April 23, 2012

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

FROM: Matthew F. Spies, Secretary

SUBJECT: Regular Meeting of the County Committee—Wednesday, May 2, 2012

The next regular meeting of the County Committee will be held at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, May 2, 2012, in the Board Room of the Los Angeles County Office of Education, located at 9300 Imperial Highway in Downey. Reserved parking spaces will be available on the east side of the building just south of the main entrance for County Committee members.

Attached is the agenda for the meeting of May 2, 2012.

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

MFS/AD:ahl
Attachments
AGENDA

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

Regular Meeting

Los Angeles County Office of Education
Board Room
May 2, 2012
9:30 a.m.

I  Information
D  Discussion
A  Action
*  Sent to Committee

I. CALL TO ORDER—Chairperson Ms. Maria Calix

II. FLAG SALUTE—Ms. Calix

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES  I, D, A*

The minutes of the regular meeting of the County Committee, held on
March 7, 2012, will be submitted for approval.

IV. COMMUNICATIONS—Secretary, Mr. Matt Spies  I, D*

Correspondence

- A March 22, 2012, letter from the Citizens for a Unified Wiseburn
  School District addressed to Senator Curren Price regarding the
  Unification Legislation for Wiseburn School District. (Attachment 1)

- A March 22, 2012, letter from the Citizens for a Unified Wiseburn
  School District addressed to Senator Roderick D. Wright regarding the
  Unification Legislation for Wiseburn School District. (Attachment 2)

Newspaper Article

- A March 22, 2012, article from the Mercury News—“Cerritos College
  settles voter lawsuit for $55K.” (Attachment 3)

- A March 28, 2012, article from the Altadena Patch—“PUSD Board
  Praises Electoral Districting Plan.” (Attachment 4)

- A March 28, 2012, article from the San Mateo Daily Journal—“Colleges
  eye district elections.” (Attachment 5)

- A March 29, 2012, article from the San Diego Union-Tribune—“School
  boards vary widely in response to voting rights law.” (Attachment 6)

- An April 8, 2012, article from the Pasadena Sun—“Former school board
  member says new voting districts would be ‘a step backward’.”
  (Attachment 7)
• An April 16, 2012, article from the Pasadena Star News—“Facing pressure from minority groups, Mt. SAC board to vote on trustee redistricting plan.” (Attachment 8)

Informational Correspondence


V. PRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

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

VI. UPDATE ON THE PETITION PROPOSING TO FORM A WISEBURN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (USD)

The Secretary will update the County Committee on the petition to form a Wiseburn USD, including a review of proposed correspondence and discussion of the recent legislative proposal.

VII. UPDATE ON THE PETITION PROPOSING TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN AND TO ESTABLISH TRUSTEE AREAS WITHIN THE POMONA USD

The Secretary will update the County Committee on the petition for governance change in the Pomona USD, including a review of recent actions by the Pomona USD governing board. The Secretary will confirm availability for a public hearing in May 2012.

VIII. UPDATE ON THE PETITION PROPOSING TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN AND TO ESTABLISH TRUSTEE AREAS WITHIN THE MOUNT SAN ANTONIO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT (CCD)

The Secretary will update the County Committee on the petition for governance change in the Mount San Antonio CCD, including a review of recent actions by the Mount San Antonio CCD governing board. The Secretary will confirm availability for a public hearing in May 2012.
IX. 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.

X. UPDATE ON LOS ANGELES USD REORGANIZATION PROPOSALS (Attachment 10)  

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")

XI. UPDATE ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY SD REORGANIZATION PROPOSALS EXCLUDING THOSE AFFECTING THE LOS ANGELES USD (Attachment 11)  

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]")

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

XIII. ADJOURNMENT
UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF THE
LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION

Regular Meeting
March 7, 2012

The Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) met on Wednesday, March 7, 2012, at the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) in Downey. The meeting was called to order at 9:40 a.m. by Chairperson Ms. Maria Calix who asked Ms. Joan Jakubowski to lead the flag salute.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members Present</th>
<th>Members Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Allen</td>
<td>Frank Bostrom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Calix</td>
<td>John Nunez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Edmiston</td>
<td>Frank Ogaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen Griffith</td>
<td>Suzan Solomon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Jakubowski</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Kunkel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ Willmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff Present

Matt Spies, Secretary
Allison Deegan, Staff
Mary Bracamontes, Recording Secretary
Anna Heredia, Recording Secretary

It was MOVED by Ms. Jakubowski and SECONDED by Mr. Allen that the minutes of the regular meeting held on January 4, 2012, be approved. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

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

Mr. Willmer arrived at 9:45 a.m.

Mr. Allen clarified the February 1 Malibu Times article stating that the Santa Monica-Malibu USD did not deny the request but tabled the request for a non-voting Malibu member. He also asked when the public hearings are held -all day, mornings, afternoon, or evenings?

Mr. Spies responded that it depends on the availability of the district but in general public hearings are held in the evening and could last approximately two hours.
Mr. Spies provided an overview of the proposed formation of a Wiseburn USD. He stated that at the January County Committee meeting members requested that staff draft a letter to the State Board of Education (SBE) requesting that they accept the Wiseburn SD environmental impact report (EIR) for the purpose of keeping the unification proposal alive. Mr. Spies continued that following this meeting he contacted the superintendents at Wiseburn SD and Centinela Valley Union High SD (UHSD) to inform them of the request and he was asked to hold off on sending the letter because they were in the process of drafting new legislation and bylaws for a proposed joint powers authority (JPA) as their local solution to the issue. He stated that he agreed to their request with the understanding that they would attend today's meeting to discuss it with the County Committee members. Mr. Spies stated that after this discussion he would inquire if the County Committee members still want the letter sent to the SBE but he wanted to first update the members on the current status. He went on to say that what has happened is that the proposed legislation now would apply only to Centinela Valley UHSD and Wiseburn SD, and the repayment of existing and future bonded indebtedness - whereas Wiseburn SD would continue to pay its share of pre-unification bonding obligations and would no longer be obligated to pay for bonding after the unification. Mr. Spies continued that in recognition that the residents of Wiseburn SD would continue to pay, the district would receive $4 million in bond proceeds from Centinela Valley UHSD and the Wiseburn SD would be required to spend the funds in a manner which is consistent with the ballot measure passed by the voters, and for future bond measures Wiseburn SD would be limited to collecting the tax only on the residential territory within the district and Centinela Valley UHSD on all its current territory minus the residential territory within the Wiseburn SD. He went on to say that the bonding limitations applicable to each district will also apply to a JPA that will be formed and each district will be responsible for repayment of its proportionate share of debt; any eligible Wiseburn SD student may attend Centinela Valley UHSD schools without an interdistrict permit; the legislation would take away any future actions by the County Committee and SBE; and require that the county superintendent order a unification election solely within the Wiseburn SD territory. Mr. Spies stated that he had been informed that the JPA bylaws already received had been changed dramatically in that there was language that stated it may provide funding to the feeder districts rather than shall provide funding to the feeder districts, and he hoped that this would be discussed today by one of the districts. He continued that the feeder districts took exception to both the proposed legislation and the JPA language in the bylaws because the JPA language stated it may provide funding to the feeder districts rather than shall. Mr. Spies went on to say the following: that it is estimated that the parcel tax would raise $13 million annually and be distributed 20 percent to Wiseburn SD and 80 percent to Centinela Valley UHSD with 50 percent of the amount being shared with the feeder districts; that the original intent was to have
the unification and parcel tax election occur in 2012 but because this
issue has been stalled it may not happen; and should the unification
election fail the special legislation as well as the JPA bylaws would cease
to exist. He stated that all feeder districts had met last week to discuss the
recent changes to the bylaws and he did not have a status of the meeting
but as far as he understood State Senator Wright has indicated that until
all districts agree on a plan he will not sponsor a bill on the matter. At the
conclusion of Mr. Spies overview he asked members if they had any
questions or comments.

Mr. Allen asked for clarification regarding Senator Wrights support of the
legislation.

Mr. Spies responded that Senator Wright had backed away from
supporting the legislation at this time.

Mr. Allen asked that the members be sent the current information on the
matter.

Mr. Spies responded that the information would be e-mailed to the
members as soon as possible.

Ms. Jakubowski inquired about the parcel tax and where this issue had
come from because this was the first time she had heard language about
this?

Mr. Spies responded that this was a new issue in an effort to mitigate any
potential impacts on the feeder districts as well as to provide funding to
all districts.

Ms. Jakubowski asked who would be voting on this issue and who will
pay the parcel tax?

Mr. Spies responded that as far as he understood it would be the entire
Centinela Valley UHSD for the vote as well as the payment of the parcel
tax.

Ms. Jakubowski asked what if the vote fails what happens?

Mr. Spies responded that this is contingent upon things being put in
place-if the unification fails the JPA is no longer needed-if the bond
measure fails and unification passes it is a possibility.

Ms. Jakubowski requested a flow chart of the process because the issues
are getting confusing and it seems very different than what the issues
were in the past and what County Committee has been dealing with for
the past ten years.

Mr. Spies responded that a flow chart of the process would be
forthcoming but some of these issues have just come forward in the last
two weeks.
Dr. Deegan responded that the flow chart will be forthcoming once the districts explain the proposal and the process to staff and the County Committee.

Ms. Calix called on Dr. Tom Johnstone, Superintendent of the Wiseburn SD, to address the County Committee.

Dr. Johnstone explained that this was a very complex plan that involved legislation on the areas that legislation can handle but there are some things that can not be dealt with by legislation so in order to work on those areas, they have been working with Centinela Valley UHSD to create a JPA that would enable them to access the areas they are accessing now in the future in the commercial part of the Wiseburn SD. He continued that the commercial part is 37 percent of the assessed valuation of the Centinela Valley UHSD which is why this process has been going on for 11 years, because Centinela Valley UHSD under no circumstances would be willing to give that up because it would have severe tax consequences both in terms of future bonds and in current bonds that communities of Lennox, Lawndale, and Hawthorne would be responsible for. Dr. Johnstone went on to say that through legislation and the JPA they are attempting to take care of paying for authorized issued bonds and authorized unissued bonds from the 2000 election which have all been issued now but there are still bonds from the 2008 and 2010 election that have been authorized but not issued, so legislation is needed to take care of Wiseburn SD’s ability to continue to meet that responsibility so there is no fiscal impact on the other feeder districts. He continued that as far as the parcel tax, both Centinela Valley UHSD and Wiseburn SD had both considered this on their own because they are going into their fifth year of declining funding from the State and are at 22 percent less in their budget than in 2007-08, and are being funded like in 2003-04, so under the JPA a parcel tax would be able to be done and if this failed in 2012 it would have the ability to go out for future parcel taxes when the climate is more favorable. Dr. Johnstone stated that more importantly, through a school facilities improvement district bond Centinela Valley UHSD would be able to continue to access the commercial property within the Wiseburn SD for future obligation bonds. He stated that the petition at the SBE has the old conditions which were unacceptable to Centinela Valley UHSD and to the other feeder districts, so in order to make it acceptable we are looking for a win win situation and would like to achieve Wiseburn SD unification but do not want the neighbors footing the bill for it.

Ms. Jakubowski questioned the parcel tax and asked whether the parcel tax was just for Centinela Valley UHSD and Wiseburn SD?

Dr. Johnstone responded that it is Centinela Valley UHSD and Wiseburn SD, but because Centinela Valley UHSD draws from the other feeder districts, it is all of the districts-Lennox, Lawndale, Hawthorne, and Wiseburn SDs.
Ms. Jakubowski asked if this would be one parcel tax?

Dr. Johnstone responded that yes it would be one parcel tax that would tax residential properties at three cents a square foot so the average residential parcel throughout the Centinela Valley UHSD would be paying $150 per year and the average commercial parcel would be paying seven and a half cents a square foot depending on the size of the parcel.

Mr. Allen asked if they had polled for the parcel tax?

Dr. Johnstone responded that it is in the process and if this is going to be done they would like to be able to be successful.

Ms. Jakubowski stated that she was trying to recall whether a discussion concerning some type of legal issue regarding Wiseburn SD continuing to pay the taxes, and her concern now is the commercial portion of the district being committed to future indebtedness, and is this something that the County Committee needs to look into from a legal aspect or has this been part of other discussions?

Dr. Johnstone responded that in 2004 the Wiseburn SD hired a law firm to handle this and at that time the argument to the SBE was that the district could legally continue to pay all existing bonds that had been approved by the voters up to that point, and it was not a complex issue at that time because it was just the 2000 bonds of $59 million and by 2004 all of the bonds had been authorized and issued. He continued that it was basically holding the Wiseburn SD taxpayers responsible for only those bonds, but since that time two more bonds have been passed in 2008 and 2010 that have made this issue more complex.

Mr. Spies added that in addition to this while in Sacramento on another matter, he had met with the attorneys for Centinela Valley UHSD and Wiseburn SD, and Mr. Larry Shirey of the California Department of Education, to discuss this matter and it was agreed that some components of the legislation would have to be reviewed by the legislation counsel to determine if there was a legal option available, so there are potential hurdles in Sacramento for it to become a bill and law.

Ms. Jakubowski stated that she would still like staff to send correspondence regarding approval of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) report. She then MOVED that staff send a letter to the SBE requesting approval of the CEQA report before the timeline would approach which is five years, and the CEQA report is already in its fourth year.

Mr. Willmer added that the County Committee still has a petition process in place and the process is instigated by a petitioner and the process results in a popular vote in a designated area, and he does not believe that the process should be held up and it needs to come to closure. He then SECONED Ms. Jakubowski’s motion.
Dr. Johnstone responded that one of the chief petitioners was present in the audience if the committee wanted to get her opinion on the issue.

Mr. Willmer responded that he did not believe the petitioner could bring back a petition once the process was started and that the SBE could only send the petition back. He went on to say that the County Committee is asking that the SBE follow through on the process.

Dr. Johnstone responded that he was speaking on behalf of the Wiseburn SD in that they also want the EIR report approved and from their perspective it is long overdue, but he knows that if Centinela Valley UHSD were in the audience they would oppose this because it is something to hold over Wiseburn SD.

Ms. Jakubowski stated that her concern was that the timeline for the approval of the CEQA report was running out and did not want this to happen because then the CEQA process would have to start over again.

Mr. Spies responded that according to Mr. Shirey, he explained that in general a CEQA report has a shelf life of approximately five years and it is said this way because there could be significant changes within the community that would make the report no longer viable in the environmental assessment so this CEQA report is in its fourth year at this time. He went on to say that even if the County Committee made the request for approval it still could be determined that the report is no longer viable, and if this is the case since this occurred four to five years ago, the State determined that it will no longer be involved in paying for anything related to CEQA so that would now become a local issue that would need to be paid for by some other entity.

Dr. Johnstone commented that the Wiseburn SD is currently conducting its own EIR because in 2010 a bond was passed for $87 million to build a high school so the report is for that project. He again reiterated that the Wiseburn SD would also like the unification CEQA report approved by the SBE.

Ms Calix inquired regarding who will vote on the parcel tax issue?

Dr. Johnstone responded that he had a letter (a copy was distributed to the County Committee members and staff) that addresses this issue if the members wanted him to read it out loud at this time?

Ms. Calix asked that he go ahead a read the letter.

Mr. Willmer interrupted Dr. Johnstone stating that the members had a copy of the letter and suggested that he not continue reading the entire letter. He then asked Ms. Calix if this was agreeable.

Ms. Calix asked Dr. Johnstone to summarize the letter instead of reading the entire letter, which he did summarizing some of the main points of the letter.
Mr. Willmer again asked that Dr. Johnstone not continue reading the letter and allow the members to read it on their own.

Members agreed and Ms Calix called for a vote on Ms. Jakubowski’s motion.

The motion CARRIED unanimously.

Mr. Spies suggested that agenda item VII and VIII be changed in the order of the agenda because on February 28, 2012, the Court of Appeals (Court) issued a ruling involving the Madera case as it relates to what is the role and responsibility of the County Committee in regards to the compliance of the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA). He went on to say that the Court ruled that the Madera County Committee had not violated the CVRA and the Court also upheld the decision to substantially reduce the amount of attorney fees sought by the plaintiffs from approximately $1.7 million to $162 thousand. Mr. Spies stated that this decision makes it clear that the County Committee, as long as it does not affirmatively act to impose or apply an at-large method of election on its district, it can not be held liable under the CVRA. He continued that the Court disagreed with the legislatures use of the phrase “impose or applied” and indicated the liability for violating Election Code §14027 is premise on the party taking some part of affirmative action with respect to the election. Mr. Spies stated that what makes this decision interesting and should be noted, is that while it makes it clear the role or liability of the County Committee it sets up the county superintendent to perhaps be named in future challenges to the CVRA by the authority given to the county superintendent to order elections, and if the county superintendent orders an at-large election the legal review indicates that it may see the shifting from the County Committee being named to the county superintendent in future challenges. He stated that he is working with in-house legal counsel to see if they agree with the perspective on this Court decision and if they do agree how can the county superintendent and the County Committee work on this to assure that neither one sets the other one up for potential litigation. Mr. Spies stated that he would keep the County Committee apprised of any additional information.

Mr. Willmer asked that as a procedural issue, the members receive a copy of the documents prior to the meetings or even if the meeting was held up for a short period of time, to allow the members to read the documents themselves instead of having them read to them.

Mr. Spies responded that this would be done in the future. He then continued that the reason he provided this information was due in light of the Pomona USD petition and the way it has been approached up until this point in time. He stated that this would allow the district to get in front of the petition to institute a by trustee area of election method and to increase the board size from five to seven with the understanding that the district would come back and demonstrate that it was moving towards implementing the by trustee area of election, and if not the County Committee always had the authority to move on its own.
Mr. Spies cautioned the County Committee that in light of the Court decision and staffs work with in-house legal counsel to navigate this on where the liability is in the process. He then stated that the meeting could move forward on agenda item VII.

Mr. Spies provided an overview of the proposed increase of the number of trustees from five to seven and to establish trustee areas within the Pomona USD. He stated that at the January 4, 2012, County Committee meeting, the members requested that staff be involved in the efforts of the Pomona USD and during the month of February, staff participated in three community outreach meetings that the district conducted and staff provided an overview of the petition process as well as the CVRA process and they are two distinct separate processes before the district.

Mr. Allen requested a short recess of the meeting and asked that the Madera case documents be provided to the members since it pertained to this petition.

Mr. Spies responded that this could be done if a short recess were taken so that he could have copies of the documents made to distribute to the members.

Mr. Allen made a **MOTION** to take a short recess and the motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Willmer. The motion **CARRIED** unanimously.

The meeting recessed at 10:32 a.m.

The meeting was reconvened at 10:48 a.m.

Mr. Spies distributed the requested documents and stated that the document was only one legal opinion and in-house counsel has not had a chance to respond since the document had just been received. He then asked the members if they had any questions regarding the article.

Dr. Deegan provided the name of the law firm and title of the article stating that it was a legal alert from the law firm of Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo titled “Court Finds County Committee on School District Organization Did Not Violate the California Voting Rights Act,” and dated March 1, 2012.

Ms. Jakubowski asked how this affected the County Committee’s discussion regarding agenda item VII?

Mr. Spies responded that he brought this to the County Committee’s attention because it is possible for the district to come back and conclude that they will not move towards the by trustee area method of election and the County Committee will then have to decide how they will proceed.
Ms. Jakubowski then asked if the district is currently moving forward with the plan that was heard at the previous meeting and whether they were scheduled to provide an update to the County Committee?

Mr. Spies responded that the Pomona USD attorney was in the audience and could provide that update.

Ms. Calix stated that there had been oversight of one of the attendees in the audience who wanted to address the County Committee on agenda item VI. She then called on Dr. Ellen Dougherty, Superintendent of the Lawndale SD.

Dr. Dougherty stated that she was surprised and concerned that conversations had been held with Mr. Spies and the two other districts, and no conversations with the three districts to find out where they were in the process or with their attorneys. She stated that she respectfully disagreed with Dr. Johnstone that the districts did not want to participate - this was farther from the truth because when they had a conversation with him they mentioned that they were not interested in a parcel tax because they did not want their taxpayers, who are in the 13 percent unemployment rate and 80 percent free and reduced lunch population, to have another tax at this time and they were not interested in anything that was not an area wide vote, but other than that they did want to be a part of the conversation. Dr. Dougherty continued that she came to a meeting in the fall and heard for the first time that there would be legislation; Dr. Morgan had gone to the next meeting and found out that there was a JPA and that is how they have been finding our the information by attending the County Committee meetings, and this affects 20,000 other students. She went on to say that the reason they sent the letter was because they received the JPA very late on a Friday afternoon and both boards voted on it the following Tuesday and there was no time to ask questions or really understand what was going on - all of this has happened quickly and it is affecting them and their students. Dr. Dougherty added that the JPA can be changed at any time and they are not members of the JPA and they have no power in the JPA even though it affects their area, their voters, and students; this JPA can be changed at any time by the board of the JPA; there are MOUs with the district that in the last meeting kept changing so they are still in the process and at the table having conversations. She continued stating that the letter that both she and Dr. Morgan sent was because they received the JPA, which has been changed since, in a very short timeline and that was the letter taken to the boards to ask them to slow down, read the JPA, and allow them the time to look at before both boards took action so that is the history of the letter received by the County Committee, and she just wanted to let the County Committee know that there is another side to this.

Ms. Calix thanked Dr. Dougherty and asked that the meeting resume with agenda item VII.
Mr. Spies restated that he and Dr. Deegan had participated in three community outreach meetings within the Pomona USD with two of those meetings held within the City of Pomona and one in the City of Diamond Bar. He continued that at the first two meetings there was approximately 50 attendees at each with a mix of input, and the third meeting approximately 75 attendees where they were predominantly opposed to the process. Mr. Spies explained that those who were opposed to the process tend to be opposed due to some bad experiences that the City of Pomona has changed to by trustee area elections and the community feels that its decreased the effectiveness and representation of the community in total because it has created areas where each city council person is only concerned with that particular area. He continued that they also expressed support of the existing board and how they are operating and they are concerned that it would cause the same issue as the City of Pomona. Mr. Spies then introduced Mr. Casey Haws, Pomona USD’s legal counsel, to provide an update.

Mr. Haws provided an update of the district stating that discussion has been held at the board meetings in addition to the three community meetings, and they have hired a demographer who has come up with four different potential plans for by trustee area voting - two with five areas and two with seven areas that are currently being discussed. He continued that with the Madera case decision this has an impact on the district and indicated that the impact of this decision is comments from the public that they like the way the board is now and the fact that they are at-large and go around feeling that the entire district is within their purview, then there is this negative reaction to what has happened in the City of Pomona. Mr. Haws went on to say that a petition signed by over 11,000 individuals was to have the by trustee area voting go away and to go back to at-large, and this will be voted on at the November election so it’s on the communities mind. He continued that at this time the district has a very diverse board that was elected at-large and the board does not feel that they have a CVRA liability because of the make up of the board now and historically, and the geographic disbursement. Mr. Haws stated that the actual resolution will be considered in April with board meetings the first and third Tuesday so what they are proposing is that the public hearing for the petition be held in early May which would give them two board meetings to consider the issue and to come up with a resolution and thereby coming up with an official position to bring up at the public hearing. He added that the district is doing as much as they can in terms of moving forward in good faith, and then asked if there were any questions.

Ms. Calix thanked Mr. Haws for his presentation.

Mr. Allen asked Mr. Spies what the County Committee’s responsibility is at this point?
Mr. Spies responded that at this point it is not a proposal that has time constraints for the County Committee, and the requirement is that the County Committee will need to conduct at least one public hearing in the jurisdiction and at the conclusion of the public hearing the County Committee will need to make a decision to approve or deny the petition that is before them. He continued that the actions in regards to the compliance of the CVRA by the district are separate from the petition responsibilities of the County Committee.

Mr. Allen asked if there would be a problem allowing the Pomona USD to continue their work on this?

Mr. Spies responded that there would not be a problem based on what has been said and if there is going to be action taken at the district level, then the County Committee could hold off in making a decision to wait to see what the action will be.

Mr. Allen asked Mr. Haws if he was looking for input and thoughts from the County Committee or was this a status presentation?

Mr. Haws responded that it is both - he wants the County Committee to understand where the district stands as far as the districts current thinking, and he is also looking for some input from the County Committee because until the Madera decision there was a since that the County Committee was leaning towards a by trustee area voting simply because the CVRA challenge and its potential threat to the committee as well as the district. He continued that the recent decision has made it less of an issue for the County Committee and has placed more on the Pomona USD because if someone is going to get sued and pay attorney fees, defend it, and take a position that the district is not engaged in racially polarized voting and therefore can maintain its at-large election methodology, it will be the district rather than the County Committee.

Mr. Spies stated that he would have to ask in-house legal counsel if the County Committee gets a response back that they want to continue the current method of at-large elections and the County Committee takes no further action to implement its authority to force a change on the at-large process, is that a defensible position if County Committee did get pulled into a future lawsuit and can legal counsel defend that position. He went on to say that as a result of the discussions today he would need that answer sooner than later.

Mr. Kunkel commented that at previous public hearings concerning the Pomona USD and Mount San Antonio Community College District (CCD) petitions, the chief petitioner provided maps and demographic information regarding past and present board members that seems different from what has been presented today but of course there is no way of knowing the validity of the information.
Dr. Deegan responded that the chief petitioner’s information was completely different from what was studied in both the Pomona USD and Mount San Antonio CCD in that the findings agreed with the district that historically board members have been elected from many different locations.

Ms. Jakubowski asked for clarification in that if the public hearing were held and the County Committee voted to move to seven seats elected by trustee area, and then the Pomona USD goes through their process and decides not to move to by trustee areas, what happens - do they take precedent or does the County Committee?

Mr. Spies responded that because the petition process is a little different in regards to compliance of the CVRA - if the County Committee were to take action to accept or continue the existing at-large method, the question would be does the County Committee step into the challenge process again by not taking action to make change towards the CVRA compliance and can the lack of action be considered a non-compliant act of the CVRA. He continued that in the case of this petition, if the district shows a good faith effort moving towards the by trustee area voting, staff’s recommendation to the County Committee would be to conditionally deny the petition and allow the district to move forward, you would always retain the authority to initiate a study that is in the code and allows you to do this.

Mr. Allen stated that it seems that County Committee needs to get guidance from legal counsel in order to provide the Pomona USD with any guidance.

Dr. Deegan clarified that the district is undergoing its own study in response to staff’s request for action on their part, they are not responding to a petition or demand letter because of the CVRA so if the County Committee holds the public hearing and decides they want to accept the petition and implement trustee area voting they will call the election and that is the process. She went on to say there is not a process for the district to make this happen outside the petition process.

Mr. Spies added that a challenge would have to be filed subsequent to this being resolved if the district remained at-large.

Mr. Haws stated that the district’s perspective is the County Committee’s decision on the petition and its authority to mandate that the district place on the ballot whether the district should go to by trustee area elections. He continued that as the process moves forward the question will be does the County Committee agree to have the election or will they say no an election is not appropriate at this time and here is why - at the end of the presentation the County Committee will make that decision and that is what will occur. Mr. Haws went on to say that at the same time the County Committee has allowed the district to process this to decide what they will recommend and he would ask that he be allowed more
time to present the information to the district board and for them to pass a resolution to instruct him on how to present their case to the County Committee at the public hearing.

Mr. Willmer asked when the petition had been presented to the County Committee?

Mr. Spies responded that it was presented to the County Committee in November 2011.

Mr. Willmer stated that the County Committee has a petition process and the petitioner has rights and needs to have a response from the County Committee so he would ask that the committee be respectful of a timely response to the petition.

Mr. Haws responded that the district has been very respectful of the chief petitioner, who has attended all community meetings, and they do not want to delay the process either.

Mr. Willmer asked what the timeline is to make a decision on the petition after the public hearing?

Dr. Deegan responded that the County Committee has no timeline but the timeline has been triggered by 1) until there is a trustee area voting plan from the district they are subject to liability under CVRA and a demand letter that can come at any time; and 2) the Office of the Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk (Registrar-Recorder) has a set timeline in which it can feasibility implement district by trustee area voting plans which is October 2012 for next years election.

Mr. Willmer asked if for some reason the County Committee chooses not to have the public hearing in April, is there a danger of the timeline?

Mr. Spies responded that there would be no danger because it would require fast action by the district to seek a waiver from the SBE on the approval of the election, then they could transmit their plans to the Registrar-Recorder which would then enter the information into their database to be effective for a November 2013 governing board election.

Mr. Spies recommended that the County Committee not delay the public hearing any further than May so that the Registrar-Recorder’s timeline can be met. He then stated that the County Committee members would be polled for their availability in May.

Mr. Spies introduced Mr. Wayne Stark who was a former member of the County Committee and was involved with the Wiseburn SD proposal when it started.

Mr. Spies reviewed proposed legislation related to school district reorganization. 

Review of Proposed Legislation
Mr. Spies stated there were no updates to Los Angeles USD reorganization proposals.

Mr. Spies called on Dr. Deegan to provide an overview of staff activities related to Santa Monica-Malibu USD and the possibility of a Malibu USD.

Dr. Deegan stated that staff had been asked by the City of Malibu to provide information concerning the proposed unification of a Malibu USD and what the process would be at a meeting held by representatives of the City of Malibu, Santa Monica-Malibu USD, and the Santa Monica-Malibu board including Mr. Allen who is the board president. She continued that there had been a petition to transfer territory from Santa Monica to Malibu to create a Malibu USD over seven years ago and then five years ago the petition was revived by new petitioners and additional signatures were gathered, but the petition has never been submitted so the discussions held revolved around what the role of the County Committee is, the role of LACOE staff, and the role of petitioners. Dr. Deegan went on to say that at a community meeting the week before, Mr. Spies provided an extensive presentation regarding the school district organization process and the nine conditions, and staff anticipates a petition is forthcoming.

Mr. Spies stated that per earlier conversation, LACOE like other school districts is experiencing budget constraints and problems and looking at greater efficiencies and budget reductions. He continued that in December LACOE mailed information concerning a retirement incentive plan that needed a minimum number of participants with the final decision to be made by March 6, 2012, which was yesterday. Mr. Spies went on to say that the plan was approved for the retirement incentive and as a result of the plan, myself and Ms. Mary Bracamontes will be retiring on June 30th including our division director, Mr. Mel Iizuka, the top three management positions will be retiring. He went on to say that during this transition period, Ms. Anna Heredia, who is the secretary to the assistant director position in the division, will be brought in to learn the County Committee process as well as Dr. Deegan. Mr. Spies stated that he will be sending a status of activities of the County Committee prior to retiring to all members, as well as a letter encouraging the County Committee to request that Dr. Deegan become the permanent Secretary to the County Committee as you did for him, because he feels that she is more than capable to assist you in the future. He went on to thank the County Committee for their support and especially in the last year as Secretary to the County Committee.

Mr. Willmer stated that he and Mary will be missed and hopes that they have something interesting to do while retired.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:48 a.m.
March 22, 2012

Senator Curren Price
Administrative Offices West
700 State Dr.
Los Angeles, CA 90037

Honorable Senator Price,

Unification Legislation for Wiseburn School District

As Chief Petitioners of the Citizens for a Wiseburn Unified School District, we urge you to assert your support of the Wiseburn School District and to author key legislation, which will help the Centinela Valley region achieve educational equity. More than ten years ago, we petitioned the State Board of Education (SBE) to transform the Wiseburn Elementary School District into a unified K-12 district. Although the SBE initially approved our reorganization petition in 2004, subsequent legal pursuits caused the SBE to retract its decision. At present, our petition is stalled due to the 2010 SBE recommendation for a region-wide vote and the current petition's inability to adequately address fiscal issues between school districts in the Centinela Valley region. Recently, the Wiseburn School District and Centinela Valley Union High School District (CVUHSD) jointly established an effective plan to achieve a regional solution addressing the needs of all districts involved with CVUHSD. Legislation to address current statutes in the Education Code is an essential component of the current regional solution. Your immediate action is critical to ensure the educational success of high school students in the Centinela Valley region.

The Citizens for a Wiseburn Unified School District, have incessantly championed the concept of the Wiseburn School District's unification, as evidenced by the 2010 petition reaffirmation with nearly 3000 signatures. We therefore now go on record as supporting the current Wiseburn School District unification plan as a method to achieve our petition’s outcome with superior stipulations for the long-term educational and fiscal equity of the entire Centinela Valley region.

We recognize that the superintendents of the three elementary school districts, Lawndale, Hawthorne, and Lennox, have withheld their support of this regional solution for sundry and arcane reasons. Although the elementary school districts were initially sought as participants in the development of this regional plan, they opted out of participation with the knowledge that Wiseburn and Centinela would

http://www.sites.google.com/site/unifywiseburn
continue to move forward. Still, the current regional solution explicitly and
generously represents their interests as feeder districts to CVUHSD. Furthermore,
we have no evidence that residents of these feeder districts share the sentiments of
their district leadership.

We respectfully request you to move forward and introduce the required legislation
in the most expeditious manner possible. The creation of a Wiseburn Unified School
District is a viable way to narrow the existing achievement gap between White and
Asian versus African American and Latino youth. It will distribute the responsibility
of educating all students in the region, including those with special education/IEP
needs, providing relief to CVUHSD high schools and the region's seven wait-listed
charter high schools. Finally, it will preserve the economic base of the surrounding
community by eliminating the need for struggling families to pay for costly private
institutions and unanticipated bond tax hikes.

We thank you in advance for your immediate action to get legislation passed as a
foundation to the Wiseburn Unification Plan. If you have any questions or need
additional information, please contact us as specified below.

Sincerely,

Lydia Rodriguez
Chief Petitioner
5164 W. 131st Street
Hawthorne, CA 90250
Phone (310) 676-8052

Linda Cuesta
Chief Petitioner
5521 W. 124th Street
Hawthorne, CA 90250
Phone (310) 536-9614

Shavonda Webber-Christmas
Chief Petitioner
5131 W 139th ST
Hawthorne, CA 90250
Phone (310) 644-7507

C: Tom Johnstone, Superintendent, Wiseburn School District
Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization
Assemblymember Steven Bradford
Assemblymember Betsy Butler
Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors
Dr. Arturo Delgado, Los Angeles County Office of Education Superintendent
State Superintendent Tom Torlakson
California State of Board of Education – All Board Members
Educational Legal Alliance

http://www.sites.google.com/site/unifywiseburn
March 22, 2012

Senator Roderick D. Wright  
One Manchester Blvd., #600  
Inglewood, CA 90301

Honorable Senator Wright,

Unification Legislation for Wiseburn School District

As Chief Petitioners of the Citizens for a Wiseburn Unified School District, we urge you to assert your support of the Wiseburn School District and to author key legislation, which will help the Centinela Valley region achieve educational equity. More than ten years ago, we petitioned the State Board of Education (SBE) to transform the Wiseburn Elementary School District into a unified K-12 district. Although the SBE initially approved our reorganization petition in 2004, subsequent legal pursuits caused the SBE to retract its decision. At present, our petition is stalled due to the 2010 SBE recommendation for a region-wide vote and the current petition's inability to adequately address fiscal issues between school districts in the Centinela Valley region. Recently, the Wiseburn School District and Centinela Valley Union High School District (CVUHSD) jointly established an effective plan to achieve a regional solution addressing the needs of all districts involved with CVUHSD. Legislation to address current statutes in the Education Code is an essential component of the current regional solution. Your immediate action is critical to ensure the educational success of high school students in the Centinela Valley region.

The Citizens for a Wiseburn Unified School District, have incessantly championed the concept of the Wiseburn School District's unification, as evidenced by the 2010 petition reaffirmation with nearly 3000 signatures. We therefore now go on record as supporting the current Wiseburn School District unification plan as a method to achieve our petition's outcome with superior stipulations for the long-term educational and fiscal equity of the entire Centinela Valley region.

We recognize that the superintendents of the three elementary school districts, Lawndale, Hawthorne, and Lennox, have withheld their support of this regional solution for sundry and arcane reasons. Although the elementary school districts were initially sought as participants in the development of this regional plan, they opted out of participation with the knowledge that Wiseburn and Centinela would

http://www.sites.google.com/site/unifywiseburn
continue to move forward. Still, the current regional solution explicitly and generously represents their interests as feeder districts to CVUHSD. Furthermore, we have no evidence that residents of these feeder districts share the sentiments of their district leadership.

We respectfully request you to move forward and introduce the required legislation in the most expeditious manner possible. The creation of a Wiseburn Unified School District is a viable way to narrow the existing achievement gap between White and Asian versus African American and Latino youth. It will distribute the responsibility of educating all students in the region, including those with special education/IEP needs, providing relief to CVUHSD high schools and the region's seven wait-listed charter high schools. Finally, it will preserve the economic base of the surrounding community by eliminating the need for struggling families to pay for costly private institutions and unanticipated bond tax hikes.

We thank you in advance for your immediate action to get legislation passed as a foundation to the Wiseburn Unification Plan. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact us as specified below.

Sincerely,

Lydia Rodriguez
Chief Petitioner
5164 W. 131st Street
Hawthorne, CA 90250
Phone (310) 676-8052

Linda Cuesta
Chief Petitioner
5521 W. 124th Street
Hawthorne, CA 90250
Phone (310) 536-9814

Shavonda Webber-Christmas
Chief Petitioner
5131 W 139th ST
Hawthorne, CA 90250
Phone (310) 644-7507

Tom Johnstone, Superintendent, Wiseburn School District
Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization
Assemblymember Steven Bradford
Assemblymember Betsy Butler
Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors
Dr. Arturo Delgado, Los Angeles County Office of Education Superintendent
State Superintendent Tom Torlakson
California State of Board of Education – All Board Members
Educational Legal Alliance

http://www.sites.google.com/site/unitywiseburn
Cerritos College settles voter lawsuit for $55K.
The Associated Press News Puze
Posted: 03/22/2012 01:26:05 PM PDT
Updated: 03/22/2012 01:26:05 PM PDT

NORWALK, Calif.—Cerritos Community College has agreed to pay $55,000 to settle a lawsuit that charged its trustee electoral system discriminated against Latino voters.

The college said Thursday the sum is a portion of the $140,000 sought by the three Latino voters who filed the suit to recover their attorneys' fees and costs.

In a statement, the college says it believes the plaintiffs were not entitled to any money, but agreed to settle rather than incur more legal fees.

The three voters sued the college last September charging that its at-large trustee electoral system violated the California Voting Rights Act.

The college had already started changing the system to by-district elections. The new system was adopted in December and will be used for the first time in this November's board election.
Schools

PUSD Board Praises Electoral Districting Plan

The board will officially take action on the plan at a later meeting.

By Redmond Carolpio and Dan Abendschein | Email the authors | March 26, 2012

Related Topics: PUSD Districting Task Force

Where do you stand on the districting plan? Tell us in the
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M HNASILUM
The Learning Center

The Pasadena Unified School District school board and residents praised a task force’s "consensus map" of electoral sub-districts following a presentation at the board’s regular Tuesday evening meeting, seemingly to approve the plan the next time it’s brought before them.

"Wow, just tremendous work," said board member Tom Selinske. "I want to support this."

The plan, according to its architects, aimed to give a solid amount of voting power to Sierra Madre and Alta map’s proposed districts.

The PUSD Districting Task Force examined four proposed maps before releasing the "consensus map" plan thus far is a culmination of work since January 2011, when the school board green-lit the creation of the district. The task force held public meetings and worked on developing maps of geographic sub-districts accountable to specific geographic areas of Pasadena, Altadena and Sierra Madre.

"We really were thinking about PUSD and the kids as a whole," said Ken Chawkins, the task force’s chair board, which you can see to the right of this article.

Task force member Victor Gonzalez broke down the various maps and demographics that came into the fir "significant amount of community feedback." He stressed it was important to give a stronger electoral voice input from the Sierra Madre city council and its desire to be attached to the southern part of PUSD, which it is.

A majority of the residents who commented at the meeting had only positive feedback for the task force’s work. Monica Hubbard. Tom called the plan the product of “thoughtful listening and careful balancing of sometime appreciated how the plan reached out to "all corners of PUSD" and that the plan "shows what’s possible when engaged.”

Issues raised

But Sandra Siraganian of Sierra Madre called the proposal a "huge mistake, and will likely create adversarial factionalize PUSD." She added that sub-distriicts allow PUSD residents to vote for only one board member.

"That is less democracy, not more," she said.

Siraganian also questioned how the task force approached its numbering of the districts. The plan has Sierra Madre elected in 2015 "instead of adhering to previous discussions which are recorded in the task force meeting would be able to vote in 2013. Instead, District 1 -- the northwestern chunk of PUSD -- would be able vote in 2015.

The plan for District 1 outlines that board member Ramon Miramontes can run in 2013, while Kim Kenne cannot run in 2013, which ends in 2015. The problem, Siraganian said, is that Miramontes terms out in 2013.

"So why is the task force stating that Trustee Miramontes can run in 2013 when the trustee is required to run and this one has a trustee whose term does not expire in 2015?" she asked.

Siraganian wasn’t alone with concerns. Various local members of the League of United Latin American Citizens and English about adequate representation of the Latino community -- a point also made by Siraganian, with numbering of three vacant districts (2, 3, and 6) to prevent Sierra Madre, northeast Pasadena, northeast Altadena and predominantly Hispanic and black district -- from being represented until 2015.

Each board member took turns in commending the work of the task force and the plan itself. Board member "unprecedented" while acknowledging that a "perfect" solution doesn’t exist. Miramontes cautioned all to get behind the task force’s work.
The consensus plan was noted as a discussion item in the Tuesday night agenda, which means the board come at a subsequent meeting. If approved, the shift from at-large elections to the sub-districts heads to the districting plan 10 years ago.

For more about the task force's work, check out the links below:

*New PUSD Task Force Map Has Two Board Seats for Altadena*

*Which PUSD Districting Map Should Altadena Support?*

*PUSD Districting Task Force Talks Maps, Plan with Residents*
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---
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Colleges eye district elections
March 28, 2012, 05:00 AM By Heather Murtagh Daily Journal Staff

San Mateo County Community College District officials are considering studying the creation of boundaries for elections—a conversation that could be affected by a lawsuit against the county for using countywide elections rather than specific districts to choose supervisors.

Last year, a suit was filed by the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights, the Asian Law Caucus, law firm Arnold & Porter LLP and voting rights attorney Joaquin Avila which contends the current method is inequitable to minorities. Although Latinos and Asians each comprise approximately 25 percent of the county's population, only one Latino has held a seat on the Board of Supervisors since 1995 and no Asians, the group argued. While the case is still in court, the San Mateo County Community College District Board of Trustees has been discussing examining its own policies.

"Given the great diversity in this county, the board expressed concerns about our current election system not being compliant with the California Voting Rights Act that prohibits an election that 'impairs the ability of a protected class to elect candidates,'" said Barbara Christensen, director of community/government relations for the district.

On Wednesday, the board will consider hiring a law firm familiar with the California Voting Rights Act; authorizing Chancellor Ron Galatola to seek bids for a professional firm familiar with analyzing voter populations and drawing boundaries; and appointing a two-member subcommittee to work with the hired professionals. That subcommittee would report findings back to the board before any decisions will be made.

The San Mateo County Community College District oversees three colleges and serves more than 40,000 students annually. Trustees for the five-member board are elected through county-wide elections and are not required to live within a certain geographic area or district.

The California Voting Rights Act allows challenges to come from any voter. Since the act applies to the community college district, the board can consider a few options for elections: Continue using at-large elections; conduct a study; or consider transitioning to a by-trustee area election.

Should the district go to a by-trustee option, it would first need to draft districts. It could also have between five to nine seats. If it stuck with five, the current number of trustees who serve, each district would include 136,000 to 150,000. The number of constituents would drop to 97,000 to 107,000 if the district had a seven-member board.

Should the district seek such a change, it could go into effect as soon as November 2013. Those who currently serve, however, would finish their current terms. Trustees whose terms end in 2013 would be eligible to run for re-election but would need to live within the new districts.

Every 10 years, the district must re-evaluate election policies. Board President Dave Mandelkern explained the conversation allows the board to decide the most effective way to hold elections.

"We are having a very interesting conversation," he said.

The board meets 6 p.m. Wednesday, March 28 at the District Office, 3401 CSM Drive, San Mateo.

Heather Murtagh can be reached by email: heather@smdailyjournal.com or by phone: (650) 344-5200 ext. 105.
School boards vary widely in response to voting rights law

By California Watch

Thursday, March 29, 2012

Dozens of school boards in the Central Valley are changing their election systems in response to a state law aimed at increasing minority representation, but much of the rest of the state hasn't budged.

Some county boards of education have aggressively pushed for change, spurred on by expensive lawsuits targeting school districts. Other counties haven't made the issue a top priority, have faced resistance from local school boards or have given advice to school districts that some say could leave them vulnerable to lawsuits.

Under the California Voting Rights Act, local governments can't hold at-large elections—in which the entire community votes for all elected positions—if that system weakens the ability of minorities to elect candidates of their choice. Lawyers can prove a violation under the 2002 law by showing that voting is polarized along racial lines. School boards can avoid liability by changing to trustee-area elections, in which each trustee is elected by a different region of the school district.

The civil rights lawyers who crafted the law started off suing governments in the Central Valley, sparking a domino effect in the region. Since 2009, 70 school boards have applied with the state Board of Education to switch to trustee-area elections, most of them just this year and most of them in counties like Fresno, Kings, Madera and Tulare. School boards can either put the change to a vote or ask for a waiver from the state Board of Education.

All but one school district in Madera County decided to switch out of an "abundance of caution," said Geri Kendall Cox, chief business and administrative services officer of the Madera County Office of Education.

"It seemed like the best course of action for the districts to protect their assets and the assets of the County Office of Education," she said.
Lawyers representing Latino residents had sued the Madera Unified School District in 2008 to force it to switch to trustee-area elections. Even though the district acquiesced soon after the suit was filed, the lawyers demanded $1.7 million in attorneys fees, sending fear throughout school administration circles statewide and helping to spur the ripple effect.

Robert Rubin, a key attorney behind the legal offensive, often points to the Madera case as a success, noting that the number of Latino school board members has increased from one to four out of seven.

After a long battle, though, an appellate court agreed last month that the attorneys fees should be lowered to $162,500.

With that ruling, school boards now might be less worried about the threat of huge legal fees, said Ron Wenkart, general counsel for the Orange County Department of Education. In contrast to the Central Valley, no districts in Orange County have initiated a switch to trustee-area elections.

Last year, Wenkart advised districts to look into the past electoral success of minority school board candidates. If minority candidates won most of the time, according to his letter, the district will likely prevail in a voting rights lawsuit.

Wenkart, in an interview, also said that if a school board hasn't had any minority candidates, then it probably wouldn't be vulnerable under the law.

"Then there's no history of racially polarized voting," he said.

Paul Mitchell, a Sacramento-based redistricting consultant, disagreed strongly.

"You can't just rest on, 'Well, they don't try,'" Mitchell said. "Making a statement like that in a position of authority is really irresponsible."

Mitchell said Wenkart's letter was overly simplistic and could leave local school districts vulnerable to lawsuits.

In some counties, the issue simply isn't considered urgent. Even though the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors got sued last year, the County Committee on School District Organization is not immediately concerned about lawsuits, said committee Secretary Nancy Magee.

"They see the election system as a separate discussion they're not having right now," she said. "The election conversation hasn't gotten that deep."

Other counties have tried to goad districts into action without success.
The Santa Clara County Board of Education passed a resolution in 2009 encouraging school districts to review their election systems "to ensure the process fully supports the letter as well as the spirit of the CA Voting Rights Act."

Since then, though, only one district in the county has moved to trustee-area elections. Board President Joseph Di Salvo said he has been frustrated at the lack of response. He attributes the inaction to "self-preservation and self-interest" among local school board trustees who don't want to jeopardize their re-elections.

"We haven't been willing to be bold enough about these issues," Di Salvo said. "The status quo is not OK."

The Fresno County Office of Education, on the other hand, took aggressive action and got results. After watching lawsuits hit neighboring jurisdictions, County Superintendent Larry Powell told local districts to get into compliance and ordered a demographic study to get them started. Resistance, he said, would be like "spitting in the wind."

"It doesn't make sense for us not to comply with the law," Powell said. "There was no good reason not to do it, so we took away any reasons they had. ... We tried to say, 'You can't afford not to.'"

The result: 11 school districts in Fresno County have moved to make the switch so far.

Still, not all school boards need to change. Rubin, who helped draft the law and has directed the legal onslaught to enforce it, said parts of the state might not be in violation because voting isn't racially polarized there. Rubin also admits his own limitations.

"We're not going to be able to sue every school district in the state," he said. "So there's going to be some measure of good will and following of the rule of law in order for this to be effectively implemented."

**School boards that applied to switch election systems, by county, since 2005**

Source: California Department of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madera</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stanislaus  2
Amador        1
Mendocino     1
Sacramento     1
San Joaquin   1
Santa Clara   1
Shasta        1
Trinity       1

Agustin Armendariz of the California Watch staff contributed to this report.
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Former Pasadena school board member says new voting districts would be 'a step backward'

Measure A asks voters in Pasadena, Altadena and Sierra Madre whether the Pasadena Unified School District should abandon its at-large board elections for a set of seven geographic voting districts.

April 06, 2012 | by Joe Plessck | joe.plessck@gmail.com

A proposal to elect Pasadena Board of Education members by geographic district is designed to increase the voting power of minority groups and the accountability of the board, but a former school official says the plan would backfire.

Measure A on the June 5 ballot will ask voters in Pasadena, Altadena and Sierra Madre whether the Pasadena Unified School District should abandon its at-large board elections for a set of seven geographic voting districts.
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Stella Murga, executive director of the Pasadena Youth Center and a member of the Pasadena Latino Coalition, said doing away with the predictable costs of running large campaigns will encourage candidates from minority neighborhoods.

Districting Task Force member Roberto Martinez, who is also a member of the Pasadena Latino Coalition, noted that recent school closures have hit hardest in areas including Altadena and Northwest Pasadena, where parents have felt isolated.

"Groups of residents who've not been active may be more likely to participate" under the new plan, Martinez said.

Pasadena Bond of Education members are expected to sign off on the new districting map on April 24, while the decision on whether to implement it rests with voters.

The map creates two Northwest Pasadena districts, where Latinos outnumber other groups, and a west Altadena district that is strongly African American — areas responsible for the majority of school district enrollment.

Four mostly white districts cover east Altadena, west Pasadena, central Pasadena, and link Sierra Madre with the Pasadena's southeast side.

The map would pit some incumbent members of the board against others in the coming years.

Ramon Miranda, the school board’s only Latino member, lives in a portion of Pasadena that was drawn into the west Altadena district, where black voters are strongest.

He would be forced to run against board ally Kim Kenne in 2013 unless Kenne decides to step down at the end of her current term.

The board’s only black member, Renatta Cooper, would run against Tom Sulinske in 2015 in a district with fewer black voters than whites or Latinos.

Ed Honowitz and Elizabeth Pomeroy would square off next year in a diverse central Pasadena district with the highest percentage of Asian voters, and Scott Phelps would be the lone incumbent next year in west Pasadena.
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Facing pressure from minority groups, Mt. SAC board to vote on trustee redistricting plan

By Steve Scauzillo, SGVN San Gabriel Valley Tribune

The Mt. San Antonio College Board of Trustees is poised to change the way each board member is elected, switching from at-large elections to individual districts and expanding the board from five to seven members.

The historic changes are being considered at 6:30 p.m. Wednesday at the Mt. SAC board's regularly scheduled meeting at the community college Founders Hall on the Walnut campus, 1100 N. Grand Ave.

District officials and current board members are responding to a petition filed with the Los Angeles County Office of Education by long-time critic and unsuccessful board candidate John Mendoza of Pomona. Mendoza is calling for more minority representation on the college board by having voters select them from seven different and distinct geographic boundaries across the East San Gabriel Valley.

Failure to act would unleash an official inquiry from LACOE's Committee on School District Organization, which would include public hearings and collection of public testimony, said Matt Spies, secretary to the committee. Spies said Mendoza's petition has about 1,200 valid signatures, enough to qualify for an official action.

Impetus for redrawing the lines comes from data collected during the recent 2010 census and the California Voting Rights Act, Spies said.

College President Bill Scroggins recommends the board move to seven members elected by voting area, called option B-7 in a lengthy report prepared by Redistricting Partners, a consulting firm.

Two new trustee areas would be carved out of the western edge of the college's sprawling overall district, adding one board member from West Covina/Valinda and one from Baldwin Park-Irwindale. The current five members each live in one of the other five trustee areas to the east and south, redrawn as part of option B-7.

"The major issue with redistricting is compliance with the California Voting Rights Act. Option B-7 is most compliant - it creates the most strongly ethnic-centered districts of those that have been drawn," Scroggins said.

The board discussed how to redraw the lines at a study session in early March but put off a vote. According to the minutes from that session, the board wants to move forward with this plan in order to avoid the possibility of a costly lawsuit. The report said an analysis of voting patterns showed "racially polarized voting" among different voting blocs and said the college district is possibly "a target" for a federal lawsuit.
Under the recommended redistricting plan, the college would create four trustee areas that would have a majority of Latinos in the citizen voting age population, and one area with a majority of Asians who are citizens of voting age.

The preferred maps "seek to maximize the number of majority minority and ethnic influence seats" while they "create no displacements of current incumbents," according to the report.

"The purpose of the California Voting Rights Act ... is to increase the influence of underrepresented minorities in elected position," Scroggins said.

If approved by the board, the new maps would take effect in November 2013, Spies said. Two board members, Judy Chen-Haggerty in the Rowland Heights, Diamond Bar, Industry and the southern half of Walnut trustee area; and David Hall, in the Covina-Charter Oak-parts of San Dimas and Walnut trustee area could run in these areas. Also, the election would include candidates in the brand new trustee areas on the western edge not represented by any current board member, Scroggins explained.

Laura Santos, a Bassett Unified School District board member, said she preferred if Bassett was included with Baldwin Park, not with Hacienda Heights. "We feel more of a community of interest with Baldwin Park," Santos said.

Nonetheless, she said she is glad they are considering Latino majority districts. "I think it is a good idea."

Each trustee area is about the same size, between 108,000 and 114,000 in population under the preferred option. The lines are drawn with an eye on communities of interests, while respecting city and school district lines, according to the report.

Contact Steve via email, by phone at 626-962-8811 Ext. 2237, or on Twitter.
NOTICE TO SUBJECT/INTERESTED AGENCIES

Office of Supervisor Antonovich
City of Palmdale – City Clerk
City of Palmdale – Planning Department
Los Angeles County Auditor-Controller
Los Angeles County Chief Executive Office
Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning
Los Angeles County Office of the Assessor
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk
Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department – Enforcement Bureau
Consolidated Fire Protection District of Los Angeles County
Sanitation Districts for Los Angeles County
Antelope Valley Mosquito and Vector Control District
Antelope Valley Resource Conservation District
Antelope Valley Health Care District
Little Rock Creek Irrigation District
Keppel Union School District

Subject: City of Palmdale Annexation No. 2011-19

Notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexation listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) for the County of Los Angeles. The application involves approximately 405 acres of uninhabited, unincorporated territory generally located south of Palmdale Blvd, between 80th Street East and 85th Street East, adjacent to the City of Palmdale. The proposal consists of the following proposed organizational changes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City or District</th>
<th>Change of Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Palmdale</td>
<td>Annexation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope Valley Mosquito and Vector Control District</td>
<td>Annexation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road District No. 5</td>
<td>Detachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Library</td>
<td>Detachment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed application, map and legal are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by April 30, 2012.

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

Date: March 28, 2012
EXHIBIT "A"
LEGAL DESCRIPTION
LAFCO CITY OF PALMDALE
ANEXATION 2011-19

ALL THAT REAL PROPERTY LOCATED WITHIN THE SOUTHWEST ONE-QUARTER OF SECTION 30, T6N, R10W, S.B.M., TOGETHER WITH A PORTION OF THE WEST ONE-HALF OF SECTION 31, T6N, R10W, S.B.M., IN THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID SOUTHWEST ONE-QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 30;

1. THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID SOUTHWEST ONE-QUARTER, A DISTANCE OF 2640 FEET, MORE OR LESS, TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID SOUTHWEST ONE-QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 30, SAID POINT ALSO BEING THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID WEST ONE-HALF OF SAID SECTION 31;

2. THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID WEST LINE, A DISTANCE OF 3960 FEET, MORE OR LESS, TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF THE NORTH ONE-HALF OF THE SOUTHWEST ONE-QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 31, SAID POINT BEING ON THE EXISTING CITY OF PALMDALE BOUNDARY LINE;

3. THENCE WESTERLY ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID NORTH ONE-HALF AND ALONG THE EXISTING CITY OF PALMDALE BOUNDARY LINE, A DISTANCE OF 2640 FEET, MORE OR LESS, TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID NORTH ONE-HALF;

4. THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID SECTION 31 AND ALONG THE EXISTING CITY OF PALMDALE BOUNDARY LINE, A DISTANCE OF 1320 FEET, MORE OR LESS, TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THE NORTHWEST ONE-QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 31;

5. THENCE CONTINUING NORTHERLY ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID SECTION 31 AND ALONG THE EXISTING CITY OF PALMDALE BOUNDARY LINE, A DISTANCE OF 2640 FEET, MORE OR LESS, TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID SECTION 30;

6. THENCE CONTINUING NORTHERLY ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID SECTION 30 AND ALONG THE EXISTING CITY OF PALMDALE BOUNDARY LINE, A DISTANCE OF 2640 FEET, MORE OR LESS, TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID SECTION 30;

7. THENCE EASTERLY ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF THE SOUTHWEST ONE-QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 30 AND LEAVING THE EXISTING CITY OF PALMDALE BOUNDARY LINE, A DISTANCE OF 2640 FEET, MORE OR LESS, TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

CONTAINING APPROXIMATELY 405 ACRES

THIS LEGAL DESCRIPTION WAS PREPARED BY ME OR UNDER MY DIRECTION

THOMAS E. RAGEN, L.S. 6205
EXPIRES: 3/31/2012
APPLICATION TO INITIATE PROCEEDING FOR CHANGE OF
ORGANIZATION/REORGANIZATION/SPECIAL REORGANIZATION
(Pursuant to the Cortese-Knox-Hartzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000,
Division 3, Title 5 Commencing with Section 56000, of the Government Code)

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO: LAFCO City of Palmdale Annexation 2011-19

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)

1. City of Palmdale
2. Antelope Valley Mosquito and Vector Control District
3. Los Angeles County Roads District No. 5
4. Los Angeles County Library District

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

1. Los Angeles County
2. 
3. 
4. 

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

APPLICANT: City of Palmdale

TITLE: 
CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER: City of Palmdale

ADDRESS: 38250 Sierra Hwy

CITY: Palmdale STATE: CA ZIP CODE: 93550

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: Juan Carrillo, Assistant Planner I

E-MAIL ADDRESS: jcarrillo@cityofpalmdale.org

TELEPHONE: 661-267-5200
By submitting this Application to Initiate Proceedings, the applicant acknowledges receipt of the "Instruction for Filing Application for Change of Organization/Reorganization/Special Reorganization" and agrees to be bound by same, including, but not limited to the provisions contained therein regarding filing and processing fees, and defense and indemnification of the Commission.

INDEMNIFICATION / LEGAL DEFENSE

As a condition of any LAFCO approval, the applicant shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless LAFCO and its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against LAFCO or its agents, officers, and employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul the approval of LAFCO concerning the processing of the proposal or any action relating to, or arising out of, such approval. At the discretion of the Executive Officer, a deposit of funds by the applicant may be required in an amount sufficient to cover the anticipated litigation costs.

SIGNATURE: [Signature]  DATE: March 7, 2012

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:

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

The proposed annexation is located between Palmdale Boulevard and the alignment of Avenue R-12 and between 80th Street East and the alignment of 85th Street East.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:

405 Acres

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

☐ Yes

☒ No
GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

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

The proposed annexation consists of a total of 39 vacant parcels. Ownership of the 39 parcels consists of 22 different property owners with 255 acres under one ownership and the remaining 160 acres owned by 21 different entities. The proposed site is within unincorporated Los Angeles County and no development is proposed at this time.

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

The proposed annexation area is a relatively flat area with no major landforms or areas with landslide potential. It is located on the western side of the Littlerock Creek alluvial fan which has been classified as a Regionally Significant Mineral Resource Area.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. What is the current population of the subject territory? 0 Inhabitants

2. If the proposal includes development, what is the estimated population of the proposed area? No development is proposed

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

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory.
   22

5. What is the proximity of the subject territory to other populated areas?

There are existing residential uses approximately 2,500 feet to the east, within the unincorporated area of Sun Village, and approximately one mile to the west within the City of Palmdale.
6. What is the likelihood of significant growth in the area; and in adjacent incorporated and unincorporated areas within the next ten years?

It is very unlikely that any significant growth will result from the proposed annexation. The proposed site is immediately adjacent to the Litterrock Creek alluvial fan which has been identified as a Regionally Significant Mineral Resource Area. The Pre-Zone designation of the site is QR-PZ (Quarry and Reclamation, Pre-Zone)

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:

N/A

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

The QR Pre-Zone designation of the site does not permit for residential uses, therefore annexation will not assist the City in meeting the RHNA numbers for the City of Palmdale as set by SCAG.

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

The proposal to annex the 405 acres into the City of Palmdale does not include a project at this time. The site will remain as is until a project is proposed. At the time a project is proposed an environmental document will be prepared as required by CEQA. However, given the underlying zoning designation, public facilities and public services are not expected to be impacted.

LAND USE AND ZONING

1. What is the assessed land valuation of the subject territory (give source and date of information)?

$2,516,514 Obtained from the Assessors office website

2. What is the current land use and zoning designation within the subject area?

N1 (Non-Urban) / A2 (Heavy Agricultural) within unincorporated Los Angeles County

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

SP-14 (Specific Plan-Eastside Quarry-Proposed) / MRE (Mineral Resource Extraction)
4. Describe any proposed change in land use and zoning as a result of this proposal (including, if applicable, pre-zoning by an affected city).

The proposed annexation area has a General Plan Land Use designation of MRE (Mineral Resource Extraction) and is zoned is QR-PZ (Quarry and Reclamation, Pre-Zone) and no change of land use or zoning is proposed.

5. What is the land use in the surrounding area? Be specific.

Vacant land within Los Angeles County to the north and east, and vacant land to the south and west within the City of Palmdale.

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

SP-14 (Specific Plan-Eastside Quarry-Proposed) / MRE (Mineral Resource Extraction)

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

Yes, the proposal is consistent with the City's General Plan and proposed Specific Plan.

8. Will this proposal result in development of property now or in the near future? Describe the type of development proposed (type of business or industry, single-family or multi-family residential, etc., and number of units or facilities).

No development is proposed at this time. Future development of the site would include any of the permitted uses in the QR zone.

9. What effect would denial of this proposal have on the proposed development, if any?

When future development is proposed, the site may provide a large number of employment opportunities to the Antelope Valley and nearby residents. If the proposal is denied, the site may remain vacant for a longer period of time minimizing potential employment opportunities in the future. Further, development applications would have to be processed through Los Angeles County possibly requiring more time and cost.
10. Is the subject territory currently within a redevelopment area or proposed to be included within a redevelopment project area upon completion of this proposal?

No, it is not.

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

No agricultural land exists within the annexation area. The Littlerock Creek is located to the east of the site and it will remain as open space with no immediate future plans to modify its natural state.

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

The proposed site is within the City’s Sphere of Influence and has been identified as a Regionally Significant Mineral Resource Area as mandated by the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975. Potential interest may exist from mining companies for the proposed annexation into the City of Palmdale. There are six mining operators to the west, south, and southwest of the proposed site within the City of Palmdale. A future project would provide employment opportunities and improve the housing and jobs balance per the General Plan. With a future development on the site the economic vitality of the City may also expand which is another goal of the City’s general Plan. Additionally, the potential aggregate material that could be extracted from the site will also alleviate the scarcity of sand and gravel to the construction industry making the State of California more prepared for the expected growth in the construction industry.

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

a. Adjacent areas:

The proposed site is within the Los Angeles County jurisdiction with a Land Use of N1 and Zoning designation of A2 (Heavy Agricultural) which does not permit for mineral extraction. With the site classified as Regionally Significant Mineral Resource Area, Los Angeles County will have to modify the General Plan and Zoning of the Site to permit mineral extraction. The City of Palmdale has Pre-Zoned the area QR (Quarry and Reclamation) which allows for mineral extraction within the classified Regionally Significant Mineral Resource Area. Another alternative action is to leave the site as is which may be the case since no project has been submitted with the proposed annexation.

b. Mutual social and economic interests:

The proposed annexation and future development of the site may create employment opportunities. Future mineral extraction may provide potentially significant cost savings providing aggregate materials to the local construction industry and local street improvement projects. Those benefits include a reduction in emissions from trucks with the reduction of truck miles traveled for hauling aggregates, reduction of pavement deterioration from fewer truck miles traveled, shorter hauling distance reducing aggregate-truck miles of travel and the cost of the material. An even bigger benefit will be the potential reduction of green-house gases (GHG's), which is State wide goal, by lowering vehicle miles traveled (VMTs).
c. The local government structure of the County:

The proposed annexation is within the Los Angeles County jurisdiction, as well as within the City of Palmdale's Sphere of Influence. The Local Agency Forming Commission for Los Angeles County is the responsible authority to coordinate logical and timely changes in local governmental boundaries. The proposed annexation is essential to the social, fiscal, and economic well being of the State. As such, the local government structure of the County will not have any negative effects due to the proposed 405-acre annexation which is approximately 90 miles to the northeast of its administrative offices. With the proposed annexation, the County will not have to provide any future services to the site if it were developed.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

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

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

Currently, there are minimal fire and police services needed due to the area being vacant in comparison to a commercial or residential area where fire and policing services are more prominent. The proposed annexation area will not demand more police or fire services due to the nature of the future land use, if the annexation is approved. Fire and police services are provided by the Los Angeles County Fire Department and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department by an annual contract. This contract is reviewed annually and any additional services are provided Citywide. If future development is proposed, development fees will apply to finance any increase in fire and police services.

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

The proposed annexation area is vacant land with no project currently proposed. If future development is proposed, development fees will be applicable and government services provided according to the proposed project. Any future development will have to be in accordance with permitted uses for the QR (Quarry and reclamation) zoning designation. No commercial or residential development is permitted, nor will it be supported. Fire and policing services will be provided by the City of Palmdale if the proposed annexation is approved and the costs associated with those services will be financed through development fees when a project is proposed.

3. If the proposal includes incorporation, formation, or annexation, what will be the effect of this proposal or exclusion and of alternative courses of action on the cost and adequacy of services and controls in the proposed area and adjacent areas?

The proposed 405-acre annexation area is classified as a Regionally Significant Mineral Resource Area and the future use will likely be an aggregate related use as permitted in the QR zone. If the annexation is approved, additional aggregate material will be available for the construction industry and for the maintenance of local roads upon approval of an aggregate mining use. An alternative course of action would be to leave the land vacant. Currently, the adequacy of services and controls in the proposed 405-acre annexation area and adjacent areas is adequate, with minimal services required. With the approval of the annexation and future land use, a minimal increase in the adequacy of services and controls in the area would be expected since no commercial or residential development would be permitted.
4. If, as a result of this proposal, increased service demand exceeds the existing capacity, describe what will be done by the service provider to increase capacity of services.

There will be no increased service demand as a result of this proposal. The proposed annexation area does not include a project. If a future development is proposed, development fees will finance the required services which are minimal due to the potential proposed land use of mineral extraction or other aggregate related uses.

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

Police contract fees paid by the City of Palmdale will likely remain the same due to minimal increased City area. Street maintenance on Palmdale Boulevard along the annexation frontage will be provided by the City of Palmdale, if the annexation is approved. No assessments, or other charges will result as part of this proposal.

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

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

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

   Yes ☑ Name of Agency City of Palmdale No ☐

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

   The Sun Village Town Council expressed concerns over the proposed annexation. City staff attended one of the Town Council meetings at the request of the Sun Village Town Council on September 28, 2011. At the meeting, Sun Village residents were concerned that the Sun Village boundaries were being encroached upon with the proposed annexation. Mr. Norm Hickling, Field Deputy of Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich, also attended the meeting to answer any concerns that the Town Council had.

3. If the proposal includes a request for a city sphere of influence update, provide a written statement on whether an agreement on the sphere change between the city and the county was achieved. Please provide a copy of the written agreement pursuant to Government Code Section 56425(b).

   The annexation does not propose a Sphere of Influence update.
BONDED INDEBTNESS

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

Yes, the parcels involved in the proposed annexation have a Community College, and a High School voted indebtedness.

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

The existing voted indebtedness is for Community College and High School districts. The Antelope Valley College serves the City of Palmdale as well as the unincorporated areas of the Los Angeles County in the Antelope Valley, therefore it will remain the same. The High School voted indebtedness will also remain the same since the annexation area does not propose to change high school district boundaries.

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

The liability will remain as stipulated at the time of the voted indebtedness.

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

N/A

NOTIFICATION

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Roger Chortliuk</td>
<td>200 S. Main St., Suite 200 Corona, CA 92882</td>
<td>951-634-7128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Village Town Council</td>
<td>P.O. Box 151 Littlerock, CA 93543</td>
<td>661-609-7212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juan Carrillo</td>
<td>38250 Sierra Hwy Palmdale, CA 93550</td>
<td>661-267-5200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams Bennett Investments, LLC</td>
<td>200 S. Main St., Suite 200 Corona, CA 92882</td>
<td>951-634-7128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals

May 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 April 17, 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

- 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)

May 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 April 17, 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 Brann, then Superintendent of Wiseburn SD, appeared before the County Committee to inform them that the SBE would withdraw its approval of the petition, pending a negotiation with Petitioners and attorneys for Centinela Valley UHSD. On January 13, 2005, the CDE withdrew its recommendation to the SBE to approve the Wiseburn USD petition and order the election to be conducted within the territory of the Wiseburn SD. Staff at the CDE informed LACOE staff that they intended to redo the review process related to CEQA and to return the petition to the SBE for action at a later time (not to the County Committee). Subsequently, the SBE rescinded its previous approval of the Wiseburn SD’s unification petition.

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

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

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

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

* 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 Johnston. 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 its 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.

**Status:** Petition on hold; Wiseburn SD negotiating legislation and agreement with Centinela Valley UHSD; County Committee to review letter to the SBE.

**Status Date:** April 17, 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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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 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 will also participate in any public hearing scheduled by the County Committee.

* Indicates update from previous summary.
Staff has gathered availability for County Committee members throughout May 2012 and will schedule a public hearing and provide all the requisite notices.

*Status: Pomona USD governing board to review alternative trustee area proposals; County Committee public hearing anticipated in May 2012.

**Status Date:** April 17, 2012

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

On February 26, 2010, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to BC §5019 to increase the number of trustees from five to seven, to establish trustee areas, and to require trustee area voting within the Mount San Antonio CCD. The request was submitted by chief petitioner Mr. Mendoza. The petition was forwarded to County Counsel to determine its legal compliance regarding format and content. County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient and staff returned the petition to the chief petitioner on March 12, 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 Mount San Antonio CCD (the addition of two governing board members and the creation of trustee areas). It was submitted under BC §5019(c) and, based on the number of registered voters in the Mount San Antonio CCD, requires valid signatures from at least 1000 registered voters within the petition area.

On February 15, 2012, the chief petitioner submitted signed petitions for review. Staff conveyed the signed petitions to the Registrar-Recorder for signature verification on February 24, 2012.

Staff immediately contacted Dr. Bill Scroggin, President/CEO of the Mount San Antonio CCD, to advise him on the submission of the petition. Dr. Scroggin advised staff that the district was already undergoing the process to move to a trustee area voting system under an expanded board. They have passed district resolutions and hired demographers who have studied the district and the issue of trustee area voting under the CVRA, and have developed multiple alternative plans. Dr. Scroggin advised that a review by the board of these plans, and a selection of one of them to implement for its next regular election, was imminent. He also stated that the board would seek a waiver for an approval election of any trustee area plan adopted, under the California Community College Chancellor's office. Dr. Scroggin stated that he would keep staff apprised of developments with the district and its trustee area plan process.

On March 12, 2012, the Registrar-Recorder reported that the petitions contained 1212 valid signatures out of 1339 signatures submitted. The Registrar-Recorder also reported that the number of registered voters in the Mount San Antonio CCD was 349,833. Under the guidelines of BC §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.
Staff contacted the chief petitioner and followed up with a letter explaining the status of the petition on March 12, 2012. Staff also contacted the Mount San Antonio CCD and advised them of the sufficiency of the petition. District staff informed LACOE staff that the Mount San Antonio CCD governing board had hired a demographer and was developing a trustee area plan that included seven trustee areas and seven board members. At its March 28, 2012, meeting the Mount San Antonio CCD governing board approved the seven member trustee area plan. The petition will be presented to the County Committee at its May 2, 2012, meeting. At that meeting, staff will update the County Committee on the district’s progress toward implementing the approved trustee area voting plan, coordination with the Registrar-Recorder, and the scheduling of a public hearing within the district.

*Status: Petition valid; to be presented to the County Committee at its next meeting; trustee area plan approved by district; public hearing schedule pending.

Status Date: April 17, 2012

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

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

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 BC §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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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.