August 16, 2011

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, September 7, 2011

The next regular meeting of the County Committee will be held at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, September 7, 2011, in the Board Room of the Los Angeles County Office of Education, located at 9300 Imperial Highway in Downey. Reserved parking spaces will be available on the east side of the building just south of the main entrance.

Attached is the agenda for the meeting of September 7, 2011.

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

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

Regular Meeting

Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE)
Board Room
September 7, 2011
9:30 a.m.

I  Information
D  Discussion
A  Action
*  Sent to Committee

I. CALL TO ORDER---Chairperson Mt. John Nunez

II. FLAG SALUTE—Mr. Nunez

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES  I, D, A*

The minutes of the regular meeting of the County Committee, held on
July 6, 2011, will be submitted for approval.

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

Correspondence

• A July 25, 2011, letter from the Centinela Valley Union High School
  District (UHSD) in response to the County Committee’s letter concerning
  the Wiseburn SD unification proposal. (Attachment 1)

Newspaper Articles

• A July 29, 2011, article from the Los Angeles Times—“California
  redistricting panel got earful about draft maps.” (Attachment 2)

• A July 29, 2011, article from the Los Angeles Times—“Citizens panel
  gives initial approval to new political districts.” (Attachment 3)

Informational Correspondence

• An August 3, 2011, Local Agency Formation Commission Notice to
  Subject/Interested Agencies concerning City of Long Beach
  Reorganization No. 2011-13 (Los Angeles/Orange County Boundary
  Adjustment). (Attachment 4)
V. PRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

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

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

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

VII. REVIEW OF REGIONAL ISSUES RELATED TO THE PROPOSED FORMATION OF A WISEBURN USD

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

VIII. REVIEW OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

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

IX. UPDATE ON LOS ANGELES USD REORGANIZATION PROPOSALS

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

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

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

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

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

I, D
XI. ADDITIONAL COMMUNICATIONS, CONCERNS, OR ITEMS FOR NEXT AGENDA

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

Regular Meeting
July 6, 2011

The Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) met on Wednesday, July 6, 2011, at the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) in Downey. The meeting was called to order at 9:34 a.m. by Chairperson Mr. John Nunez, who lead the flag salute.

Members Present
Frank Bostrom
Lloyd de Llamas
Owen Griffith
Joan Jakubowski
Maurice Kunkel
John Nunez
Frank Ogaz
Suzan Solomon
AJ Willmer

Members Absent
Maria Calix

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

Mr. Nunez suggested that after approval of the minutes (Agenda Item III), that Agenda Item VII be moved ahead of other agenda items for discussion and to allow for presentations from the audience concerning the item.

It was MOVED by Mr. Bostrom and SECONDED by Mr. Griffith that the minutes of the regular meeting held on April 6, 2011, be approved. The motion CARRIED with two abstentions from Ms. Solomon and Mr. Ogaz.

Approval of
the Regular Meeting
Minutes of
April 6, 2011
Motion #1

It was MOVED by Mr. Bostrom and SECONDED by Ms. Jakubowski that there be a change in the order of the agenda, and that Agenda Item VII be moved to the front of the agenda. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

Motion #2
Mr. Spies provided an overview of recent activities and issues related to the proposed formation of a Wiseburn USD, and the meetings held with the impacted districts within the Centinela Valley UHSD region concerning a local solution to provide a better educational environment to students. He stated that LACOE staff had attended three of these meetings to listen to discussions and to be present as a resource on school district organization. Mr. Spies stated that the last meeting LACOE was asked to attend was scheduled to be held in May but the meeting was cancelled. He stated that Ms. Sharon Harvey, LACOE staff, tried to reschedule a meeting before June 30 but she was unsuccessful, and she has now been reassigned so will no longer be involved. Mr. Spies referred members to a letter in the folders that the County Committee requested regarding actions taken by the County Committee in 2002 on the proposal, committees awareness of the recent district meetings, and a request of updates from the impacted districts.

Mr. Nunez asked members for any questions or comments regarding Mr. Spies overview and there were none. He commented that the County Committee had met on the subject twice concerning the letter and that the information had been shared with the Wiseburn SD. He went on to say that the committee felt that there was a stagnation in resolving the issue, and that the impacted districts needed to move forward and make a decision. Mr. Nunez stated that the County Committee also has an obligation as a committee to look into the possibilities of what could happen if the involved districts cannot make a decision; and this is why the letter was sent. He asked the members for further comments and there were none. Mr. Nunez called on members of the audience concerning this agenda item.

Dr. Tom Johnstone, Superintendent of the Wiseburn SD, addressed the County Committee stating that the district appreciated the letter sent by the County Committee and that the district shared the committees sentiment in that it seemed the process was stagnant. He stated that the proposal had been sent to the State Board of Education (SBE) in 2004 and the Wiseburn unification was approved by a vote of 10-0, but the process was stopped by litigation involved around an environmental review. He continued stating that the proposal came back up to the SBE in 2009 with the completion of the environmental impact report (EIR) but he was not going to go into what the report said. Dr. Johnstone stated that the SBE approved the Wiseburn unification proposal with an area wide vote but because of the language of the ballot measure, it was not going to be favorable to Wiseburn because the district is only 13 percent of the voting population in the Centinela Valley UHSD. He went on to say that the sentiment of the community was that it would have been a big loser for the district, so a decision was made to work with the impacted districts to come up with a solution. Dr. Johnstone went on to say that three meetings have been held and they are working ahead, and the language of the County Committee’s letter is very accurate in that there is not a unanimous opinion on how to resolve the situation. He referred to a portion of the County Committee’s letter regarding the committee’s concern “that any resolution of the original petition request focus on the
interest of the local community members who moved for the petition and most importantly on the interests of the thousands of students who could be impacted.” Dr. Johnstone continued that the district shared the committee’s concerns especially since in September this year it will be ten years that this proposal started, and most importantly because of the 292 students that graduated from Dana Middle School in 2010, only 17 of the Wiseburn SD students chose to attend the Centinela Valley UHSD. He went on to say that the Wiseburn SD community passed a bond of $87 million to build their own high school. Dr. Johnstone stated that the district was going to push ahead for unification, and that he and Mr. Fernandez were working with their attorneys to draft language to come up with a resolution that would leave the Centinela Valley UHSD whole for their future bonding capacity. He commented that one of the sticking points was the wide area vote and the issue is being worked on, but he believes the Wiseburn community would support the wide area vote and they would like to bring the proposal to an end within the next 18 months. Dr. Johnstone then asked for questions from the County Committee.

Mr. Willner inquired about the district’s opinion on requesting approval of the EIR that is in place?

Dr. Johnstone responded that since the EIR has a shelf life of five years, the district would like to see it approved since the State has spent a lot of money on it.

Ms. Jakubowski inquired about the bonding capacity of the district and whether the district has addressed the issue, and does the district feel that it would still be financially sound?

Dr. Johnstone responded that as far as their future bonding capacity, the district would maintain all of its elementary K-8 capacity; and as far as the high school capacity, that would include the commercial area of eastern El Segundo which represents 36 percent of Centinela Valley UHSD’s bonding capacity. He continued that if this were taken out the Wiseburn SD would be in better shape but it would also leave Centinela Valley UHSD in a very precarious situation which the district knows would end up in litigation, and the Wiseburn SD just wants to resolve this. Dr. Johnstone stated that the Wiseburn community just passed an $87 million bond without this and would maintain the residential portions of the Holly Glen and Wiseburn communities which is nine percent of the Centinela Valley UHSD bonding capacity so the K-8 bonding capacity would go up slightly or stay the same, and 20 percent of the high school bonding capacity would be kept so Wiseburn SD would lose 80 percent to Centinela Valley UHSD so in terms of operation, the district would not be impacted in its future bonding capacity.

Mr. Nunez thanked Dr. Johnstone and called on Dr. Fred Navarro, Superintendent of the Lennox SD, to address the County Committee.
Dr. Navarro stated that he was happy to hear that the Wiseburn SD was in favor of an area wide vote because the Lennox SD’s constituents would only agree to the proposal if there were an area wide vote. He went on to say that the Lennox SD was an unincorporated area of Los Angeles County and one of the densest in population because they are a district of 6,000 in population in a 1.3 square mile area. Dr. Navarro stated that he realizes there is an agreement being made by Wiseburn SD and Centinela Valley UHSD for the bonding capacity, but when Dr. Johnstone and Mr. Fernandez are long gone years from now who is to say that won’t change through some other legislation, and if that is going to be part of this deal then the Lennox SD would like their constituents to have a say on what is going to happen in the future of their students because no one knows what is going to happen.

Mr. Nunez asked the County Committee if they had any questions.

Mr. Bostrom inquired that if the district is in favor of an area wide vote, how soon will your district be able to take a position on it as a board?

Dr. Navarro responded that it would just be a matter of going back to the board and adopting a resolution at a board meeting stating its position.

Mr. Nunez thanked Dr. Navarro and called on Dr. Ellen Dougherty, Superintendent of the Lawndale SD.

Dr. Dougherty addressed the fact that she disagreed with what was said in the letter and there were many inaccuracies in the letter as well as the County Committee’s minutes of April 6, 2011. She stated that the main thing that needed to be said is that there are two different issues—there is a regional solution that all superintendents met 20 years ago to try and work on and there is Wiseburn unification; this is about Wiseburn unification not a regional solution. Dr. Dougherty continued that it is not a regional solution for our students and there are 19,500 students between Lennox, Lawndale, and Hawthorne that have not gotten a voice in this, and have not gotten a chance to clarify the letter or to clarify the minutes. She also stated that the minutes contained an e-mail that she did and she did not know how it got there and it was not addressed in the minutes correctly. Dr. Dougherty went on to say that her board was directing her to listen to all sides of the issue and it is not just a Centinela Valley/Wiseburn issue, there are three other school districts and a lot of other students that will be affected by this decision.

Mr. Nunez asked the County Committee if they had any questions.

Mr. Bostrom inquired about what the inaccuracies were so that it could be a matter of record for the committee?

Dr. Dougherty responded that there were inaccuracies in the letter and parts of the minutes from the last meeting as far as the whole idea of why the districts met, how they met, and the purpose of the meetings—they were inaccurately addressed.
Mr. Nunez asked Dr. Dougherty to clarify the letter and minutes she spoke about.

Dr. Dougherty clarified that it was the letter Mr. Nunez had recently sent to all affected districts and the County Committee’s April meeting minutes. She stated that the County Committee should meet with the other three elementary districts that are being affected by this, and that it would be an important step before such an important decision is made.

Ms. Jakubowski asked for page or reference clarification regarding the inaccuracies of the April meeting minutes.

Dr. Dougherty responded that from Page 6 on of the minutes, there are statements like “superintendents don’t pass the information on to their boards.” She went on to say that their boards are part of those meetings and at the direction of their boards they were at this meeting, so they do understand the issue deeply. She explained that the “Wiseburn deal” subject came up at one of the district regional solution meetings because none of the districts in attendance knew anything about this so they started asking questions about it and the legislation.

Ms. Deegan asked Dr. Dougherty to submit a letter outlining the inaccuracies of the letter and minutes in greater detail.

Dr. Dougherty agreed to submit the letter.

Mr. Willmer commented that the County Committee’s concern was that a local solution was not going to happen and they preferred that this be resolved by the impacted constituents. He went on to say that the purpose of the notice was to let the districts know that if this was not resolved by the impacted constituents and they did not come up with a solution, then the County Committee would take their prerogative to reinstate the process by open meetings, noticed meetings, in a very public manner. Mr. Willmer stated that the County Committee was looking for a local solution but if this does not happen, then the committee will discuss what prerogatives they have to open the process again.

Dr. Dougherty asked Mr. Willmer what he meant by a local solution?

Mr. Nunez spoke on behalf of the County Committee stating that they want the impacted districts to solve the problems in the area as far as the Wiseburn SD unification issue-size of voting area, who gets to vote, and the revenue still needs to be figured out. He continued that the districts need to solve this because if the County Committee has to figure out a solution, they may not see the issue like the districts do so it’s very important that this come to an end and get solved.

Mr. de Llamas asked Dr. Dougherty for clarification regarding the districts meeting 20 years ago.
Dr. Dougherty responded that the previous superintendents of the districts met 20 years ago to come up with a regional solution and they discussed how the different high schools would be part of their own area—Lawndale High School would stay with Lawndale; Hawthorne High School would stay with Hawthorne—while this was going on, that is when Wiseburn SD went off on their own to try to unify and the regional solution was halted. She stated that they are not sure if their solution is to stay K-8 districts and feed into Centinela Valley UHSD, but if that is their solution then a regional vote needs to happen so that the taxpayers can weigh in on the decision.

Mr. de Llamas commented that 20 years is two generations of students going through the system, and 20 years is a solution of doing nothing.

Dr. Dougherty responded that if the solution is to stay K-8 schools and to feed into Centinela Valley UHSD then that may be their solution, and there may be one district that does not want to do that but for the rest of us that may be our solution.

Mr. Bostrom stated that there seemed to be a problem in the definition of terms—what is a regional solution and what is germane to the Wiseburn application? He went on to say that an argument could be made that the Wiseburn situation should be incorporated into a regional solution but by definition those are two different issues and the County Committee needs to follow the procedures of the Wiseburn application as it was submitted, so clarification needs to be done because the two issues are being used interchangeably and it's causing some confusion.

Mr. Ogaz commented that it has been ten years since the issue started in 2001 and the County Committee held several public hearings where the constituents of the communities at that time—Wiseburn and Centinela Valley UHSD—were the primary stakeholders and this is where it started. He continued that now other districts have joined in and ten years have passed and nothing has still happened, and trying to resolve this with a regional solution has not happened and the issue is still at square one. Mr. Ogaz stated that the district regional meetings being held should be better communicated to the County Committee and there should be no attempt by Wiseburn SD or any other district to circumvent the County Committee’s decision on the proposal and that has been sent to the SBE. He went on to say that there has been at least one SBE meeting on the proposal that was cancelled because Wiseburn SD could not make the meeting and because of reasons like this, the proposal is not moving forward and its time that the affected districts focus on the matter for the students because ten years is just too long without a solution. Mr. Ogaz suggested that the County Committee bring back the issue to the committee level and make a decision that would be beneficial to all, especially because the other districts who were not involved from the beginning are now coming forward due to the regional meetings being held in the area and it is now a larger issue than before.
Mr. Nunez commented that what is being heard is the tone of the County Committee's meetings of the last two years, and what we are hearing is that there is a problem in the area and at one time there was regional planning going on but then one district (and they had the right to) decided that they wanted to do something else. He stated that discussions were held concerning what should be done ten years ago, and the County Committee as well as the SBE agreed that the one district should do what they wanted, and the fact of the matter is that the process can not be stopped because of the guidelines that need to be followed. Mr. Nunez stated that another 20 years without a solution can not go on because the demographics as well as other changes can take place in the area.

Dr. Dougherty responded that maybe the district boards now just want to stay K-8 districts without a regional solution and maybe 20 years ago they did want a regional solution, but now with one district trying to pull out, it could mean large ramifications for the other districts.

Mr. Nunez called on Mr. Jose Fernandez, Superintendent of the Centinela Valley UHSD, to address the County Committee.

Mr. Fernandez stated that the discussions being held were very informative and laid out some of the problems the district is facing. He went on to say that the process did work and it went up to the SBE and it was placed on the agenda, and 72 hours prior to the meeting the Wiseburn SD asked that the agenda item be pulled and if this had not happened an election would have been held and the issue would have been resolved. Mr. Fernandez continued that it was not Centinela Valley UHSD or any of the other three feeder districts that requested that the agenda item be withheld it was Wiseburn SD, and he wanted to make sure the County Committee understood this. He stated that his understanding of why the item was withheld is because Wiseburn SD was not happy that all stakeholders would have a say in the outcome, and Centinela Valley UHSD's position has always been that every resident of the district and everyone impacted by this decision should have a say in the outcome.

Mr. Fernandez stated that he concurred with the statements from the Lawndale and Lennox SDs that education needs to occur and that there are inaccuracies in the minutes-lack of information-and that they also have issues with the letter from Mr. Nunez, and would provide those discrepancies and misconceptions in writing to the County Committee. He suggested that the County Committee meet with all the impacted districts to get input and points of view, and that a regional solution would be the best thing but there is a difference between a regional solution and a Wiseburn SD unification and there is a lot of misinformation.

Mr. Nunez asked County Committee members for questions.

Ms. Jakubowski asked Mr. Fernandez if his district has submitted current information to LACOE as far as how many students the district actually receives from each of the feeder districts?
Mr. Fernandez responded that he was not aware that the County Committee was dealing with this issue for the past two years, and the only reason he was at this meeting today was because Dr. Dougherty (Lawndale SD) informed him that his district was on the agenda and the Wiseburn SD issue was going to be discussed. He continued that most of the other districts did not know that this issue was being discussed at this level for the past two years, they all thought it was at the State level and their focus was to work with the State.

Ms. Jakubowski asked that her question be answered concerning number of students from the feeder districts.

Mr. Fernandez responded that he was not sure if LACOE had current information but the number of students from Wiseburn SD was very small.

Ms. Jakubowski asked staff if it were possible to get the information.

Ms. Deegan responded that the information currently available is total enrollment in eighth grade in all the feeder districts and the information is from the State data, also the ninth grade enrollment in the Centinela Valley UHSD. She continued that the only information not available was the home district of the enrolled ninth graders and each feeder district would have to provide that information, and a request for the information will be made.

Mr. Ogaz commented that the County Committee is well aware about the district regional meetings but for the past two years have wondered what has happened, what successes have you had, and what advances have you had, in the planning and getting together to come up with a consensus and a decision to finally get this issue resolved and it hasn’t happened. He went on to say that they have asked staff to keep them updated on the status of this issue, and that is why this item was agendized because the County Committee would like to know where it stands. Mr. Ogaz stated that this issue started ten years ago and at that time the County Committee made its decision regarding the vote between Centinela Valley UHSD and Wiseburn SD, and the decision was that the vote would be between all the feeder districts which included Wiseburn SD, but Wiseburn SD was not in favor of the decision. He continued that although the County Committee’s decision was based on a total review, input from the community at the meetings held, and the information available concerning ethnicity, demographics, and student enrollment, it was determined that the proposal move forward to the SBE, and it is now on hold either for political or other reasons and its time that it be finalized. Mr. Ogaz stated that if the County Committee is going to request additional information from the other impacted districts, when it was just Centinela Valley UHSD and Wiseburn SD before, does this mean the request for additional information starts the process over again from the beginning or do you add on to the current information due to the fact that
the districts have had the regional meetings and the County Committee is not aware of what has been discussed or planned or how often the districts have been meeting?

Mr. Fernandez responded that since he has been superintendent, the main issue has been whether everyone has a say in the outcome or whether Wiseburn SD determines its own fate on its own, that has always been the argument. He went on to say that their position has always been that all stakeholders should have a say in the outcome since they will be impacted by the decision. Mr. Fernandez stated that his district did not oppose the decision of the SBE which called for everyone to have a say in the outcome and his district would have accepted the outcome, but it was Wiseburn SD that delayed the process not his district.

Mr. Ogaz reiterated his comments that from the beginning it was Wiseburn SD’s petition to break away from the Centinela Valley UHSD and that was the original issue. He went on to say that the County Committee’s decision was based only on whether Wiseburn SD would be allowed to break away and who would decide the matter-voters residing in the Wiseburn SD or the total Centinela Valley UHSD area, and it was the County Committee’s decision to allow the total Centinela Valley UHSD area to vote, and as far as the County Committee there has been no change in that decision. Mr. Ogaz stated that now with the regional meetings the districts have held this could change the complexity of the issue because now there are other voices, concerns, and issues that are coming forward so does the County Committee start over again and that is the current issue.

Mr. Nunez asked Mr. Fernandez that since his district was not at the first regional meeting, whether the district had representatives at the other regional meetings held?

Mr. Fernandez responded that he as well as the district board president, board vice president, and other board members have been present at those meetings.

Mr. Willmer asked that a correction be made on the history of this issue. He stated that at the County Committee’s hearing the recommendation was for a full Centinela Valley UHSD vote and it then got appealed at the SBE, and at that time the SBE crafted some environmental impact issues that dealt with some of the bonding capacity and then the SBE recommended a vote only in the Wiseburn SD area. Mr. Willmer confirmed that at that point the Centinela Valley UHSD legally filed to stop the process, so the initial SBE recommendation was for the Wiseburn SD voting area only and based on actions by the Centinela Valley UHSD, a larger EIR was filed and a subsequent recommendation was made for a larger vote. He went on to say that he agreed with Mr. Ogaz in that the County Committee stands on their decision made at the time the proposal was presented and felt that if the County Committee has to review the proposal again, their recommendations could change.
Mr. Bostrom commented that it is important to stay focused because there is a regional issue, which is yet to be defined, and the Wiseburn SD issue. He stated that he felt that the County Committee cannot go back to revisit an issue that has already been voted on based on a new definition, unless the whole process is revisited.

Mr. Nunez stated that the County Committee needs to look at the Wiseburn SD unification issue only, and he understands that there is a regional issue in the area that could possibly come before the County Committee in many different ways, but right now the Wiseburn SD unification issue needs to be resolved either by a vote to unify or not to unify, it needs to be completed and finished.

Mr. Fernandez reiterated that it was not his district who stopped the process and they would like this issue to also come to a close.

Mr. Bostrom asked Mr. Fernandez if his board would be willing to go on record supporting an area wide election and ask that it be held ASAP?

Mr. Fernandez responded that his board is prepared for an area wide solution but has not asked about election dates and there has not been any opposition to that, and he stated that the board president was present to address that issue.

Mr. Nunez called on Mr. Hugo Rojas II, Centinela Valley UHSD Board President, to address the County Committee.

Mr. Rojas stated that because Mr. Fernandez had already spoke on some of the issues, he was just going to stress some items on behalf of the district board, such as (1) all districts need to be involved in this process; (2) all stakeholders should be involved since there are 163,000 residents in the area. He went on to say that this issue is fairly new to him as a board member of the district because he has been there for a little over a year, but is becoming very educated on how the process works and he commended the County Committee. Mr. Rojas stated that he was also present at the feeder district meetings.

Mr. Bostrom asked Mr. Rojas that the term “the vote should be conducted in Centinela Valley UHSD” and another one is “all affected school districts in the area,” which would be regional, so which is it, and would your board be willing to support the original recommendation that it be Centinela Valley UHSD only, or is the board looking to change the recommendation to an area wide vote?

Mr. Rojas responded that they are looking at an area wide vote, that all districts and voters have a say in the process, and because this has gone back and forth he is trying to get all the facts from the County Committee as well as the district because there can sometimes be some misconception of the information.
Mr. Nunez thanked Mr. Rojas and called on Ms. Janet Mueller, Dannis Woliver Kelley Law Firm and Legal Counsel for the Centinela Valley UHSD.

Ms. Mueller stated that she was not going to repeat what had already been discussed but was going to focus on key legal issues. She reiterated that the district would be happy to meet the timeline specified in the letter and they would also use the time to correct and/or raise some legal issues that exist and that need to be clarified. Ms. Mueller stated that the CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) process issue that has been discussed at great length could be significant and needs to be resolved, and the basis of the idea that an EIR has a five year life is something she has never heard and does not know where the idea comes from. She continued that she encourages the County Committee to be aware of the fact that anytime an EIR becomes outdated either because of the conclusions it draws or the setting or project have changed, something has to happen under CEQA-additional information has to supplement the EIR and at this point it is not an adopted document so there is nothing official to supplement-there may need to be some additional information at this point because of the passage of time, and it should be a State issue since its their document. Ms. Mueller went on to say that as far as delays, it took the State four out of the ten years to come up with the EIR so there was nothing that could happen because the CEQA process took so long to complete. She continued that as far as the regional meetings, there have been two held that she knows have involved Centinela Valley UHSD so it is a false impression that the meetings have been going on for two years because they have not, Centinela Valley UHSD started being involved in these meetings in October 2010. Ms. Mueller commented that the district had received a proposal from the Wiseburn SD that had foundational issues and they were trying to understand how the proposal would fit within the larger reorganization scheme required by law-questions of the issues regarding the vote and different stakeholder groups, whether the proposal was written to take away the authority or further process of the SBE, the County Committee or any other entity that would normally be involved in the decision making. She continued that there was very broad language in the proposal that would take away the process or the rights of all organizations normally involved and because they wanted clarification on the proposal and felt it was not correct or legal, they did not look closely or in detail at the bonding capacity and assessed valuation proposals made by Wiseburn SD to address the key taxation issues. Ms. Mueller stated that they felt if the foundational issues could not be addressed then they should not spend the time to look at what the impact would be on the future bonding capacity or outstanding debt of the district.

Mr. Willmer inquired if Ms. Mueller was speaking about Wiseburn SD’s draft legislation?

Ms. Mueller responded that she was speaking about the proposal received in March 2011 from Wiseburn SD concerning the addition of five statutes to the Education Code that pertained specifically to this issue.
Ms. Mueller commented that the question concerning whether the district would support calling an immediate election, the district would want clarification on what basis, what plan, and what expectations for the division of bonding capacity, repayment of the outstanding debt, etc. since there is a proposal on the table from Wiseburn SD. She continued that they had responded to the proposal but had not heard from Wiseburn SD and did not know where Wiseburn SD stood until receiving the letter from the County Committee so they are still waiting for a response from Wiseburn SD regarding the proposal.

Mr. Nunez clarified that the four year delay of the CEQA process was partially due to Centinela Valley UHSD’s challenge in addition to the other districts putting road blocks of the vote.

Ms. Mueller responded that the SBE has now changed their practice because they agreed and believed that in fact they had not been complying with CEQA on reorganization proposals so from the districts point, they created some good law and practice for reorganization.

Mr. Nunez responded that he was not disputing that something good came out of this but delays were caused by all stakeholders of the proposal not only the SBE. He went on to say that like all things, the main issue was the money and richness of the Wiseburn community because the number of students affected would not have been an issue for Centinela Valley UHSD if it was not for the revenue base. Mr. Nunez thanked Ms. Mueller and called on Dr. Helen Morgan, Superintendent of the Hawthorne SD.

Dr. Morgan addressed the County Committee stating that the meetings held by the districts were not Wiseburn SD unification meetings but were regional solution meetings because there are concerns about Centinela Valley UHSD’s student achievement and we all recognize the issue, and changes are being made. She went on to say that they have had positive outcome from the meetings, and the feeder districts are having dialogue with the high school district to have a cohesive program of students going from the feeder districts to the high school district. Dr. Morgan continued that the regional solution meetings were not about the Wiseburn SD unification but they discussed school uniforms, safety issues, how to improve student achievement, and occasionally the issue of unification would come up in the since of most feeder districts want to remain elementary districts, and the bottom line is how to improve the needs of the students. She went on to say that there are many other issues but the monetary outcome will impact all the districts but it is a separate issue from what the feeder districts discussed at the regional solution meetings.

Dr. Morgan stated that Centinela Valley UHSD was not invited to attend the first regional solution meeting, but districts discussed that if these meetings were going to continue, Centinela Valley UHSD needed to be included in the discussions otherwise, the meetings were not going to continue, and at that point Centinela Valley UHSD joined in the discussions with a positive outcome. She felt that these meetings were
not about the Wiseburn SD unification but about better serving the needs of the students and the community.

Mr. Nunez asked the County Committee if they had any questions.

Mr. Ogaz asked Dr. Morgan if Centinela Valley UHSD did not attend the first meeting because they were not invited or because they did not want to attend?

Dr. Morgan responded that her understanding was that they were not invited to attend.

Mr. Ogaz inquired that the definition of "regional" does not exist when that happens?

Dr. Morgan responded that at that point the districts decided that Centinela Valley UHSD needed to be at the meetings.

Mr. Ogaz commented on student accomplishments and how they are developing and the student grades. He stated that it is difficult to point fingers at a particular district when districts have to deal with what they have, and depending on demographics and social economic issues of the districts, especially if there is a lack of parent support for many reasons, this will determine how much support you have or do not have to help or assist students. Mr. Ogaz continued that it then becomes difficult for districts in general to make gains in student achievement, and this needs to be kept in mind and districts need to stop blaming a particular district.

Dr. Morgan responded saying that she respectfully disagreed with Mr. Ogaz's comments because her district is serving the same students as the other feeder districts and their student achievement is doing quite well and they are moving forward, and that is the conversation they want to continue having with Centinela Valley UHSD so that the students can have the same results.

Mr. Nunez thanked Dr. Morgan and called on Dr. Ben Wolf, Assistant Superintendent of Education of the Centinela Valley UHSD, to address the County Committee.

Dr. Wolf spoke regarding student achievement in the Centinela Valley UHSD and stated that instruction and social economics determines achievement. He went on to say that there is no control of the social economics of the students that come to the district but there is control of the quality of instruction and whether they are using resource based strategies to teach the students to hopefully get improvement. Dr. Wolf stated that because there are misconceptions about how well the students are doing at Centinela Valley UHSD, he wanted to provide a summary of the test scores of the past few years. He continued that because they are working with the feeder districts, which was not the case before, in the last three years Centinela Valley UHSD's API scores have gone up
45 points and the major subject groups have also gone up. Dr. Wolf stated that Hispanic students have gone up 44 points, English I students have gone up 38 points, African-American students have gone up 47 points; and the districts lowest achieving high school, Leuzinger, has gone up 58 points, 62 points for Hispanic students, 39 points for English I learners, 56 points for African-American students, and the Federal proficiency data (AYP) which high schools are graded on differently than the feeder districts because of the California high school exit exam, the district has had large increases in proficiency in all the schools in the district and all sub groups, and Leuzinger has gone up 17 percent this year in proficiency as well as English learners, Hispanics, and African-Americans have also gone up. Dr. Wolf continued that when a comparison is made between AYP and API scores from a high school to a middle and elementary school, the State will tell you that elementary API scores in a unified school district are always higher and drop in middle and high school levels because of the different subjects and the mix of creating the scores.

Mr. Nunez asked the County Committee if they had questions.

Ms. Jakubowski asked for clarification concerning the increase of the scores within the last three years and whether they were the scores of each year.

Dr. Wolf responded that it was a close average but the largest increase was in the last year when all the reform efforts came into play. He stated that he became involved in the middle of the school year two years ago so the new reforms have been in place at least a year and very large results have taken place.

Mr. Nunez thanked Dr. Wolf for his presentation and stated that there were no other speakers to address the County Committee.

Mr. de Llanas and Mr. Bostrom agreed that the County Committee should discuss their options.

Mr. Spies stated that staff could initiate the process and get the information from several sources for the next meeting.

Mr. Willmer stated that although the district representatives felt inaccurate information was included in the letter and meeting minutes, he felt very comfortable with the letter sent and particularly because it requested responses by August 1st, and that deadline should be respected knowing that further information will be submitted by the districts. He went on to say that the regional solution meetings and articulation sounds very positive among the elementary and high school districts which is one issue, but what is in front of the County Committee is the prerogative for
a unification process that was instigated by the Wiseburn SD and we need to separate those two issues and decide how we move forward on the Wiseburn SD unification.

Ms. Solomon asked for clarification concerning the County Committee’s request of the districts to provide an update of the status of where the discussions are and what actions are taking place, but nothing has been asked of the County Committee, so is the County Committee asking themselves to review the original decision made concerning the petition at that time?

Mr. Nunez responded that he did not believe the County Committee wanted to review their original decision of the proposal and start from the beginning again. He felt the County Committee’s decision should stand as is unless the community comes forward with a request, then that is something different. Mr. Nunez continued that the work that was started over ten years ago by the committee has not been completed and it needs to come to a conclusion one way or the other.

Ms. Jakubowski commented that the committee’s concern is that as a County Committee we have timelines but the SBE does not have any timelines, and for one reason or another this process has been going on at the State level for too many years. She continued that because it has been going on for so long, the County Committee would like to see it come to a conclusion and this does not mean it has to start from the beginning again. Ms. Jakubowski stated that the process has to be looked into as far as what has been done, where is the State, where are the districts, and what can be done to move this proposal forward. She went on to say that the issue of a regional solution, although it plays into this, is a separate issue, and the County Committee was charged with the Wiseburn SD unification and that is what needs to be dealt with. Ms. Jakubowski continued that if after this issue is concluded the County Committee wants to look at the region, then that is a separate issue.

Ms. Solomon commented that what she is hearing is that the County Committee originally supported the idea of a wide regional vote to make the determination of the unification process and they still stand by that decision today. She is then hearing we need to look at new information because there is new data and new facts that could have a different impact.

Mr. Nunez responded that the original findings of the proposal need to be looked at because that is what needs to be dealt with now, but if several changes of the findings have taken place, then it is up to the community to submit a new proposal in order for the County Committee to review new data, otherwise the County Committee’s decision on the original proposal stands.

Ms. Solomon asked Wiseburn SD why the proposal had been pulled from the SBE’s agenda and what was the rational?
Dr. Johnstone responded that Mr. Fernandez made the remark that the process would have been resolved if there had been an election, but it would have been resolved only if the vote had resulted in how Centinela Valley UHSD wanted it to end up, and if it did not end up in their favor then it would have ended up in litigation because it would then create winners and losers. He continued that on the other hand if Wiseburn SD had ended up on the losing end then the chief petitioners would have started the process over again because the situation at hand is not acceptable to the Wiseburn community. Dr. Johnstone continued saying that the Wiseburn SD felt that they needed to come up with a “win win” situation and started looking at a legislative solution and they are going to continue to work with the Centinela Valley UHSD attorney, and progress is being made so that all Centinela Valley UHSD districts come out on the winning side.

Mr. Nunez stated that the County Committee was having a difficult time understanding how Dr. Johnstone was answering Ms. Solomon’s question regarding why his district had pulled the item from the SBE’s agenda.

Dr. Johnstone responded that the rational was that given the language of the proposal, there was no way Wiseburn SD with 13 percent of the voting population was going to win and they were going to end up causing a major loss to the community.

Mr. Willner commented on Ms. Solomon’s comments stating that the County Committee has had several discussions with staff and others concerning the situation, and once process this committee gets involved with reorganization is when petitions come before them but the committee has always been forthright that if the situation looked appropriate then the County Committee themselves could initiate a process. He inquired about the suggestions given to the committee by staff and in particular bullet eight concerning engaging LACOE staff to study the voting area issue, assessed valuation issue, retention of bonded indebtedness obligations for Wiseburn residents if and when they leave Centinela Valley UHSD, and other issues challenging a local solution. Mr. Willner stated that he would like the committee to revisit the original decision because he recalls that the committee had some concerns about some economic uncertainties or bonding problems with this type of reorganization and that situation may be worse, or there may be proposals that remove that as a dilemma and the committee may now not see an economic impact for a local vote within Wiseburn SD.

Mr. Nunez responded concerning whether the County Committee could revisit the original decision, and felt that the Wiseburn SD proposal had to come to a conclusion as it currently stood, but once concluded the County Committee could revisit the proposal. He stated that he felt the appropriate way to do this was to have the community come forward with a request to revisit the proposed area, and then if the County Committee strongly felt they should get involved then this could happen, but for now the current proposal needed to be concluded.
Mr. de Llamas inquired about a statement made by Dr. Johnstone regarding that they were approaching a solution that would satisfy all involved and that was why they were asking for more time so that they could come up with something that would satisfy everyone, was this what was said?

Dr. Johnstone responded that his statement was accurate and time was of the essence as far as they were concerned.

Mr. de Llamas asked if he could make a motion concerning this and Mr. Nunez asked that he hold off until he made a comment.

Mr. Nunez commented that he was reviewing the agreements Wiseburn SD was making to allow the Centinela Valley UHSD to continue having the revenue from the area and felt that as a resident of the area, he would question why he should pay taxes on something his schools will not benefit from and he did not understand how this could happen without a vote from the residents of the area.

Mr. Willmer stated that this was the point and the solution should probably be that the Wiseburn area have a say on the proposal.

Mr. Nunez stated that when the original petition was submitted, there was no reference in the petition of Wiseburn SD allowing Centinela Valley UHSD to keep the revenue of the area, and the County Committee's decision and actions were based on information of the original petition, and because new solutions are now being submitted, the County Committee can not be expected to start over again.

It was MOVED by Mr. de Llamas that the County Committee correspond with the SBE to request a formal adoption of the current EIR and that the proposal be calendared and reviewed in its current form. Mr. de Llamas continued that by requesting the proposal be calendared, it would give emphasis to the SBE to resolve the issue one way or the other, and if the Wiseburn SD loses it would give them the opportunity to come back with a new petition to start over again. He stated that ten years of this bouncing around for position has sentenced a whole new set of students to a bicak future and sent them through the process. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Bostron.

Ms. Jakubowski suggested that the County Committee wait on the motion because of the letter sent to the districts and the August 1 deadline date to receive responses from the districts.

Mr. de Llamas disagreed because he felt that the districts had been giving the same responses over the last ten years.
Mr. Nunez requested that Mr. de Llamas amend his motion to include the August 1 deadline date.

Mr. de Llamas asked if the County Committee wanted to hold the motion until the next meeting in order to wait to receive the district responses?

Mr. Bostrom stated that as the second of the motion, there was a valid reason to hold the motion because the preoccupation has been failure of all the parties to get this to a vote and not for lack of the County Committee doing anything. He went on to say that the County Committee has been trying to push the process and if the process means the parties can not get along, then we have to facilitate that or be preemptive and move forward. Mr. Bostrom agreed with Ms. Solomon concerning her comments that if the parties are talking and the issue is pushed from August to September, then he does not see any harm in that.

Ms. Solomon responded that now her question becomes, what is to prevent the school district from requesting that again the item be taken off the SBE agenda if there is no movement to create a “win win” situation?

Mr. Nunez responded that the County Committee has no control over that situation because they are independent school districts that will do whatever they have to do for the best of their district, and the County Committee needs to do whatever they have to do to move forward. He asked Mr. Spies what the date of the next meeting would be in order to wait for the district responses which are due by August 1.

Mr. Spies responded that the next meeting would be August 3 which would be a little tight to gather the district responses and to summarize, but staff could bring the district response information to the September 7 meeting in order for the County Committee to discuss.

Mr. de Llamas stated that he did not want to amend his motion and the motion would stand as is.

The motion CARRIED with one 'no' vote from Mr. Nunez, and two abstentions from Ms. Solomon and Mr. Kunkel.

Ms. Deegan inquired if the County Committee wanted the most current CDE EIR report which includes the full findings of the EIR and the advent of charter schools which was not an issue when the County Committee first reviewed the original petition.

Several County Committee members responded that they would like a copy of the most current CDE EIR report.

Mr. Nunez asked for a recess at 11:05 a.m.

The meeting reconvened at 11:18 a.m.
Mr. Nunez asked about the minutes and statements made concerning incorrect information from some of the district representatives present at the meeting.

Ms. Deegan responded that hopefully those districts could include that information in the responses due by August 1, but her guess would be that when someone says something that is in the minutes it is not the same as issuing a report attesting to something factual because the County Committee members all have an opinion and that is what is captured in the minutes and not an actual recounting. She continued that hopefully the districts would be more specific as to what the inconsistencies are.

Mr. Bostrom stated that what is going to happen is the districts are going to respond with their interpretation against our interpretation of what constitutes due process, and since the County Committee has publicly raised the discussion of whether or not the report needs to be redone, and if their legal argument is that the report needs to be redone because ten years have past and the information has changed, then that is something we need our County Counsel to tell us because we have never dealt with this as far as if a petition has gone beyond its liability in terms of its content.

Mr. Spies responded that in working with the CDE staff, LACOE staff have provided them with new financial information so the SBE has the most current information.

Mr. Bostrom responded that he felt that County Counsel could at least look at precedence and confirm that there was no violation of due process.

Mr. Nunez asked that the meeting continue at the next agenda item.

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

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

Mr. Spies stated that on April 19, 2011, he had a LACOE Board presentation concerning the CVRA, activities around the State, and options available to districts to avoid being challenged. He continued that the presentation went well but the question and answer period did not go as well because of concerns expressed by one of the LACOE Board members about the law and how school elections had been occurring in the last 150 years without problems and why change needs to occur now. Mr. Spies went on to say that at the presentation the Board had several questions concerning the role of the LACOE Board, County Committee, and the Los Angeles County Trustees Association (LACSTA), and their
play in the County Committee election and the interaction between the agencies. He went on to say that as a result of the Board’s request, he was asked to give another presentation on June 23 along with other LACOE staff—LACOE’s in-house Legal Counsel, and Mr. Frank Kwan, Director of Communications and Administrator of LACSTA. Mr. Spies went into the next agenda item as he continued his presentation.

Mr. Spies continued that he sent the County Committee members an invitation to attend the LACOE Board meeting on June 23 and those present were Mr. Nunez, Mr. Willner, and Ms. Calix. He thanked the members for attending and went on to say that Mr. Kwan was first to give his presentation and that he covered the history of LACSTA and how it is a venue for the County Committee’s elections. Mr. Spies stated that his presentation was next and he spoke about the history of the County Committee, how the voting occurs, and how each district selects their voting representative. He continued that at the conclusion of his presentation, the Board asked several questions regarding procedural issues related to the election and the open-ended nature of petitions that are brought before the County Committee. Mr. Spies then asked the County Committee members present at the Board meeting if they had anything to add.

Mr. Nunez added that he felt one in particular Board member was adamant about the timeline of gathering signatures, and he was shaking his head in the back of the room and felt that the Board member noticed this and hopefully realized that the County Committee is asking the same questions. He went on to say that after the meeting he spoke to this particular Board member and the member stated that she would support any legislation concerning this issue.

Mr. Spies stated that a copy of the bulletin concerning the CVRA was also enclosed in their folders as well as a draft letter requested by the County Committee to be addressed to the presidents of the governing boards of the school and community college districts for review. He went on to say that the role of the County Committee is to approve plans submitted by districts; districts will provide evidence and attest that the plan submitted meets the requirements of the CVRA; County Committee accepts and approves the plans and the approval is perfunctory in nature; districts may also want to seek a waiver of the Education Code that requires an election of the community to approve these trustee area plans. Mr. Spies stated that staff had surveyed the County Committee members and it does not appear that there will be a quorum for an August meeting, and it is possible that districts could submit plans in the summer but there is no timeline for the County Committee to act on the plans, so they could be held until the September meeting and at that time agendaize it so that the County Committee could act upon them.
Mr. Bostrom asked to discuss the draft letter concerning the CVRA and suggested that a one-page attachment be included regarding a timeline concerning what the process is and what needs to be done to have a trustee area change.

Mr. Spies responded that the information was included in the bulletin and the bulletin would be attached to the letter, and staff has planned a follow-up bulletin that will also include the information.

Mr. Bostrom stated that there are those who will not read the bulletin but if there is some type of matrix showing the process, they will more likely review that instead of reading.

Ms. Jakubowski suggested using the last attachment of the bulletin and just add estimated times/dates to the document.

Ms. Solomon suggested that the word “I” be replaced with “the County Committee” or “we” so that it is not so personal because it is suppose to be a business letter and information for the districts.

Mr. Spies provided an overview of proposed legislation related to school district organization.

Mr. Bostrom inquired why staff had checked the “Watch” box regarding monitoring the bill and not taking action for Assembly Bill (AB) 1252/Davis?

Ms. Deegan responded that the prior bill included that type requirement for all community college districts and has since been amended to more of a choice then this bill came up requiring this so that their study is paid for.

Mr. Bostrom suggested that the County Committee support the bill instead of just monitoring it.

Ms. Jakubowski stated that what she was hearing is that a motion should be made to send a letter in support of the bill and she proceeded to make the motion.

It was MOVED by Ms. Jakubowski and SECONDED by Mr. Bostrom that the County Committee send a letter in support of AB 1252/Davis.

Ms. Solomon inquired as to who is actively supporting or opposing the bill because this would be a factor in her support of the bill?

Mr. Spies responded that staff was not sure but would get the information to her.

Ms. Deegan added that she would research who is actively supporting or opposing the bill and why.
Ms. Jakubowski stated that she would amend her motion that after review of where the legislation stands, that the County Committee will support the bill based upon review of the current legislation and at the discretion of the Chairperson.

The motion FAILED with four 'yes' votes, four 'no' votes, and one abstention by Mr. de Llamas.

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

Mr. Spies provided an update on school district reorganization proposals excluding those affecting the Los Angeles USD. He stated that he had received a telephone call from Mr. Mendoza indicating that he was still collecting signatures and hoped to submit the petition on the Pomona USD trustee area proposal within a month. Mr. Spies went on to provide an update on the Compton CCD lawsuit regarding their governing board election in November.

Mr. Bostrom suggested that a thank you letter be sent to the district representatives of the Wiseburn SD unification proposal who were in attendance at the meeting to keep the dialogue going. He commented that the letter received from the law firm seemed that it was going to delay the process and could stop the County Committee from trying to move the process forward.

Mr. Spies responded that it could stop the process but after speaking to the CDE representative he did not think it would.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.
July 25, 2011

John Nuñez, Chairperson
Los Angeles Committee on School District Organization
C/O Matthew Spies, Secretary
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242-2890

Re: Wiseburn Unification/Response to Letter Dated June 22, 2011;
Our file 1995.10407

Dear Mr. Nuñez and Members of the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization:

Please accept this letter in response to the June 22, 2011 request of the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization ("County Committee") that Centinela Valley Union High School District ("Centinela Valley") communicate to the County Committee by August 1, 2011 its assessment of progress towards resolving the Wiseburn School District reorganization petition.

As an initial matter, I hope that the County Committee found helpful the input of the various school district representatives at the meeting of July 6, 2011, including Centinela Valley. Hopefully it was clear to the County Committee that the failure of this matter to reach a resolution — whether through the statutorily required process with action by the State Board of Education or otherwise — has not been caused by a single entity, nor is it the result of delay by Centinela Valley. Although Centinela Valley has opposed this petition from its onset, and continues to believe that the unification of Wiseburn is not the best result for the region as a whole, our district has cooperated and complied with the local and State review process since its inception, lodging objections and criticisms when solicited, providing information when requested, taking steps to ensure that the process itself complied with the law, attempting to stay abreast of the twists and turns in this project over the years and the numerous delays that have occurred outside of our control. Suffice it to say that Centinela Valley has felt as strongly about its position, for the benefit of the school children of the entire region, as has Wiseburn with respect to its local constituents, and that this is an important public debate that warrants the attention of all affected districts and their residents.

I hope it also was clear that the term “local solution,” used repeatedly in this recent discussion, has no agreed-upon definition; for Wiseburn, it appears to mean the ability to secede from Centinela Valley through some kind of negotiated settlement implemented in the form of special legislation, but for the other districts, it means Superintendents and other education leaders developing and implementing serious and coordinated plans to vastly improve student achievement at the high school level so that
all local residents receive a top quality education. As we presented in summary fashion, the achievement levels in Centinela schools look vastly different than they did when this matter commenced, and they will continue to improve as a result of the many initiatives we have instituted.

To the extent that your letter suggests that Centinela Valley has been motivated by interests other than "the thousands of students who could be impacted" by this matter, we strenuously disagree, and hope that your actions moving forward will reflect the perspectives of all parties. For example, in your letter you question why Wiseburn's initial attempt at reorganization legislation was rejected by Centinela Valley when it appears to be so generous to our district, but you completely omit reference to the $17 million required fund transfer from Centinela to Wiseburn contained in that proposal, the lack of any vote on the reorganization by any elector, and the lack of any review and approval of any public body at all, even each school district board. In our view, this appeared at worst unlawful and at best incomplete, and we returned it to Wiseburn with a request that it be amended in a form that could be more thoroughly considered by Centinela Valley. As mentioned at your meeting, Centinela had no idea that this matter was continuing to be discussed by the County Committee. Had we been informed of the County Committee's continued interest, we would have been happy to share our perspectives with you.

Turning finally to your question about the prospects for progress: notwithstanding this vast divergence in opinion, and in deference to your request, renewed efforts to explore the possibility of a Wiseburn unification on terms that would be acceptable to Centinela Valley have ensued, starting with the first one-on-one meeting between me and Tom Johnstone on July 6, immediately following the County Committee meeting. This meeting was cordial and collegial, and Mr. Johnstone has expressed a willingness to consider an area-wide election and to explore options for an equitable sharing of property assessed valuation, as well as a shared debt assumption for outstanding Centinela Valley bond debt. Wiseburn's legal counsel apparently has agreed to re-draft proposed legislation that Centinela can take to its consultants to be analyzed thoroughly for fiscal impact, and a full group meeting of all affected districts, their representatives and counsel as desired, has been scheduled for August 26, 2011. At that time, we believe it will be possible to better judge the prospects for reaching at least conceptual agreement on a reorganization framework that could be implemented through legislation as a complete or partial alternative to re-instituting the statutory reorganization process.

For that reason, we respectfully ask that the County Committee refrain from taking any action that would conflict with these efforts, and to refrain from doing so for a period of 6 months while we explore these options.

Sincerely,

Centinela Valley Union High School District

[Signature]

Jose A. Fernandez
Superintendent

cc: Janet Mueller, Dannis Woliver Kelley
    Dr. Ellen Dougherty, Superintendent, Lawndale ESD
    Dr. Tom Johnstone, Superintendent, Wiseburn SD
    Dr. Helen Morgan, Superintendent, Hawthorne SD
    Dr. Fred Navarro, Superintendent, Lennox SD
Dowrey, CA 90242-2890
Los Angeles County Office of Education
C/O Administrator, Secretary
Los Angeles County Board of Education

Lawndale, California 90260
Office of the Superintendent
Cerritos Unified School District
California redistricting panel got earful about draft maps

Passionate input from across California amounted to an extended conversation about what makes a community and what unites and divides the state's residents. The commission votes Friday.

By John Hoeffel, Los Angeles Times

July 29, 2011

Reporting from Fremont, Calif. -- Residents and civic leaders in Fremont, which sprawls from San Francisco Bay to the golden-seared folds of Sunol Ridge, say their desert-hued bedroom community should be in a congressional district with its neighbors, Newark and Union City.

The three cities, they explained, share such interests as planning, transportation, policing, healthcare, water, education and jobs. And they also offered a more unusual argument.

"Our Tri-Cities is a community of many people: Caucasians, Indian Americans, Chinese Americans, Laotians, Afghans, and so many people," Yogi Chugh, the chairman of Fremont's planning commission, told the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. After boasting that Fremont residents speak scores of languages, he said, "We humbly ask for your consideration in ensuring that you can protect our community of interest."

The assertion that Fremont is a community because it has embraced its diversity highlights a question the commissioners have debated for months: How do Californians define their communities? Or, as Cynthia Dai, a commissioner from San Francisco, put it more bluntly at one hearing: "The question is: Who do you want to be placed with and who do you absolutely not want to be placed with?"

On Friday, Californians will get the commission's verdict when it votes on the maps for 53 congressional districts, 120 legislative districts and four for the State Board of Equalization. The commission will take a final vote Aug. 15, but Californians can challenge the districts in court or by referendum.

Thanks to voter-approved initiatives, the state's election-district mapmakers are no longer politicians aiming to protect incumbents, but 14 Californians charged with keeping counties, cities, neighborhoods and communities of interest together as much as possible. In 34 hearings from Redding to San Diego, more than 2,700 Californians offered advice as diverse as their state. More than 20,000 emails and letters were submitted by an array of people that included nuns, Mayflower descendants, politicians and...
neighborhood activists.

The result was an extended conversation — all archived on the commission's website — about what unites and divides the more than 37 million people who live in the nation's most populous state.

Californians talked passionately, often poetically, about the communities created by the state's complexity: winding roads and interstates; coast, flatlands, foothills and mountains; cities, suburbs and small towns; vineyards and orchards; shopping centers and school districts; and, of course, race and ethnicity.

After draft maps came out early last month, the conversation became rather less lofty. Californians were suddenly a lot surer who they absolutely did not want to be placed with. One San Leandro resident emailed the commission to say his city wanted no part of any district with Oakland in it: "They don't want us to even have plastic bags to carry our food home from the store. These are crazy people."

And, as the fallout for the political parties and incumbents became clearer, form-letter campaigns kicked off, partisan advocates masqueraded as community-minded residents, and organizations representing ethnic groups, environmentalists, business owners and regions stepped up their lobbying.

The intense jockeying by ethnic groups led Santa Clara County Supervisor George Shirakawa to joke, "Since I'm Asian and Latino and even European American, any map works for me."

In Fremont, the aspirations of some of the state's newest immigrants played a pivotal role in the city's hope not to be divided between congressional districts. The 2010 census found that the city is now slightly majority Asian. "It's really the one place in the entire state, perhaps the country, that has a strong, cohesive South Asian voice," Anil Godhwani, a high-tech entrepreneur and community activist, told the commission.

Michelle Park Steel, who serves on the Board of Equalization, asked the commission not to splinter Korean Americans in Los Angeles and Asian Americans in the San Gabriel Valley. Orthodox Jews noted they have more than 25 synagogues in the West Los Angeles area. Latinos pressed for districts in urban areas, such as the east side of San Jose. An East Bakersfield resident, speaking to the commission in Spanish, said, "The majority of my neighbors are not sure who Buck Owens is, but they do know who Vicente Fernandez is."

Black voters in Los Angeles County, however, pleaded with the commission not to be "packed" in districts, saying that would dilute their power. "It places yet another undue stress on an already over-extended community," Blair H. Taylor, president of the Los Angeles Urban League, wrote.

At one of the earliest hearings, in Marysville, speakers who were mostly white noticed something odd: no Latino, Sikh or Hmong speakers. So they returned to the microphone and spoke for them. One noted that the Hmong have strong families, which he called "really a plus for us." Another said of the Sikhs: "Super, super group of people. Definitely need to be part of the whole issue that you guys are working on."

Residents also debated how geography defined them. Some, for example, suggested that a single congressional district at the top of the state could bring an end to the feud between salmon fishermen and potato farmers over the water in the Klamath River. But David Bitts, a fisherman from Eureka, urged the commission to draw a north-south line through the mountains, severing fishermen from farmers.
"However you slice it, the North Coast is going to be the tail of its congressional district just because of population," he said. "I think, speaking for the tail of the dog, I'd rather be wagged by a breed that I at least recognize."

In San Luis Obispo County, residents said that if they had to be divided, the place to do it was Cuesta Grade, a steep incline on U.S. 101. "We're about evenly split between Dodgers fans and Giants fans around here," said Steve DeVencenzi, the planning director for the county Council of Governments.

For many, agriculture remains the central issue. Robert Bernsky said San Benito County should not be connected to San Jose. "We are cowboys. We are growers. We do not have any wafer fabs or any large hotels," he said.

But leaders in Indio in Riverside County asked not to be hooked to Imperial County because their economy now depends not on date palms but such things as the Coachella Valley Music & Arts Festival.

The first drafts of the maps sharpened the debate over lines that many believe will create new identities.

When one resident saw that Santa Cruz might be split and part of it put with a few rich San Francisco Peninsula cities, she wrote the commission that it was like "wearing tennis shoes with a tuxedo."

American Canyon in Napa County urged that it not be yoked to a Solano County district. "We suffer from an identity crisis, most definitely. People refer to us as North Vallejo. If you draw us out of the districts, they will continue to call us North Vallejo," fretted Belia Bennett, a councilwoman.

The most agonized cries came from Simi Valley in Ventura County and La Habra in Orange County, where residents feared being included in districts with Los Angeles County voters. A Ventura County resident said she had "concrete aversion," while a La Habra resident issued an ultimatum: "L.A. is a corrupt cesspool of Democrat politicians and there is no way you are going to do this!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!"

john.hoeffel@latimes.com
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A citizens panel on Friday gave tentative approval to new political boundaries in California despite complaints from Republican and African American activists that the maps are not fair.

Republican Michael Ward, a chiropractor from Anaheim, was the only member of the 14-person Citizens Redistricting Commission to vote against the draft maps for state Legislative and Board of Equalization districts. He was joined by Republican attorney Julie Pilbrow Webber from Koret in voting against maps for California's congressional districts.

Ward said the commission failed to "take politics and special interests" out of the decision-making.

The process, which now moves to two weeks of public comment before a final vote, was open and fair, said Helen Hutchison, vice president of the League of Women Voters of California.

Most members of the commission said they were satisfied that they had balanced the demands of the state's many ethnic, social and cultural groups in drafting the maps.

"I think this is a fantastic set of maps," said Commissioner Peter Yao, a Republican who is the former mayor of Claremont. "We made every attempt to satisfy as many people as we could. I think across the board most people will feel satisfied with the maps. No doubt about it, these maps are fair."

Even so, commissioners have taken action, including retaining legal advisors, to prepare for lawsuits.

**ALSO:**

*Some cities say they'll keep red-light cameras operating*

*Clark Gable's grandson arrested in laser-pointing incident*

*Laguna Woods OKs shooting of coyotes by professionals*

-- Patrick McGreevy in Sacramento

See the first draft: Has your district been redrawn?
Citizens panel gives initial approval to new political districts [Updated] - latimes.com

[Update 1:40 p.m.] The maps above are from the first draft of the redistricting process. The Times plans to make the newest maps available as soon as possible. Districts were assigned names for the first draft of the maps. The customary numbers normally used to identify districts will not be assigned until the second set of maps is released. (Allen J. Schaben, Times Staff Photographer, Sandra Pouledexter and Ben Welsh)

Photo: Carson Mayor Jim Dear, seen with a redistricting map behind him, comments at a hearing last month. Credit: Lawrence K. Ho / Los Angeles Times

Comments (3)

Iron Williams - Top Contributor
This story is hilarious. Ward says they didn’t take politics and special interests out.
Then, the other members admit this is true:

"Most members of the commission said they were satisfied that they had balanced the demands of the states many ethnic, social and cultural groups in drafting the maps."

Mike Rowe - Walks At Random
anything that maligns the españoles is fine by me. And isn't Jeff Sheve's "South California" idea just some great wannabeing?
Like Reply • 4 hours ago

John McDermott - Top Contributor • San Diego State University
These still look like they were drawn by alcoholics with broken Expo A-Style pens. Have any of these lines boundaries (solid)?
Like Reply • 4 hours ago

Iron Williams - Top Contributor
They could be only and natural lines in boundaries, and you do have to keep the population numbers as consistent as possible.
Like Reply • 2 hours ago
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NOTICE TO SUBJECT / INTERESTED AGENCIES

Los Angeles County Supervisor Don Knabe
Orange County Supervisor John Moorlach
California Highway Patrol
City of Long Beach - City Clerk
City of Long Beach - City Manager
City of Long Beach - Fire Department
City of Long Beach - Planning Department
City of Long Beach - Police Department
City of Los Alamitos - City Clerk
City of Los Alamitos - Police Department
City of Seal Beach - City Clerk
City of Seal Beach - Police Department
County of Orange
Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control Dist.
Los Alamitos Unified School District
Los Angeles County Assessor
Los Angeles County Auditor Controller
Los Angeles County Chief Executive Office

Los Angeles County Committee on School Dist. Organization
Los Angeles County Dept. of Regional Planning
Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts
Long Beach Unified School District
Orange County Cemetery District
Orange County Department of Education
Orange County Fire Authority
Orange County Parks (CSA 26)
Orange County Sanitation District
Orange County Sheriff's Department
Orange County Vector Control District
Orange County Water District
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Municipal Water District of Orange County
Rossmoor/Los Alamitos Area Sewer District
Water Replenishment Dist. of So. California

SUBJECT: City of Long Beach Reorganization No. 2011-13
(Los Angeles/Orange County Boundary Adjustment)

Notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed reorganization of territory listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission for the County of Los Angeles. The application involves the annexation and detachment of territory of four separate areas totaling 72.52 ± acres of uninhabited, unincorporated territory along the boundary of the City of Long Beach within the County Los Angeles, and the boundaries of the Cities of Los Alamitos and Seal Beach within Orange County. The proposal is in conjunction with a boundary adjustment between the County of Los Angeles and Orange County. The proposal consists of the following proposed organizational changes within the County of Los Angeles:

City or District
City of Long Beach
City of Long Beach
Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 3
Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 3
Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 19
Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 19
Greater Los Angeles Vector Control District
Greater Los Angeles Vector Control District
Water Replenishment District of Southern California
Water Replenishment District of Southern California

Change of Organization
Annexation/Detachment
Sphere of Influence Amendment
Annexation/Detachment
Sphere of Influence Amendment
Annexation/Detachment
Sphere of Influence Amendment
Annexation/Detachment
Sphere of Influence Amendment
Annexation/Detachment
Sphere of Influence Amendment

The proposed jurisdictional changes may affect your agency. The submitted application, maps and legal descriptions are attached for your information. Please submit all written concerns and comments to the LAFCO office by August 31, 2011. Should you have any questions regarding this proposal, please contact this office at (818) 254-2454.

Date: August 3, 2011

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

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO: [Blank]

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)

1. Long Beach
2. Seal Beach
3. Los Alamitos
4. [Blank]

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

1. Annexation/Detachment
2. Annexation/Detachment
3. Annexation/Detachment
4. [Blank]

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

APPLICANT: City of Long Beach/Reginald Harrison

TITLE: Deputy City Manager CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER: City of Long Beach

ADDRESS: 333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 13th Floor

CITY: Long Beach STATE: California ZIP CODE: 90802

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: Reginald Harrison TELEPHONE: 562-570-5850

E-MAIL ADDRESS: reginald.harrison@longbeach.gov

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY
700 N. CENTRAL AVENUE, SUITE 445 GLENDALE, CA 91203
TELEPHONE: (818) 254-2454 FAX: (818) 254-2452
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: ___________________________ DATE: 7/26/11

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:

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

See Attachment #1

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:

72.52 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.)

   See Attachment #1

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

   See Attachment #1

POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

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

   0

3. Number of registered voters within the proposed territory.

   Unknown

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory.

   Unknown

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

   All properties are along the San Gabriel River/Los Coyotes Creek Channel bordering Long Beach, Seal Beach and Los Alamitos. All parcels are uninhabited. The backyards of 5 residential properties currently in Long Beach will go to Los Alamitos (Area 7).
6. What is the likelihood of significant growth in the area; and in adjacent incorporated and unincorporated areas within the next ten years?

There are currently no development plans for these areas.

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:

The backyards of 5 residential properties currently in Long Beach will be annexed into Los Alamitos.

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?

No known impacts.

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?

No known impacts to public facilities or the provision of public services. The park in Area 5, currently in Seal Beach will be annexed into Long Beach and continue to be operated as a park.

LAND USE AND ZONING

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

See Attachment #2

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

Area 7: Land Use - Land Use District (LUD) #1 - Single Family
Zoning - R-1-N (Single Family Residential)

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

There will be no change in the land use of the subject areas.
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).

There will be no change in land use nor zoning as a result of this proposal.

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

Area 1: North-parking lot; San Gabriel River Channel; South-Pacific Ocean; East-San Gabriel River Channel; West-LB Marina Channel.
Area 4: North; South; East; West-Underdevelopment operations.
Area 5: North-San Gabriel River Channel, single family homes; South-San Gabriel River Channel, industrial; East-San Gabriel River Channel, bike trail, SCE right-of-way; West-Single family homes.
Area 7: North-Single family, Coyote Creek Flood Control Channel; South-Single family; East-Single family; West-Coyote Creek Flood Control Channel.

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?

Area 1: LUD #7 (Mixed Use)
Area 4: LUD #7 (Mixed Use)
Area 5: LUD #11 (Open Space and Park District) for park area and LUD #1 (Single family) for remainder. Note: for Areas 1, 4 and the non-park portion of Area 5, the proposed Land Use District is the existing LUD within the city boundaries that abut the subject areas.

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

The proposal is consistent with the Long Beach General Plan and applicable specific plans.

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

The proposal will not result in the development of the subject areas now or in the near future.

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

No development proposed as part of this boundary clean-up. However, service delivery issues would continue.
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?

Long Beach parcels are not within a redevelopment area.

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?

This proposal preserves open-space lands. There are no agricultural lands in the proposal.

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

In 2009, various cities including Long Beach, Seal Beach and Los Alamitos began discussions to resolve service delivery issues along the Coyote Creek Flood Control. These cities have parcels that are only accessible through a neighboring city in another county. This situation creates service delivery issues for the individual cities affected.

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:

See Attachment #2

b. Mutual social and economic interests:

See Attachment #2
c. The local government structure of the County:

See Attachment #2

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.

See Attachment #2

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

See Attachment #2

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?

See Attachment #2
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.

See Attachment #2

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.

See Attachment #2

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 __________________________ No [x]

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?

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).
BONDED INDEBTNESS

1. Do the agencies whose boundaries are being changed have any existing bonded debt?
   See Attachment #2

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

3. To what extent will landowners within the proposal area be liable or remain liable for any existing Indebtedness of the city or district?
   See Attachment #2

4. In the case of detachment requests, does the detaching agency propose that the subject territory continue to be liable for existing bonded debt?
   See Attachment #2

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.

   Name: 
   Address: 
   Telephone: 

   Name: 
   Address: 
   Telephone: 

   Name: 
   Address: 
   Telephone: 

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

   Name: Reginald Harrison
   Address: 333 W. Ocean Blvd., 13th Fl, Long Beach, CA
   Telephone: 562-570-5650

   Name: Michael Mais
   Address: 333 W. Ocean Blvd., 11th Fl, Long Beach, CA
   Telephone: 562-570-2230

   Name: Jeffrey Winklepleck
   Address: 333 W. Ocean Blvd., 4th Fl, Long Beach, CA
   Telephone: 562-570-6607
## ATTACHMENT #1

### Summary of Los Angeles County-Orange County Boundary Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ACREAGE</th>
<th>AREA MOVED FROM CITY TO CITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Area includes a small portion of Long Beach Harbor (west side of rock jetty) and Khoury's Parking Lot</td>
<td>44.57</td>
<td>Seal Beach to Long Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deleted 2</td>
<td>Area includes bike path located along the San Gabriel River channel north of Marina Drive bridge.</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>Seal Beach to Long Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deleted 3</td>
<td>Area includes portion of Seal Beach Trailer Park and parking lot behind the Oakwood Apartments and eastern edge of the San Gabriel River.</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>Long Beach to Seal Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Area along the west edge of Hellman Ranch near Haynes Plant cooling water outfall.</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>Seal Beach to Long Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>College Estates Park area that includes tennis court, park area (unincorporated Orange County) and west side of the San Gabriel River channel.</td>
<td>20.98</td>
<td>County of Orange to Long Beach; Seal Beach to Long Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deleted 6</td>
<td>Area includes vacant parcel east of flood control channel.</td>
<td>36.63</td>
<td>Long Beach to Los Alamitos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Area includes Stansbury Park and rear portions of five (5) residential parcels along Toland Avenue.</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>Long Beach to Los Alamitos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>72.52</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPLICATION FOR CHANGE OF ORGANIZATION—ATTACHMENT "A"

Plan for Municipal Services

Pursuant to Government Code 56653, any local agency submitting an application for a change in organization must also submit a plan for providing services to the subject territory. Please provide information for provision of services.

("Special districts need only submit those pages of this application that apply."

1. Describe how his proposal will result in the provision of new services and changes in existing services, including location from which such services are or will be provided, service level or capacity (i.e., sewer line capacity, average response time for emergency vehicles, etc.) and how services will be financed.

   There are no new services or changes in existing services with this annexation/ detachment.

Fire and Emergency Services

1. Which fire protection agency currently provides fire protection and emergency medical service in the subject territory? Give a brief description of how this service is provided and to what extent.

   Long Beach Fire department currently provides fire and emergency medical services to these areas and will continue to do so for the annexed areas.

2. Is annexation to a County Fire Protection District part of this request?  
   □ Yes    □ No

3. What agency will be providing services to the subject territory as a result of this request? Provide a description of the level and range of services that are to be provided. Indicate if there are any changes in service level.

   Long Beach Police, Fire, Parks Recreation and Marine and Public Works and other departments will provide services as needed to the affected areas.

4. What is the approximate date in which these services will be made available?

   Services are currently available

5. Provide information on how these services will be financed (i.e. assessment district, general property tax, developer fees, etc.).

   These services are funded by the City of Long Beach

6. Will there be any upgrading or transfer of facilities as a result of this request?  
   □ Yes    □ No

Page 1
If yes, please give details.

N/A

Police Services

1. Which police protection agency currently provides service to the subject territory? Provide a brief description of how this service is provided and to what extent.

   The Long Beach Police Department (LBPD) currently provides emergency response to the area and will continue to do so.

2. What agency will be providing law enforcement services to the subject territory upon approval of this request? Provide a description of the level and range of services that are to be provided. Indicate if there are any changes in service level.

   LBPD will provide service to the area.

3. What is the approximate date in which those services will be made available? Services are currently available

4. Provide information on how those services will be financed (i.e. assessment district, general property tax developer fees, etc.).

   City of Long Beach general fund.

5. Will there be any upgrading or transfer of facilities as a result of this request? Yes [ ] No [x]

   If yes, please give details.
Road Maintenance Services

1. Give a brief description of how road maintenance service is currently provided and by which agency.

See attachment #2

2. What agency will be providing services to the subject territory upon approval of this request? Provide a description of the level and range of services that are to be provided. Indicate if there are any changes in service level.

3. What is the approximate date in which those services will be made available?

4. Provide information on how those services will be financed (i.e. assessment district, general property tax developer fees, etc.)

5. Provide information on any roads, facilities or capital improvements that will be transferred, as a result of this request.

Solid Waste Services

1. Give a brief description of how solid waste service is currently provided and by which agency.

See attachment #2

2. What agency will be providing services to the subject territory upon approval of this request? Provide a description of the level and range of services that are to be provided. Indicate if there are any changes in service level.

3. What is the approximate date in which those services will be made available?
4. Provide information on how those services will be financed (i.e. assessment district, general property tax developer fees, etc.).

Special Assessment District Services

1. Provide information on any special assessment districts within the subject territory. Give a description of services provided.

See attachment #2

2. Will the subject territory be included in an assessment district and be subject to any new assessments upon approval of this request?

3. Provide information on any special charges, fees or taxes that will be levied as a result of approval of this request.

Street Lighting Services

1. Give a brief description of how street lighting service is currently provided and by which agency.

See attachment #2

2. What agency will be providing services to the subject territory upon approval of this request? Provide a description of the level and range of services that are to be provided. Indicate if there are any changes in service level.

3. Provide information on how those services will be financed (i.e. assessment district, general property tax developer fees, etc.).
Water Services

1. Is annexation of water service part of this request?  ☐ Yes  ☑ No

If yes, provide details.

See attachment #2

2. Will this request result in an increase in water usage upon approval of this request or in future development of the proposal area? What are the projected needs and availability of water supplies?

3. What agencies will be providing water service to the affected territory upon approval of this request? Provide a description of the capacity level and range of services to be provided and the approximate date in which those services will be made available.

4. Provide information on how those services will be financed (i.e. assessment district, general property tax, developer fees, etc.).

Wastewater Services

1. Give a brief description of how wastewater service is currently provided and by which agency.

See attachment #2

2. What agency will be providing services to the subject territory upon approval of this request? Provide a description of the level and range of services that are to be provided. Indicate if there are any changes in service level.
3. What is the approximate date in which those services will be made available?

4. Is annexation to a County Sanitation District part of this request or a future request? □ Yes □ No
   If yes, provide details.

5. Provide information on how those services will be financed (i.e. assessment district, general property tax, developer fees, etc.)

6. Will there be any upgrading or transfer of facilities as a result of this request? □ Yes □ No
   If yes, provide details.
EXHIBIT "A1"

COUNTY BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT AREA 1

FROM ORANGE COUNTY TO LOS ANGELES COUNTY

County Boundary Reorganization for the City of Seal Beach (RO 11-03)
Detach from

City of Seal Beach
Orange County Vector Control District
Orange County Cemetery District
Orange County Parks (CSA 26)
Orange County Sanitation District
Orange County Water District
Municipal Water District of Orange County

City of Long Beach Reorganization No. 2011-13
(County Boundary Adjustment)
Annex to

City of Long Beach
Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 3
Water Replenishment District of Southern California

That certain parcel of land being a portion of the southeast quarter of Section 10 and a portion of Section 15, both sections in Township 5 South, Range 12 West, S.B.M., in the City of Seal Beach, the County of Orange, State of California, described as follows;

Beginning at the intersection of the southwesterly right-of-way line of Marina Drive, 80 feet wide, and the Orange/Los Angeles County boundary line, as shown on map of Record of Survey, filed in Book 90, pages 23 to 30, of Record of Surveys, in the Office of the Recorder of the County of Orange, said intersection being a point in the common boundary of Orange/Los Angeles County, as same existed on April 4, 2011;

Thence leaving said Orange/Los Angeles County boundary line the following:

(L1) South 38° 59' 39" West 408.09 feet;

Thence, (L2) South 16° 44' 05" West 700.00 feet;

Thence, (L3) South 29° 10' 49" West 3450.00 feet;

Thence, (L4) North 64° 47' 04" West 614.00 feet to the intersection of said Orange/Los Angeles County boundary;

Thence, (L5) along said Orange/Los Angeles County boundary North 33° 00' 00" East 3482.93 feet;
Thence, (L6) continuing along said Orange/Los Angeles County boundary North 32° 51' 52"
East 225.00 feet;

Thence, (L7) continuing along said Orange/Los Angeles County boundary North 32° 58' 15"
East 392.46 feet;

Thence, (L8) continuing along said Orange/Los Angeles County boundary North 57° 10' 40"
East 551.31 feet to the Point of Beginning;

Containing 44.51± acres
County Boundary Adjustment AREA 1
From Orange County to Los Angeles County

EXHIBIT "B1"

Area 1
Orange/Los Angeles County Boundary

Area of Adjustment 44.51± acres
EXHIBIT "A4"

COUNTY BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT AREA 4

FROM ORANGE COUNTY TO LOS ANGELES COUNTY

County Boundary Reorganization for the City of Seal Beach (NO 11-08) Detach from City of Long Beach Reorganization No. 2011-13 (County Boundary Adjustment) Annex to

City of Seal Beach Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District
Orange County Vector Control District Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 3 Orange County Cemetery District Water Replenishment District of Southern California Orange County Parks (CSA 26)
Orange County Sanitation District Municipal Water District of Orange County

That certain parcel of land being a portion of Section 11, Township 5 South, Range 12 West, S.B.M., in the City of Seal Beach, the County of Orange, State of California, described as follows;

Beginning at the intersection of the easterly right-of-way line of Pacific Coast Highway, 100 feet wide, and the northwesterly boundary line of Orange County, as said intersection is shown on map of Record of Survey, filed in Book 90, pages 23 to 30, inclusive, of Record of Surveys, in the Office of the Recorder of the County of Orange, said intersection being a point in the common boundary of Orange/Los Angeles County, as same existed on April 21, 2011;

Thence along said Orange/Los Angeles County boundary, (L1) North 57° 15' 24" East 2788.42 feet to its intersection with the southeasterly boundary of that portion of land described as Parcel 1 in deed to the City of Los Angeles, recorded on February 15, 1961, in Book 5629, pages 527 to 530 inclusive, of Official Records, in said Office of the Recorder of the County of Orange, said last mentioned intersection also being a point on that certain non-tangent 700-foot radius curve concave to the northwest, a radial of said curve to said point bears South 63° 44' 46" East;

Thence along said southeasterly boundary of Parcel 1 the following courses:

(C2) southwest along said curve an arc length of 378.77 feet, through a central angle of 31° 00' 10";

Thence, (L3) South 57° 15' 24" West 227.96 feet to that certain tangent 700-foot radius curve concave to the northwest;
Thence, (C4) southwesterly along last mentioned curve an arc length of 154.37 feet, through a central angle of 12° 38' 08";

Thence, (L5) South 69° 53' 32" West 50.00 feet to that certain tangent 500-foot radius curve concave to the southeast;

Thence, (C6) southwesterly along last mentioned curve an arc length of 110.27 feet, through a central angle of 12° 38' 08";

Thence, (L7) South 57° 15' 24" West 150.00 feet to that certain tangent 500-foot radius curve concave to the southeast;

Thence, (C8) southwesterly along last mentioned curve an arc length of 110.27 feet through a central angle of 12° 38' 08";

Thence, (L9) South 44° 37' 16" West 50.00 feet to that certain tangent 700-foot radius curve concave to the northwest;

Thence, (C10) southwesterly along last mentioned curve an arc length of 154.37 feet, through a central angle of 12° 38' 08" to a line parallel with and 100 feet southeasterly, measured at right angles, from said Orange/Los Angeles County boundary;

Thence along said parallel line, (L11) South 57° 15' 24" West 1483.78 feet to its intersection with said easterly right-of-way line of Pacific Coast Highway, said last mentioned intersection being a point on that certain non-tangent 2050 foot radius curve concave to the northwest, a radial of said last mentioned curve to said last mentioned point bears North 88° 18' 20" East;

Thence, (C12) northerly along said last mentioned curve an arc length of 114.85 feet, through a central angle of 03° 12' 36" feet to the Point of Beginning.

Containing 5.79 ± acres
EXHIBIT "B4"

County Boundary Adjustment AREA 4
From Orange County to Los Angeles County

Area 4

Orange/Los Angeles County Boundary

Area of Adjustment 5.79 ± acres
EXHIBIT "AS"

COUNTY BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT AREA 3

FROM ORANGE COUNTY TO LOS ANGELES COUNTY

County Boundary Reorganization for the
City of Seal Beach (RO 11-03)
Detach from

City of Seal Beach
Unincorporated Orange County
Orange County Vector Control District
Orange County Cemetery District
Orange County Parks (CSA 26)
Orange County Sanitation District
Orange County Water District
Municipal Water District of Orange County

City of Long Beach Reorganization No. 2011-13
(County Boundary Adjustment)
Annex to

City of Long Beach
Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District
Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 19
Water Replenishment District of Southern California

That certain parcel of land being a portion of the west half of Section 36, Township 4 South,
Range 12 West, S.B.M., and a portion of the northeast quarter of Section 2, Township 5 South,
Range 12 West, S.B.M., in the City of Seal Beach and unincorporated territory, the County of
Orange, State of California, described as follows;

Beginning at the intersection of the centerline of 7th Street, 80 foot wide, and the Orange
County boundary line, as said intersection is shown on Tract Map No. 21550, filed in Book 636,
pages 43 to 49, inclusive, of Maps, in the Office of the Recorder of the County of Los Angeles,
said intersection also being a point in the common boundary of Orange/Los Angeles County, as
same existed on March 31, 2011;

Thence along the Orange/Los Angeles County boundary, (l.1) North 31° 31' 15" West 1009.45
feet and;

(l.2) North 27° 50' 00" East 3125.31 feet to the generally southeasterly boundary of the 400-
foot wide strip of land designated as San Gabriel River on said map;

Thence southwesterly along said generally southeasterly boundary the following courses;

(l.3) South 22° 06' 09" West 1679.96 feet to the beginning of that certain (C4) tangent 2664.93-
foot radius curve concave to the east;

Thence, southwesterly along said curve an arc length of 1020.47 feet through a central angle of
21° 56' 24";
EXHIBIT "A7"

COUNTY BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT AREA "Y"

FROM LOS ANGELES COUNTY TO ORANGE COUNTY

City of Long Beach Reorganization No. 2011-13
(County Boundary Adjustment)
Detach from

City of Long Beach
Greater Los Angeles Vector Control District
Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 19
Water Replenishment District of Southern California

County Boundary Reorganization for the
City of Los Alamitos (RO 11-02)
Annex to

City of Los Alamitos
Orange County Vector Control District
Orange County Cemetery District
Orange County Parks (CSA 26)
Orange County Sanitation District
Orange County Water District
Municipal Water District of Orange County
Rossmoor/Los Alamitos Area Sewer District

That certain parcel of land being a portion of northeast quarter of Section 19, Township 4 South, Range 11 West, S.B.M, in the City of Long Beach, the County of Los Angeles, State of California, described as follows:

Beginning at the intersection of the southerly right-of-way line of Ball Road and the southeasterly boundary line of Los Angeles County, as said intersection is shown on Parcel Map No. 20568, filed in Book 17, page 49, of Parcel Maps, in the Office of the Recorder of the County of Orange, said intersection also being a point in the common boundary of Los Angeles/Orange County, as same existed on March 31, 2011;

Thence, along said Los Angeles/Orange County boundary, (L1) South 58° 47' 54" West 692.46 feet to its intersection with the northwesterly line of the southeasterly 75 feet of that portion of land described as "PARCEL B" in deed to Los Angeles County Flood Control District, recorded in Book 48608 page 438, of Official Records, in the Office of the Recorder of the County of Los Angeles;

Thence, leaving said Los Angeles/Orange County boundary and along said northwesterly line, (L2) North 36° 43' 10" East 186.93 feet to the most westerly corner of that certain parcel of land described in deed to the City of Alamitos, recorded in Book D5548, page 879, of said Official Records;

Thence, northeasterly along the northwesterly boundary of last said mentioned certain of parcel of land the following courses;
Thence, (L3) North 36° 43' 10" East 198.16 feet;

Thence, (L4) North 48° 41' 29" East 42.56 feet;

Thence, (L5) North 75° 28' 24" East 86.45 feet to said southerly right-of-way line of Ball Road;

Thence, along said southerly right-of-way line (L6) North 89° 56' 06" East 246.40 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Containing 1.28 ± acres
County Boundary Adjustment AREA 7
From Los Angeles County to Orange County

Area 7
Los Angeles/Orange County Boundary

Area of Adjustment 1.28± acres
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION (LACOE)  
DIVISION OF BUSINESS ADVISORY SERVICES  

LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION  
(COUNTY COMMITTEE)  
LEGISLATIVE REVIEW-SEPTEMBER 2011

| BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR: Senate Bill 821/Fuller | INTRODUCTION DATE: 02/18/11 | LAST ACTIVITY/DATE: 06/30/11: Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Committee on Appropriations. |

DESCRIPTION OF BILL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RECOMMENDED POSITION
Staff recommends the following position:

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

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

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

Please direct all comments to Mr. Matthew Spies, Secretary to the County Committee, at (562) 922-6336.
BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR: Assembly Bill 684/Block

INTRODUCTION DATE: 02/17/11

LAST ACTIVITY/DATE: 07/05/11: From committee: do pass and re-refer to Committee on Appropriations.

DESCRIPTION OF BILL

Existing law provides for California community college districts to receive general supervision from the California Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. In addition, each community college district is under the control of its own elected board of trustees. Those independent boards of trustees develop the election structure that each community college district uses.

The latest version of this bill would authorize community college districts to adopt trustee area voting plans through which candidates for election to their board of trustees are elected by trustee area. It authorizes boards of trustees to adopt resolutions in support of trustee area voting and for the reapportionment of any existing trustee areas under the guidance of the 2010 U.S. Census data and to seek waivers for elections validating these new trustee area plans from the community college district chancellor’s office. The bill specifies that it would not apply to any community college district that enacts a specific statutory framework for its own trustee elections.

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

This bill authorizes community college districts in Los Angeles County to establish trustee area voting plans, or to review and revise their existing trustee area plan. The cost of any research or analysis of the 2010 U.S. Census data and other demographic information (along with any related legal costs) would be borne by community college districts.

RECOMMENDED POSITION

Staff recommends the following position:

☐ Watch  Bill should be monitored by County Committee staff, but no action should be taken at this time.

☐ Approve  The County Committee supports the bill’s concept, but will not actively work for passage.

☐ Support  The County Committee actively supports the bill.

☐ Oppose  The County Committee actively opposes the bill.

☐ Disapprove  The County Committee disapproves of the bill’s concept, but will not actively oppose passage.

AMENDMENTS REQUIRED

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

CORRESPONDENCE REQUIRED

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

Please direct all comments to Mr. Matthew Spies, Secretary to the County Committee, at (562) 922-6336.
BILL NUMBER/AUTHOR: Assembly Bill 1252/Davis
INTRODUCTION DATE: 02/18/11
LAST ACTIVITY/DATE: 05/03/11: In committee: Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.

DESCRIPTION OF BILL:
Existing law authorizes the county committee on school district organization, upon petition of the governing board of any community college district, to provide for the establishment, rearrangement, or abolition of trustee areas in any community college district.

This bill would establish a separate procedure for the election of the trustees of the Los Angeles Community College District (CCD). The bill specifies that a candidate for election must reside in, and be registered to vote in, the trustee area he or she seeks to represent.

The size of the board, nomination of candidates, and term length, would be determined, as specified. This bill would require the governing board to set the boundaries of each trustee area before March 1, 2012, to reflect the population enumerated in the federal 2010 decennial census. If the governing board fails to timely set the boundaries, then the county committee on school district organization shall do so before April 30, 2012.

Because this bill would impose new duties on the Los Angeles CCD, it would impose a state-mandated local program. In addition, this bill would make legislative findings and declarations as to the necessity of a special statute for the Los Angeles CCD. The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement. This bill would provide that, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that the bill contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement for those costs shall be made pursuant to these statutory provisions.

POTENTIAL IMPACT OF BILL ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMITTEE, SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION PROCESS AND/OR LOS ANGELES COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS
This bill requires the Los Angeles CCD to establish trustee areas. If successful, this bill seeks compensation as a mandated local program for any costs associated with this directive.

RECOMMENDED POSITION
Staff recommends the following position:

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

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

Please direct all comments to Mr. Matthew Spies, Secretary to the County Committee, at (562) 922-6336.
Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals

September 2011

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District (USD) that were at various stages in the school district organization process as of August 16, 2011.

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

Status: Final petition submission pending.

Status Date: June 26, 2007

OTHER INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last six months)

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

None

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

None

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

September 2011

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals (exclusive of those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District [USD]) that were at various stages in the school district reorganization process as of August 16, 2011.

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

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

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

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

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

On September 2, 2003, the CDE notified LACOE that the petition hearing before the SBE would be delayed until January 7-8, 2004. The CDE cited budget constraints and staff cutbacks as 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 Steentofte, 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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
requested that the SBE remove the review of the petition from its May 2010 agenda. Presently, there is no date set for this petition to be reviewed by the SBE. The EIR contained in the revised petition has not yet been adopted by the SBE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

On May 9, 2011, staff received a copy of a letter from attorneys for the Centinela Valley UHSD to the Wiseburn SD stating that Centinela Valley UHSD was not in agreement on the proposed 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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
May 19, 2011, but it was cancelled due to scheduling conflicts. It is anticipated that another regional meeting will be scheduled and that it will be facilitated by LACOE staff.

On June 22, 2011, County Committee Chairperson Mr. John Nunez, sent a letter on behalf of the County Committee to the Superintendents of the Centinela UHSD, Hawthorne SD, Lawndale SD, Lennox SD, and Wiseburn SD, 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 SD, Lawndale SD, Lennox SD, and Wiseburn SD, 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. As of August 12, 2011, the County Committee has not received responses from any other districts.

*Status: Petition on hold; Wiseburn SD circulating proposed legislation; County Committee awaiting responses to query from four districts.

**Status Date:** August 12, 2011

**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(a) and (c) to increase the number of trustees from five to seven, to establish trustee areas, and to require trustee area voting, within the Mount San Antonio CCD. The request was submitted by chief petitioner Mr. John Mendoza. The petition was forwarded to County Counsel to determine its legal compliance regarding format and content. On March 12, 2010, County Counsel notified staff that the petition was sufficient. On March 12, 2010, the petition was forwarded to the chief petitioner for circulation.

On August 1, 2011, the chief petitioner returned 15 signed petitions, which were conveyed to the Registrar-Recorder for signature verification on August 2, 2011. Once the signature review is completed, staff will notify the County Committee of the status of the petition.

* Indicates update from previous summary.
Formation—Altadena USD (Currently Lies Within the Boundaries of the Pasadena USD)

On January 17, 2006, LACOE received a request for a petition from chief petitioners Ms. Maurice Morse, Ms. Shirlee Smith, and Mr. Bruce Wasson, three community members who are residents of the area known as Altadena. The chief petitioners want to form an Altadena USD from territory within the boundaries of the Pasadena USD. The petition request was returned to the chief petitioners on January 20, 2006, because it lacked an adequate description of the area pursuant to EC §35700.3.

On February 10, 2006, LACOE received a revised request for a petition. Staff reviewed the request and forwarded a draft petition to County Counsel on February 22, 2006, for a legal compliance review regarding format and content. We received notification on March 6, 2006, from County Counsel informing us that the draft petition was legally acceptable.

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

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

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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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.

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

Status Date: May 12, 2011

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

On August 18, 2010, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §5019 to increase the number of trustees from five to seven and to establish trustee areas within the Pomona USD. The request was submitted by chief petitioner Mr. John Mendoza. The petition was forwarded to County Counsel to determine its legal compliance regarding format and content. On August 27, 2010, County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient. Staff returned the petition to the chief petitioner on August 30, 2010, for circulation.

Please note that this is a separate petition, distinct from the other petitions requested by Mr. Mendoza, and requests some of the same changes within the Pomona USD (the addition of two governing board members and the creation of trustee areas). It was submitted under EC §5019(c) and requires valid signatures from 500 registered voters within the petition area. If valid and certified by the County Committee, this petition would trigger a feasibility study and ultimately a vote by the County Committee.

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: August 30, 2010

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

On July 13, 2009, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §5019 to increase the number of trustees from five to seven and to establish trustee areas within the Pomona USD. The request was submitted by chief petitioner Mr. Mendoza. The petition was forwarded to County Counsel to determine its legal compliance regarding format and content. On August 7, 2009, County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient. Staff returned the petition to the chief petitioner on August 11, 2009, for circulation.

Please note that this is a separate petition, distinct from the other petitions requested by Mr. Mendoza, and requests some of the same changes within the Pomona USD (the addition of two governing board members and the creation of trustee areas). It was submitted under EC §5019(c) and requires valid signatures from 500 registered voters within the petition area. If

* Indicates update from previous summary.
valid and certified by the County Committee, this petition would trigger a feasibility study and ultimately a vote by the County Committee.

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

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

Status: Petition insufficient; action ended.

Status Date: August 16, 2010

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

On July 13, 2009, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §5019 and §5020 to increase the number of trustees from five to seven and to establish trustee areas within the Pomona USD. The request was submitted by chief petitioner Mr. Mendoza. The petition was forwarded to County Counsel to determine its legal compliance regarding format and content. On August 7, 2009, County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient. Staff returned the petition to the chief petitioner on August 11, 2009, for circulation.

Please note that this is a separate petition, distinct from the other petitions requested by Mr. Mendoza, and requests some of the same changes within the Pomona USD (the addition of two governing board members and the creation of trustee areas). It was submitted under EC §5019 and §5020 and requires valid signatures from ten percent of the registered voters within the petition area (approximately 7,000 signatures in the case of the Pomona USD). If valid and certified by the County Committee, this petition would trigger a ballot initiative (as opposed to a reference report and vote by the County Committee).

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: August 20, 2009

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

Status: Petition currently in circulation.

* Indicates update from previous summary.
Status Date: February 21, 2008

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: May 11, 2007

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: March 20, 2007

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: January 17, 2007

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: January 17, 2007

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: October 2, 2006

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: April 11, 2006

* Indicates update from previous summary.
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

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: June 16, 2003

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: August 20, 2001

OTHER INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last six months)

Unification Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Monrovia USD to Arcadia USD/May 2011

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None

* Indicates update from previous summary.
Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

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

* Indicates update from previous summary.