, the chief petitioner, the district, Pomona USD governing board members, and County Committee members were notified of the hearing, and public notices were placed as mandated. Staff requested that the district utilize its community notification channels, and we placed an advertisement in the Inland Valley Daily Bulletin. In addition, the Pomona USD stated that it distributed a media advisory aimed at generating news coverage of the upcoming hearing. The hearing was held on May 23, 2012. At the regular meeting of the County Committee on June 6, 2012, staff presented information related to the petition. Representatives from the Pomona USD also presented information and fielded questions from the County Committee. The chief petitioner did not appear. The County Committee voted to deny the petition, thus the matter is concluded.

*Status: County Committee denied the petition at its June 6, 2012 regular meeting.

Status Date: June 20, 2012

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

Please note that this is a separate petition, distinct from the other petitions requested by Mr. Mendoza, requesting some of the same changes within the Pomona USD (the addition of two governing board members and the creation of trustee areas). It was submitted under BC §5019 and §5020 and requires valid signatures from ten percent of the registered voters within the petition area (approximately 6,100 signatures in the case of the Pomona USD, based on the most recent count of registered voters). If valid and certified by the County Committee, this petition would trigger a ballot initiative (as opposed to a reference report and vote by the County Committee).

*Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: June 20, 2012

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

On January 17, 2006, LACOE received a request for a petition from chief petitioners Ms. Maurice Morse, Ms. Shirley 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 BC §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.

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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 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.

* Indicates update from previous summary.
Status Date: August 20, 2009

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

Status: Petition currently in circulation.
Status Date: February 21, 2008

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* 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

• Temple City USD to Arcadia USD/March 2012

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

• None

Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

• None

* Indicates update from previous summary.