July 17, 2012

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

FROM: Allison Deegan, Regionalized Business Services Coordinator
Los Angeles County Office of Education

SUBJECT: Cancellation of the August 1, 2012, Regular Meeting of the County Committee

The regular meeting of the County Committee scheduled for Wednesday, August 1, 2012, has been CANCELLED. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, September 5, 2012.

The following is an update of relevant information as of July 17, 2012

Staff Activities

• On June 29, 2012, staff conveyed a letter from the County Committee, signed by Chair Maria Calix, offering support for the recent developments among districts impacted by the proposed Wiseburn Unified School District (USD).

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

• Staff continues to consult with the Los Angeles County Office of Education legal counsel to assess the impact of the California Voting Rights Act in Los Angeles County.

Newspaper Articles

• A June 19, 2012 article from the Press-Enterprise—“Riverside: School district to study new trustee map.” (Attachment 1)

• A June 20, 2012 article from the Press Democrat—“Santa Rosa will ask voters to decide on district elections.” (Attachment 2)
Cancellation of the August 1, 2012, Regular Meeting of the County Committee
August 2012
Page 2

- A June 21, 2012 article from the Visalia Times-Delta—“Tulare hospital approves by-district elections.” (Attachment 3)

- A June 27, 2012 article from the Half Moon Bay Patch—“County Voters Will Pick Next Supervisor Election System.” (Attachment 4)

- A June 29, 2012 article from the Press-Enterprise—“CORONA-NORCO: School officials plan no trustee areas.” (Attachment 5)

- A July 2, 2012 article from the Metropolitan News-Enterprise—“ACLU Sues Anaheim, Alleges Racially Polarized Voting.” (Attachment 6)

- A July 12, 2012 article from the Orange County Register—“Pressure on Anaheim to change elections.” (Attachment 7)

- A July 13, 2012 article from the Press-Enterprise—“RIVERSIDE: Alvord postpones trustee areas study.” (Attachment 8)

Informational Correspondence

- A July 11, 2012, Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) Notice to Interested Agencies regarding Annexation No. 1026 to Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District of Los Angeles County. (Attachment 9)

- A July 11, 2012, LAFCO Notice to Interested Agencies regarding Annexation No. 82 to County Sanitation District No. 20. (Attachment 10)


- A July 11, 2012, LAFCO Notice to Interested Agencies regarding Annexation No. 1061 to Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District of Los Angeles County. (Attachment 12)

- A July 11, 2012, LAFCO Notice to Interested Agencies regarding Annexation No. 1060 to Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District of Los Angeles County. (Attachment 13)

- A July 11, 2012, LAFCO Notice to Interested Agencies regarding Annexation No. 89 to County Sanitation District No. 20. (Attachment 14)

- A July 11, 2012, LAFCO Notice to Interested Agencies regarding Annexation No. 29 to County Sanitation District No. 16. (Attachment 15)
School District Organization Proposals

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

- “Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals.” (Attachment 16)

- “Summary of Los Angeles County School District Reorganization Proposals (excluding those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District).” (Attachment 17)

Please call me at (562) 922-6270 if you have any questions or concerns.

AD:alh
Attachments
NEWSPAPER ARTICLES
RIVERSIDE: School district to study new trustee map

Riverside Unified is changing its representation from at large to geographic areas

"It looks like a salamander," says Gayle Cloud, Riverside school board president, about the proposed Trustee Area 3 in a map being studied by the school district.

CORRECTION: An earlier version of this story had a headline that incorrectly reported the status of the Riverside Unified School District’s election system. The board voted Monday, June 18, to move from at-large elections to a system in which board members are elected from geographic areas.
The Riverside school board needs a trustee who understands low-income neighborhoods with disproportionately high dropout rates and Spanish-speaking residents, an activist says.

"If we succeed, Riverside will succeed," said Gilberto Esquivel, representing the League of United Latino American Citizens. "If we fail, Riverside and this district will fail."

He urged the school board to adopt a map presented by San Francisco civil rights attorney Robert Rubin, one of three he presented hours before the board meeting on Monday, June 18.

The board unanimously voted to ask school officials, its attorney and consultants to work with Rubin to align his clients' favored map with the board’s and other legal criteria.

Rubin has threatened to sue the Riverside Unified School District over its current at-large elections practices.

The board rescheduled its vote to adopt trustee areas to the next meeting, at 5:30 p.m. July 16.

The new map includes one trustee area with a slight majority, 51 to 52 percent, of Latinos among the citizens old enough to vote. The map’s Trustee Area 3 meanders from Casa Blanca through the Eastside to include Riverside’s Northside neighborhood and the Highgrove area.

Two board members, Gayle Cloud and Chuck Beaty, live in the proposed Trustee Area 5. No current board member lives in the proposed Trustee Area 4.

Earlier this year, the board set six criteria to divide the district into five trustee areas:

Each high school attendance zone must be represented by at least two trustee areas;

The total population in each area must be roughly equal, within 10 percent;

Trustee areas must be drawn to comply with the Federal Voting Rights Act;

Areas should be compact and contiguous;

They should reflect communities of interest as much as possible; and

One incumbent should live in each trustee area.
Although board members expressed concerns that the areas presented could be considered gerrymandering, Rubin assured them that other factors besides race went into drawing them. He said he believes the map would survive legal challenges, and it reflects all criteria except incumbency.

“I’m concerned about gerrymandering,” said Cloud, who is the board president.

“It looks like a salamander,” she said about Trustee Area 3.

The district and its demographic consultants drew five maps. An area with the largest percentage of Latinos eligible to vote was 42 percent in one of those maps.
Santa Rosa will ask voters to decide on district elections

By KEVIN MCGALLUM
THE PRESS DEMOCRAT
Published: Wednesday, June 20, 2012 at 3:31 p.m.

Santa Rosa voters get to decide in November whether to fundamentally change the way their city council is chosen.

The council has unanimously approved a ballot measure asking voters whether they want to elect representatives from seven districts instead of the city as a whole.

The decision Tuesday came as no surprise, given that last week a majority of council members voiced conceptual support for the idea of a ballot measure, which was narrowly recommended by the 21-member Charter Review Committee.

But the vote was nevertheless hailed by district election advocates as a breakthrough 20 years in the making.

City Hall politics long have been dominated by councilmembers who live in the city’s older east side, in particular the more affluent northeast. All seven current council members live on the east side — five of them in the northeast.

“I see some change happening,” Councilwoman Susan Gorin said. “This is very exciting.”

Supporters of district elections contend that it will increase accountability and diversity in City Hall decision making, reduce the cost of elections and protect the city from lawsuits alleging “racially polarized” voting patterns.

Opponents contend that the current system works just fine and that dividing the city into seven districts will “Balkanize” city politics and erode civic unity. They worry that district elections would make council members beholden to neighborhoods at the expense of the best interests of the city as a whole.

The ballot language will merely ask voters if they want the charter to call for electing representatives from seven districts instead of the current system of seven council members from the city as a whole.

Council candidates would have to live in the district they represent, which raises a concern from some about finding enough qualified candidates to run for city council. The districts would be drawn after the election.

Some council members had previously asked whether a hybrid system could be established, such as have five members elected by districts and two from the city as a whole.

However, City Attorney Caroline Fowler said that creating seven districts was legally preferable to such a hybrid system. That’s because cities with hybrid election systems aren’t protected from lawsuits under the California Voting Rights Act of 2001, but those with pure district elections are, she said.

Roseland resident Duane DeWitt said district elections are a “totally American approach” to government that is long overdue in a city ruled by the political elite and
business interests. Increasing the geographic diversity of representation is one way to help foster a more equitable government, he said.

"If you don't see the folks on the other side of the street that often, you're going to help the folks on your side of the street," DeWitt said.

(You can reach Staff Writer Kevin McCallum at 521-5207 or kevin.mccallum@pressdemocrat.com.)
Tulare hospital approves by-district elections

The Tulare Local HealthCare District Board of Directors voted unanimously Wednesday to approve by-district elections even though the ballot measure appears to have failed.

Some Hispanic citizens who pushed for by-district elections are not happy because they say the trustees divided up the district unfairly, creating only one Hispanic majority district even though the hospital district is 60 percent Hispanic.

"The map was clearly gerrymandered around each of the incumbents," said Alberto Aguilar of Tulare.

It was the second time by-district elections were put to the ballot, said Dr. Parmod Kumar, board president. In the 1990s, by-district elections lost by a large margin. In the June 5 election, at last count, it was behind by 367 votes out of 5,929 votes cast.

"That’s telling me and the board members that it is very close, he said. "We have to listen to the voices of the people who want by-district elections."

That’s a change of heart for the board. It fought by-district elections for at least five years since a lawsuit was filed in 2007 by seven Hispanic citizens who claim at-large elections dilute Hispanic representation and violate the California Voting Rights Act of 2001.

The lawsuit was long and costly for the hospital. It was settled and the ballot measure June 5 was part of the settlement, according to court records.

In all, Tulare Regional Medical Center paid out more than $1.4 million to lawyers on both sides of the issue, according to Kris Pedersen, legal counsel for the hospital.

More lawsuits could be in the wing. A San Francisco attorney has been in touch with the plaintiffs, said Rosalinda Avitia, one of the plaintiffs.

"Another lawsuit is imminent," Aguilar said.

Construction on the four-story tower just north of the main hospital is at least three months behind, said Mike McGuire, construction manager.
He projects it will open in March 2013.

The board decided to change architects during the last month. He said he did not know why the Christiansen Group of Visalia was let go.

At Wednesday’s meeting, Kumar introduced a new architect, Chuck Kluger of Signal Hill in Southern California.

“He works very hard,” Kumar said. “He has a person on the ground 24/7. This will push construction.”

Everyday construction is delayed, it costs the hospital $18,000, he said. There have been a lot of questions from construction managers on framing as they try to fit advanced medical equipment in the new building, said McGuire. More architects were needed to answer questions. Kluger’s architects are on-site five days a week, he said.

Hospital admissions were down during the month of May by 18 percent compared to last year but surgeries were up 14 percent.

The current cash balance is $15.4 million, Kumar said. Days cash on hand is 60 days.

However, the operating income for the month of May was almost $500,000 in the red and year-to-date it was more than $700,000 in the red, according to hospital financial records. The search for a permanent replacement for former Chief Executive Officer Shawn Bolouki continues.

Three recruitment firms gave presentations at Wednesday’s board meeting.

These firms make money when the candidate they present to the board gets hired.

Previously, the hospital revealed three finalists for interim CEO.

They were John P. Friel of Oakdale, Stephen R. Selzer of Conroe, Texas, and F. Curtis Smith of Boston, said Kris Pedersen, legal counsel for the hospital.
County Voters Will Pick Next Supervisor Election System

San Mateo County Board of Supervisors empowers voters to choose between "by district" or "at large" elections.

By Austin Walsh

Email the author

June 27, 2012

San Mateo County residents will have the opportunity this fall to choose which election system they prefer for selecting candidates to the county board of supervisors.

Under a unanimous decision by the county board of supervisors Tuesday morning, a ballot measure will allow voters to choose whether to move to a "by district" election system, which would empower residents within regional boundaries to select which candidate will represent each county district.

San Mateo County is the only county in the state that currently allows supervisors to be selected by an "at large" system, in which candidates that receive the most county-wide votes are elected.

In 2010, the board shot down the idea of floating a ballot measure that empowered voters to select the county election system.

But a lawsuit filed last August by the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area challenged the board's decision, and claimed that county leadership is marginalizing the Asian and Latino voting populations by continuing to use the "at large" system.

The lawsuit cites that nearly half the county's residents are either Asian or Latino, yet neither group is represented on the county Board of Supervisors.

Opponents of the "at large" system believe that supervisors elected by district are more likely to better represent the residents of that region, which could empower members of groups that have historically been under represented in government.
At the meeting Tuesday morning in Redwood City, most supervisors defended the status quo but acknowledged a willingness to allow voters to choose which system they prefer.

"I'm not opposed to putting it on the November ballot, but I still believe this is the best opportunity for representation of all county residents," said Supervisor Rose Jacobs Gibson, who will leave her seat on the board in the coming election.

Those who defend the "at large" system believe that it encourages supervisors to be informed on county-wide issues, rather than only those that impact the district that they represent.

Supervisor Carole Groom expressed many of those same sentiments, but ultimately decided it would be best to allow the residents to decide.

"Let's put it on the ballot and let's ask the voters what their vision is," she said.

Voters have twice in the past chosen to stick with the "at large" system, in 1978 and again in 1980.

Supervisor Don Horsley, who also favors the "at large" system, agreed that voters should once again have the opportunity to choose.

"It is the right of the people to decide how they are governed," he said.

The proposed measure will come back to the board for a final approval in July, before ballot language is agreed upon and sent on to the county election officials for certification to go on the November 2012 election ballot.
CORONA-NORCO: School officials plan no trustee areas

BY LESLIE PARRILLA AND JIM MILLER

STAFF WRITERS

lparrilla@pe.com | jmiller@pe.com

Published: 29 June 2012 07:41 PM

Corona-Norco school officials said they see no evidence that minority voters lack the ability to elect a board member that represents them. School leaders don’t plan to change their system, as many other districts across the state have done to avoid lawsuits.

But an analysis of some statewide races suggests minorities in the school district could be at a disadvantage. Minority voters are more likely to cast ballots for minority candidates and white voters for white candidates, according to a Press-Enterprise analysis of election data from the Statewide Database at UC Berkeley.

Dozens of school districts throughout California are moving from at-large elections, in which candidates run across a whole district, to by-district elections, in which they run in a particular council ward or trustee area.

Critics blame at-large elections for disenfranchising Latino voters at the local level because Latino candidates often cannot win across a whole city or district. When districts divide into smaller areas, that allows Latino or other minority communities to elect a representative from their own neighborhoods, supporters say.

The Riverside Unified School District is making such a change, hoping to avoid potential lawsuits related to violating the California Voting Rights Act, passed by state lawmakers in 2002. That law prohibits at-large elections when they hinder the ability of a “protected class” of people, such as Latinos, to elect candidates from their community.
In areas such as Southern California, where the Latino population grew dramatically during the past decade, according to 2010 census numbers, a flurry of changes by school districts are taking place in an effort to avoid lawsuits.

"This year, I’m thinking we need a Hispanic person on the school board," said Mary Ybarra, who has lived in Corona for 30 years and was active for years in the Corona-Norco PTA Council. "I’m thinking there’s more Latino students in the school district and now we’re needing it."

Though minorities make up the majority of the Corona-Norco Unified School District, only one Latino has served on the board. That was in the 1960s and 1970s, according to the Riverside County Office of Education.

About 31 percent of the district’s 53,000-student population is white. Latinos comprise about half of the enrollment, followed by black, Asian and other groups, said Assistant Superintendent Tom Pike.

The city of Corona’s Latino population grew in the city of 152,000 from 35 percent in 2000 to almost 46 percent a decade later.

But Pike said a district analysis of voting patterns in precincts showed no evidence that the system should change to trustee areas.

"We have taken a look at it and don’t find that there’s really any evidence of racially polarized voting, which is really the standard," Pike said.

He said there’s no urgent need or pressing legal reason to move toward trustee areas or wards.

Pike did not have the documents readily available that officials used to study the district’s voting patterns in precincts and preferred candidates.

Three statewide non-partisan races suggest racially polarized voting. In the 2010 Democratic primary for insurance commissioner, Latino Hector De La Torre ran against Dave Jones, who is white. In areas that were 75 percent Latino, more people, 56 percent, voted for De La Torre. In primarily white areas, De La Torre averaged about 41 percent.
Similar results were seen a 2006 Democratic primary for secretary of state between Deborah Ortiz and Debra Bowen and in the 2003 gubernatorial recall election between Arnold Schwarzenegger and Cruz Bustamante.

In the latter race, Bustamante captured about 42 percent of the vote in heavily Latino areas, while he received less than 14 percent in the primarily white areas.

More study of voting patterns is needed, according to Robert Rubin, a lawyer who helped write the state voting rights law and has handled many of the cases stemming from it.

"It suggests racially polarized voting. The minority community is voting in a cohesive manner and the white community is voting in a similar manner that beats the decision of a Latino community," said Rubin, who has been involved with the issue in Riverside Unified.

He said to make a true determination of whether racially polarized voting is occurring, a study would need to done on the ethnic makeup and voting patterns on a precinct level. Until then, it's unclear whether Latinos are at a disadvantage in the district, he said.
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ACLU Sues Anaheim, Alleges Racially Polarized Voting

By a MetNews Staff Writer

The ACLU of Southern California has sued the City of Anaheim, alleging that its at-large system for electing a mayor and council discriminates against the city’s large Latino population.

The action, filed Thursday in Orange Superior Court, asks for an order declaring the present system unlawful under the California Voting Rights Act, and requiring the city to replace it with district elections.

The CVRA is similar to its federal counterpart, but is more favorable to plaintiffs in that it does not require proof that the disfavored minority lives in a geographically compact area or that the city or its officials have a discriminatory animus.

The ACLU—which is handling the case along with the Oakland firm Goldstein, Demchak, Baller, Borgen & Dardarian, said the city has made it nearly impossible for Latinos, who make up more than one-third of the electorate, to be fairly represented on the city council. Anaheim city government is comprised of a four member city council and a mayor, but there are currently no Latinos on the city council, and only three Latino individuals have ever been elected to the city council in Anaheim’s history, the complaint noted.

Two Latinos were elected in 2002, the plaintiffs noted, but under unique circumstances. Both were ex-firefighters and received huge support from non-Latinos in the first elections held after the 9/11 attacks, but only one was re-elected, while the other was defeated despite huge Latino support.

The complaint recites a long history of anti-Latino discrimination in the city, dating back to the 1920s, when it was known as “Klanaheim” because a majority of its council members were known to belong to the Ku Klux Klan. Latinos were long segregated in the local public schools, the complaint notes, long after courts said the practice was unconstitutional.

"A recurring and central issue for the Latino community, a large concentration of which resides in central Anaheim, in close proximity to the heart of the tourism industry, is that the city council puts the needs of big business ahead of their concerns, sacrificing their quality of life in favor of revenues that are disproportionately spent outside of Latino neighborhoods, many of which are in dire need of the support,” the ACLU said in a press release. “Under the current system, Latinos have no voice in their city government who can represent and raise their concerns.”

The plaintiffs are asking for an injunction that would end at-large elections after this year’s.

Copyright 2012, Metropolitan News Company
Pressure on Anaheim to change elections

By ERIC CARPENTER
2012-07-12 05:52:41

ANAHEIM – City officials held a workshop Wednesday night to examine the way Anaheim elects city leaders – the first step in what could lead to sweeping changes in how the City Council is elected in this 155-year-old town.

Anaheim, the county’s most populous city, is facing a lawsuit that contends its election system leads to a lack of minority representation. So Anaheim is considering changing its system from at-large to district elections.

The issue has come up periodically, but the heat was turned up June 28 when three Latino community leaders and the American Civil Liberties Union filed a lawsuit claiming Anaheim violates the California Voting Rights Act and demanding district elections.

About 100 people attended Wednesday night’s workshop, led by a panel of four voting-rights and demography experts. It was attended by all five council members, who said they organized the workshop to learn; the council took no action.

Residents who spoke during the workshop were sharply divided on whether Anaheim’s system should change. A majority of those who spoke supported electing council members by district, saying they would feel better represented and more empowered to participate in local government.

They wore neon stickers with the message: "Anaheim, Mirror Our City."

Resident Maria Rivera, who spoke in Spanish through a translator, said that district elections would lead to "more support and more attention to the needs of all (Anaheim) communities."

Other speakers opposed changing the system, saying that at-large elections make all the council members accountable to every resident – not just those living in a specified district.

It also ensures that the council works together on a unified vision for the city, they argued.

D.R. Haywood said he hadn’t decided yet which system he liked best, but he had doubts that district elections would make things better. "My main concern is the loss of the opportunity to vote for the overall composition of the council," he said. "I want to elect people who will work well together."

The panel included Robert Rubin, who helped draft the state’s Voting Rights Act, and Jose Paz, an attorney for Compton, a city that recently changed to district elections after facing a similar lawsuit saying that Latinos were underrepresented on that city’s council.

Most cities in Orange County have at-large elections, meaning council members can come from anywhere in the city.

Santa Ana elects from districts (or wards), meaning the candidate must come from within the district, but any registered voter in the city can vote for candidates in any district.
That would not be a solution for Anaheim if the courts determine there is a violation of the state's voting rights act, Rubin said.

The choices Anaheim could consider include:

- Establishing four or more council districts and allowing only voters from within that district to vote for a district council member.

- Instituting a cumulative system, which would allow voters to have, for instance, five votes and allow them to cast one vote for five council candidates or up to five votes for one preferred candidate. (Only three jurisdictions in the nation have such a system.)

- Choosing a ranked system, which would allow voters to cast a ballot for the candidate they most want, but also select a second, third and fourth choice, and so on. If a candidate fails to get enough votes, that candidate is eliminated and the votes are redistributed to a second choice.

The way Anaheim elects council members is guided by the city's charter. So any change would require a public vote. If the city moves to district elections, those districts would be drawn by Anaheim officials, likely with the guidance of a judge, experts said.

The ACLU lawsuit is pending. City officials have yet to announce next steps.

A rebroadcast of Wednesday's meeting will be available at anaheim.net.

Contact the writer: 714-704-3769 or ecarpenter@ocregister.com
Alvord school board member Carolyn Wilson says she is concerned about the $20,000 cost for a liability study for the district's at-large elections of board members. She said the study can be done with the district's own attorneys during closed session before the Aug. 9 meeting.

BY DAYNA STRAEHLEY The Press Enterprise STAFF WRITER
dstraehley@pe.com

Published: 13 July 2012 01:09 PM

The Alvord school board decided Thursday night, July 12, to wait until next month before starting studies on whether to divide the district into trustee areas.

Board member Carolyn Wilson said she is concerned about the $20,000 cost for an outside study of the potential for lawsuits under the California Voting Rights Act. She wants a closed session discussion before next month's meeting with the school district's attorneys. Wilson said she doesn't want to proceed to draw maps of possible trustee areas without a study.

Alvord Unified School District covers parts of west Riverside, west Home Gardens and east Corona.
INFORMATIONAL CORRESPONDENCE
NOTICE TO INTERESTED AGENCIES

Distribution:
LA County Board of Supervisors (Fifth District)
LA County Library
LA County Public Works
LA County Fire Department
United States Department of the Interior-Bureau of Reclamation
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District
Antelope Valley Resource conservation District
City of Santa Clarita
Sulphur Springs Union School District
William S. Hart School District

LAFCO File:  Annexation No. 1026 to Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District of Los Angeles County

Notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexation listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission. The application proposes to annex 70.876± acres to the district. The subject territory is located on Sierra Highway approximately 3,000 feet northwest of the intersection of Soledad Canyon Road and Sand Canyon Road, all within the City of Santa Clarita.

The proposal application and map are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by Monday, August 13, 2012.

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

Date:    July 11, 2012

Paul A. Novak
Executive Officer
APPLICATION TO INITIATE PROCEEDING FOR CHANGE OF ORGANIZATION/REORGANIZATION/SPECIAL REORGANIZATION

(Pursuant to the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000, Division 3, Title 5 Commencing with Section 56000, of the Government Code)

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO.: A-SCV-1026

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)
1. Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District of Los Angeles County
2. 

RELATED JURISDICTIONAL CHANGES
(Annexation, Detachment, Sphere of Influence Amendment, etc.)
1. Annexation
2. 

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

APPLICANT: Grace Robinson Chan

TITLE: Chief Engineer and General Manager
CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER: Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District of Los Angeles County

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

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: Donna Kitt
E-MAIL ADDRESS: dkitt@lacsd.org

TELEPHONE: (562) 908-4288 ext. 2708

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

Signature: [Signature]

Date: June 19, 2012

Description of Proposal Location:

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

Thomas Brothers Map Page 4462, Grid B7; and Page 4552, Grid B1

Located on Sierra Highway approximately 3,000 feet northwest of the intersection of Soledad Canyon Road and Sand Canyon Road, all within the City of Santa Clarita.

Total Acreage or Square Miles of Territory:

70.876 acres or 0.111 square miles

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

☐ Yes    ☒ No

General Project Information

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

   The subject territory consists of a college and is located within a commercial area.

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

   The topography is flat.

Population and Housing

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

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory.
   1
5. What is the proximity of the subject territory to other populated areas?
   N/A

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

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:
   0

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

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

LAND USE AND ZONING

1. What is the assessed land valuation of the subject territory (give source and date of information)?
   The assessed valuation per the Assessor's current tax roll is $680,680.

2. What is the current land use and zoning designation within the subject area?
   The present land use is commercial. The current zoning is IC - Industrial/Commercial.

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

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

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

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

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

8. Will this proposal result in development of property now or in the near future? Describe the type of development proposed (type of business or industry, single-family or multi-family residential, etc., and number of units or facilities).
   N/A
9. What effect would denial of this proposal have on the proposed development, if any?
Denial would prevent said territory from obtaining off-site sewage disposal services from the Sanitation District. There are no other local agencies providing off-site sewage disposal services. Therefore, property owners can request permission from their local jurisdiction to construct a septic system.

10. Is the subject territory currently within a redevelopment area or proposed to be included within a redevelopment project area upon completion of this proposal?
No

11. Are there any agricultural or open space lands within the proposal area? What is the effect of this proposal on agricultural or open space lands?
No

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Explain in detail the reasons for this proposal and why it is necessary.
All of the owners of real properties within the territory proposed to be annexed have requested, in writing, that their properties be annexed to Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District so that said district can provide off-site sewage disposal service to said properties.

2. What will be the effect of the proposal and of alternative actions on the following: (Include the names of other local agencies having the authority to provide the same or similar services as those proposed.)
   a. Adjacent areas:
      N/A
   b. Mutual social and economic interests:
      N/A
   c. The local government structure of the County:
      No effect.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

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

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

The wastewater generated by the proposed annexation is being treated by the Santa Clarita Valley Joint Sewerage System (SCVJSS), which is comprised of the Saugus and Valencia Water reclamation Plants. The SCVJSS has a design capacity of 28.1 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 19.9 mgd. The District's sewerage facilities have adequate capacity to collect, treat, and dispose of the wastewater generated by the subject territory.
2. Estimate the probable future need for government services (including public facilities) or controls in the area:

   The subject territory is already being serviced by the District. The area was included in the future service area that might be served by the District. The District’s future wastewater management needs were addressed in the 2015 Santa Clarita Valley Joint Sewerage System Facilities Plan and EIR.

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

   N/A

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

   The current permitted capacity of the SCVJSS is 28.1 mgd. On January 29, 1998, the Boards of Directors of Districts Nos. 26 and 32 (the two Districts that subsequently consolidated to form Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District) approved the 2015 Plan and certified the associated EIR. The 2015 Plan addresses the sewerage needs of the SCVJSS service area through the year 2015 and the services planned to meet those needs. The 2015 Plan allows the capacity of the SCVJSS to increase to 34.1 mgd by 2015.

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

   The property owner will be paying a service charge for the Districts services.

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

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

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

   Yes □  Name of Agency: Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District of Los Angeles County  No □

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

   N/A

BONDED INDEBTNESS

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

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

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

   Because all of the District’s existing bonded indebtedness is in the form of revenue bonds, liability for payment of the debt is apportioned to and collected from every parcel pursuant to the terms of the District’s Service Charge Program and not as a separate property tax levy. The District’s Master Service Charge Ordinance provides that local governmental parcels are exempt as long as they continue to be used for local governmental purposes. Likewise, the Ordinance provides an exemption for parcels that are not connected to the sewerage system (e.g. open space) until such time as they connect to the sewerage system.
3. To what extent will landowners within the proposal area be liable or remain liable for any existing indebtedness of the city or district? Until revenue bond is paid in full.

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

**NOTIFICATION**

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

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

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

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

SANTA CLARITA VALLEY SANITATION DISTRICT
OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIF.
OFFICE OF CHIEF ENGINEER
GRACE ROBINSON CHAN
CHIEF ENGINEER AND GENERAL MANAGER
ANNEXATION NO. 1026
TO
SANTA CLARITA VALLEY SANITATION DISTRICT

Recorded:

T.G. 4462, 87/ 4552, B1

Annexation No. 1026 shown thus:

Boundary of Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District prior to Annexation No. 1026 shown thus:

Prior Annexations shown thus:

Area of Annexation: 70.876 Acres
NOTICE TO INTERESTED AGENCIES

Distribution:
LA County Board of Supervisors (Fifth District)
LA County Library
LA County Public Works
LA County Fire Department
United States Department of the Interior-Bureau of Reclamation
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Antelope Valley Mosquito & Vector Control District
Antelope Valley Resource conservation District
City of Palmdale
Westside Union School District
Antelope Valley Union School District

LAFCO File: Annexation No. 82 to County Sanitation District No. 20

Notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexation listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission. The application proposes to annex 240.860± acres to the district. The subject territory is located at the southwest corner of Avenue S and 70th Street East, all within the City of Palmdale.

The proposal application and map are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by Monday, August 13, 2012.

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

Date: July 11, 2012

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

**LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO. : A-20-82**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFFECTED AGENCIES (Cities and/or Special Districts)</th>
<th>RELATED JURISDICTIONAL CHANGES (Annexation, Detachment, Sphere of Influence Amendment, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. County Sanitation District No. 20 of Los Angeles County</td>
<td>1. Annexation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ________________________________________________</td>
<td>2. ________________________________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPOSAL INITIATED BY:**  ✑ RESOLUTION  ☐ LANDOWNER/REGISTERED VOTER PETITION

**APPLICANT:** Grace Robinson Chan

**TITLE:** Chief Engineer and General Manager  **CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER:** County Sanitation District No. 20 of Los Angeles County

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

**DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON:** Donna Kitt  **TELEPHONE:** (562) 908-4288 ext. 2708

**E-MAIL ADDRESS:** dkitt@lacsdo.org

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

SIGNATURE: \[Signature\]  DATE: June 4, 2012

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:

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

Thomas Brothers Map Page 4287, Grids C/D4
Located at the southwest corner of Avenue S and 70th Street East, all within the City of Palmdale

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:

240.860 acres or 0.376 square miles

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

☐ Yes  ☐ No

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

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

The subject territory consists of 175 single-family homes and is located within a residential area.

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

The topography is flat.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. What is the current population of the subject territory?
   385

2. If the proposal includes development, what is the estimated population of the proposed area?
   2,556

3. Number of registered voters within the proposed territory.
   181

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory.
   173
5. What is the proximity of the subject territory to other populated areas?
   N/A

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

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:
   175 single-family homes

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

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

LAND USE AND ZONING

1. What is the assessed land valuation of the subject territory (give source and date of information)?
   The assessed valuation per the Assessor’s current tax roll is $42,829,938.

2. What is the current land use and zoning designation within the subject area?
   The present land use is vacant. The current zoning is Single-Family Residential 7,000 sq. ft. min. lot size [R-7000].

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

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

5. What is the land use in the surrounding area? Be specific.
   The land use in the surrounding territory is residential to the north and west and vacant to the east and south.

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

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

8. Will this proposal result in development of property now or in the near future? Describe the type of development proposed (type of business or industry, single-family or multi-family residential, etc., and number of units or facilities).
   There are 677 proposed single-family homes still to be developed.
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9. What effect would denial of this proposal have on the proposed development, if any?

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

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

No

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

No

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

All of the owners of real properties within the territory proposed to be annexed have requested, in writing, that their properties be annexed to County Sanitation District No. 20 so that said district can provide off-site sewage disposal service to said properties.

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

a. Adjacent areas:

   N/A

b. Mutual social and economic interests:

   N/A

c. The local government structure of the County:

   No effect.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

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

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

   The wastewater generated by the proposed annexation is being treated at the Palmdale Water Reclamation Plant (PWRP). The PWRP has a design capacity of 12 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 9.4 mgd. The District's sewerage facilities have adequate capacity to collect, treat, and dispose of the wastewater generated by the subject territory.

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

   A portion of the annexation territory is already being serviced by the District and the entire annexation area was included in the future service area that might be served by the District. The District's future wastewater management needs were addressed in the Palmdale Water Reclamation Plant 2025 Facilities Plan.
3. If the proposal includes incorporation, formation, or annexation, what will be the effect of this proposal or exclusion and of alternative courses of action on the cost and adequacy of services and controls in the proposed area and adjacent areas?

N/A

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

The current permitted capacity of the PWRP is 12 mgd. On October 6, 2005, the Board of Directors of District No. 20 approved the Palmdale Water Reclamation Plan 2025 Facilities Plan and certified the associated EIR. The 2025 Plan addresses the sewerage needs of the PWRP service area through the year 2025 and the services planned to meet those needs. The 2025 plan allows the capacity of the PWRP to increase to 22.4 mgd by 2025.

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

The property owner will be paying a service charge for the Districts services.

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

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

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

   Yes ☐  Name of Agency: County Sanitation District No. 20 of Los Angeles County  No ☐

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

   N/A

BONDED INDEBTNESS

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

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

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

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

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

   Until revenue bond is paid in full.

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

   N/A
NOTIFICATION

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

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

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

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

Distribution:
LA County Board of Supervisors (Fifth District)
LA County Library
LA County Public Works
LA County Fire Department
United States Department of the Interior-Bureau of Reclamation
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Lancaster Cemetery District
Antelope Valley Mosquito & Vector Control District
Antelope Valley Resource conservation District
Westside Union Unified School District
Antelope Valley Union School District

LAFCO File: Annexation No. 398 to County Sanitation District No. 14

Notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexation listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission. The application proposes to annex 2.531± acres to the district. The subject territory is located on 10th Street West approximately 500 feet north of Avenue O, all within the unincorporated Los Angeles County.

The proposal application and map are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by Monday, August 13, 2012.

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

Date: July 11, 2012

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

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO.: A-14-398

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)

1. County Sanitation District No. 14 of Los Angeles County
2. ____________________________________________

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

1. Annexation
2. ____________________________________________

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

APPLICANT: Grace Robinson Chan

TITLE: Chief Engineer and General Manager
CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER: County Sanitation District No. 14 of Los Angeles County

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

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

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

SIGNATURE: Grace Lee  
DATE: May 30, 2012

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:
Describe the location of the proposal area including major streets and highways that border the project area.

Thomas Brothers Map Page 4195, Grid G2
Located on 10th Street West approximately 500 feet north of Avenue O, all within unincorporated Los Angeles County.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:
2.531 acres or 0.004 square miles

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

☐ Yes ☒ No

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

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

The subject territory consists of one single-family home and one vacant commercial lot and is located within residential and commercial areas.

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

The topography is flat.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. What is the current population of the subject territory?
   2

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

3. Number of registered voters within the proposed territory.
   2

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory.
   1
5. What is the proximity of the subject territory to other populated areas?
   N/A

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

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:
   one single-family home

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

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

**LAND USE AND ZONING**

1. What is the assessed land valuation of the subject territory (give source and date of information)?
   The assessed valuation per the Assessor’s current tax roll is $50,086.

2. What is the current land use and zoning designation within the subject area?
   The present land use is residential and vacant. The current zoning is Office Professional [C-2] and Heavy Agricultural, 1 acre minimum lot size [A-2-1].

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

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

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

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

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

8. Will this proposal result in development of property now or in the near future? Describe the type of development proposed (type of business or industry, single-family or multi-family residential, etc., and number of units or facilities).
   There is no proposed development planned at the present time.
9. What effect would denial of this proposal have on the proposed development, if any?

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

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

No

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

No

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

All of the owners of real properties within the territory proposed to be annexed have requested, in writing, that their properties be annexed to County Sanitation District No. 14 so that said district can provide off-site sewage disposal service to said properties.

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

a. Adjacent areas:

N/A

b. Mutual social and economic interests:

N/A

c. The local government structure of the County:

No effect.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

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

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

The wastewater generated by the proposed annexation is being treated at the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant (LWRP). The LWRP has a design capacity of 18 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 13.9 mgd. The District's sewerage facilities have adequate capacity to collect, treat, and dispose of the wastewater generated by the subject territory.

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

A portion of the proposed annexation area is already being serviced by the District and the entire area was included in the future service area that might be served by the District. The District's future wastewater management needs were addressed in the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant 2020 Facilities Plan.
3. If the proposal includes incorporation, formation, or annexation, what will be the effect of this proposal or exclusion and of alternative courses of action on the cost and adequacy of services and controls in the proposed area and adjacent areas?  
N/A

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

The current permitted capacity of the LWRP is 18 mgd. On June 16, 2004, the Board of Directors of District No. 14 approved the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plan 2020 Facilities Plan and certified the associated EIR. The 2020 Plan addresses the sewerage needs of the LWRP service area through the year 2020 and the services planned to meet those needs. The 2020 plan allows the capacity of the LWRP to increase to 26 mgd by 2020.

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

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

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

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

1. Is the proposed area within the existing sphere of influence of the annexing agency?
   Yes ☒ Name of Agency: County Sanitation District No. 14 of Los Angeles County  No ☐

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

BONDED INDEBTNESS

1. Do the agencies whose boundaries are being changed have any existing bonded debt?
   Yes. The District only has outstanding revenue bonds. These are not general obligation bonds subject to taxation.

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

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

3. To what extent will landowners within the proposal area be liable or remain liable for any existing indebtedness of the city or district?
   Until revenue bond is paid in full.

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

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

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

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

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

Distribution:
LA County Board of Supervisors (Fifth District)
LA County Library
LA County Public Works
LA County Fire Department
United States Department of the Interior-Bureau of Reclamation
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District
City of Santa Clarita
Castaic Lake Water Agency
Newhall School District
William S. Hart School District

LAFCO File:  Annexation No. 1061 to Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District of Los Angeles County

Notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexation listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission. The application proposes to annex 1.621± acres to the district. The subject territory is located on Newhall Avenue approximately 600 feet northwest of Meadow Ridge Drive, all within the City of Santa Clarita.

The proposal application and map are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by Monday, August 13, 2012.

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

Date:  July 11, 2012

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

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO. : A-SCV-1061

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)

1. Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District of Los Angeles County

2. ____________________________

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

1. Annexation

2. ____________________________

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

APPLICANT: Grace Robinson Chan

TITLE: Chief Engineer and General Manager       CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER: Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District of Los Angeles County

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

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: Donna Kitt       TELEPHONE: (562) 908-4288 ext. 2708

E-MAIL ADDRESS: dkkitt@lacsd.org

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

SIGNATURE: Grace L Clem

DATE: June 19, 2012

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:

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

Thomas Brothers Map Page 4641, Grid B2
Located on Newhall Avenue approximately 600 feet northwest of Meadow Ridge Drive, all within the City of Santa Clarita.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:

1.621 acres or 0.003 square miles

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

☐ Yes  ☒ No

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

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

   The subject territory consists of vacant land and is located within a residential area.

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

   The topography is flat.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

2. If the proposal includes development, what is the estimated population of the proposed area?
   90

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

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory.
   1
5. What is the proximity of the subject territory to other populated areas?
   N/A

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

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:
   0

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

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

**LAND USE AND ZONING**

1. What is the assessed land valuation of the subject territory (give source and date of information)?
   The assessed valuation per the Assessor’s current tax roll is $54,561.

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

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

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

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

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

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

8. Will this proposal result in development of property now or in the near future? Describe the type of development proposed (type of business or industry, single-family or multi-family residential, etc., and number of units or facilities).
   The territory is being developed to include a proposed 30-unit apartment complex.
9. What effect would denial of this proposal have on the proposed development, if any?

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

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

Yes. Santa Clarita-Newhall RP.

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

No

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

All of the owners of real properties within the territory proposed to be annexed have requested, in writing, that their properties be annexed to Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District so that said district can provide off-site sewage disposal service to said properties.

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

   a. Adjacent areas:
      N/A

   b. Mutual social and economic interests:
      N/A

   c. The local government structure of the County:
      No effect.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

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

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

The wastewater generated by the proposed project will be treated by the Santa Clarita Valley Joint Sewerage System (SCVJSS), which is comprised of the Saugus and Valencia Water reclamation Plants. The SCVJSS has a design capacity of 28.1 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 19.9 mgd. The District's sewerage facilities have adequate capacity to collect, treat, and dispose of the wastewater to be generated by the subject territory.
2. Estimate the probable future need for government services (including public facilities) or controls in the area:
Although the present area is not currently serviced by the District, the area was included in the future service area that might be served by the District. The District’s future wastewater management needs were addressed in the 2015 Santa Clarita Valley Joint Sewerage System Facilities Plan and EIR.

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

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

The current permitted capacity of the SCVJSS is 28.1 mgd. On January 29, 1998, the Boards of Directors of Districts Nos. 26 and 32 (the two Districts that subsequently consolidated to form Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District) approved the 2015 Plan and certified the associated EIR. The 2015 Plan addresses the sewerage needs of the SCVJSS service area through the year 2015 and the services planned to meet those needs. The 2015 Plan allows the capacity of the SCVJSS to increase to 34.1 mgd by 2015.

5. List any assessments, fees, or other charges to be levied as part of this proposal and or that may be levied in the near future.
The property owner will be paying a service charge for the Districts services.

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

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

1. Is the proposed area within the existing sphere of influence of the annexing agency?
   Yes ☒ Name of Agency: Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District of Los Angeles County No ☐

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

BONDED INDEBTNESS

1. Do the agencies whose boundaries are being changed have any existing bonded debt?
   Yes. The District only has outstanding revenue bonds. These are not general obligation bonds subject to taxation.

2. Will the proposal area be liable for payment of its fair share of this existing debt?
   Because all of the District’s existing bonded indebtedness is in the form of revenue bonds, liability for payment of the debt is apportioned to and collected from every parcel pursuant to the terms of the District’s Service Charge Program and not as a separate property tax levy. The District’s Master Service Charge Ordinance provides that local governmental parcels are exempt as long as they continue to be used for local governmental purposes. Likewise, the Ordinance provides an exemption for parcels that are not connected to the sewerage system (e.g. open space) until such time as they connect to the sewerage system.
3. To what extent will landowners within the proposal area be liable or remain liable for any existing indebtedness of the city or district? Until revenue bond is paid in full.

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

NOTIFICATION

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

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

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

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

Distribution:
LA County Board of Supervisors (Fifth District)
LA County Library
LA County Public Works
LA County Fire Department
United States Department of the Interior-Bureau of Reclamation
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District
Antelope Valley Resource conservation District
City of Santa Clarita
Sulphur Springs Union School District
William S. Hart School District

LAFCO File: Annexation No. 1060 to Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District of Los Angeles County

Notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexation listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission. The application proposes to annex 2.905± acres to the district. The subject territory is located on Sierra Highway between Raquet Club Court and Dolan Way, all within the City of Santa Clarita.

The proposal application and map are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by Monday, August 13, 2012.

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

Date: July 11, 2012

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

**LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO. : A-SCV-1060**

**AFFECTED AGENCIES**
(Cities and/or Special Districts)

1. Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District of Los Angeles County

2. 

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

1. Annexation

2. 

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

**APPLICANT:** Grace Robinson Chan

**TITLE:** Chief Engineer and General Manager  **CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER:** Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District of Los Angeles County

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

**DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON:** Donna Kitt  **TELEPHONE:** (562) 908-4288 ext. 2708

**E-MAIL ADDRESS:** dkiit@lacsd.org

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

SIGNATURE: [Signature]  
DATE: June 19, 2012

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:

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

Thomas Brothers Map Page 4551, Grid J2  
Located on Sierra Highway between Raquet Club Court and Dolan Way, all within the City of Santa Clarita.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:

2.905 acres or 0.005 square miles

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

☐ Yes  ☒ No

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

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

   The subject territory consists of a church and is located within a commercial area.

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

   The topography is flat.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory.
   1
5. What is the proximity of the subject territory to other populated areas?
   N/A

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

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:
   0

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

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

LAND USE AND ZONING

1. What is the assessed land valuation of the subject territory (give source and date of information)?
   The assessed valuation per the Assessor’s current tax roll is $753,852.

2. What is the current land use and zoning designation within the subject area?
   The present land use is commercial. The current zoning is Community Commercial [CC].

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

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

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

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

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

8. Will this proposal result in development of property now or in the near future? Describe the type of development proposed (type of business or industry, single-family or multi-family residential, etc., and number of units or facilities).
   N/A
9. What effect would denial of this proposal have on the proposed development, if any?

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

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

No

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

No

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

All of the owners of real properties within the territory proposed to be annexed have requested, in writing, that their properties be annexed to Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District so that said district can provide off-site sewage disposal service to said properties.

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

a. Adjacent areas:
   N/A

b. Mutual social and economic interests:
   N/A

c. The local government structure of the County:
   No effect.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

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

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

The wastewater generated by the proposed annexation is being treated by the Santa Clarita Valley Joint Sewerage System (SCVJSS), which is comprised of the Saugus and Valencia Water reclamation Plants. The SCVJSS has a design capacity of 28.1 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 19.9 mgd. The District's sewerage facilities have adequate capacity to collect, treat, and dispose of the wastewater generated by the subject territory.
2. Estimate the probable future need for government services (including public facilities) or controls in the area:

   The subject territory is already being serviced by the District. The area was included in the future service area that might be served by the District. The District’s future wastewater management needs were addressed in the 2015 Santa Clarita Valley Joint Sewerage System Facilities Plan and EIR.

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

   N/A

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

   The current permitted capacity of the SCVJSS is 28.1 mgd. On January 29, 1998, the Boards of Directors of Districts Nos. 26 and 32 (the two Districts that subsequently consolidated to form Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District) approved the 2015 Plan and certified the associated EIR. The 2015 Plan addresses the sewerage needs of the SCVJSS service area through the year 2015 and the services planned to meet those needs. The 2015 Plan allows the capacity of the SCVJSS to increase to 34.1 mgd by 2015.

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

   The property owner will be paying a service charge for the Districts services.

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

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

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

   Yes ☑️ Name of Agency: Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District of Los Angeles County No ☐

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

   N/A

BONDED INDEBTNESS

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

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

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

   Because all of the District’s existing bonded indebtedness is in the form of revenue bonds, liability for payment of the debt is apportioned to and collected from every parcel pursuant to the terms of the District’s Service Charge Program and not as a separate property tax levy. The District’s Master Service Charge Ordinance provides that local governmental parcels are exempt as long as they continue to be used for local governmental purposes. Likewise, the Ordinance provides an exemption for parcels that are not connected to the sewerage system (e.g. open space) until such time as they connect to the sewerage system.
3. To what extent will landowners within the proposal area be liable or remain liable for any existing indebtedness of the city or district? Until revenue bond is paid in full.

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

NOTIFICATION

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donna J. Kitt</td>
<td>P.O. Box 4998, Whittier, CA 90607-4998</td>
<td>(562) 908-4288 ext. 2708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annexation No. 1060 shown thus
Boundary of Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District
Prior to Annexation No. 1060 shown thus
Prior Annexations shown thus
Area of Annexation

2.905 Acres
NOTICE TO INTERESTED AGENCIES

Distribution:
LA County Board of Supervisors (Fifth District)
LA County Library
LA County Public Works
LA County Fire Department
United States Department of the Interior-Bureau of Reclamation
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Antelope Valley Resource conservation District
City of Palmdale
Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency
Westside Union School District
Antelope Valley Union School District

LAFCO File: Annexation No. 89 to County Sanitation District No. 20

Notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexation listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission. The application proposes to annex 6.287± acres to the district. The subject territory is Joshua Ranch Road which serves as the access road to the Joshua Ranch development, all within the City of Palmdale.

The proposal application and map are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by Monday, August 13, 2012.

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

Date: July 11, 2012

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

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO. : A-20-89

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)

1. County Sanitation District No. 20
   of Los Angeles County

2. ________________________________

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

1. Annexation

2. ________________________________

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

APPLICANT: Grace Robinson Chan

TITLE: Chief Engineer and General Manager

CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER: County Sanitation District No. 20
   of Los Angeles County

ADDRESS: P.O. Box 4998

CITY: Whittier

STATE: CA

ZIP CODE: 90607-4998

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: Donna Kitt

E-MAIL ADDRESS: dkit@lacsd.org

TELEPHONE: (562) 908-4288 ext. 2708

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


DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:

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

Thomas Brothers Map Page 4194, Grids J5, 6; and Page 4195, Grid A5

The parcel is Joshua Ranch Road which serves as the access road to the Joshua Ranch development, located within the City of Palmdale.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:

6.287 acres or 0.010 square miles

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

☐ Yes ☒ No

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

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

   The subject territory consists of vacant land and is located within a vacant residential area.

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

   The topography is hilly terrain with evidence of natural drainage courses.

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. 
   0

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory. 
   1
5. What is the proximity of the subject territory to other populated areas?
   N/A

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

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:
   0

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

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

LAND USE AND ZONING

1. What is the assessed land valuation of the subject territory (give source and date of information)?
   The assessed valuation is not listed on the Assessor's current tax roll.

2. What is the current land use and zoning designation within the subject area?
   The present land use is vacant residential. The current zoning is Single Family Residential, up to 20,000 sq. ft. lot [R-1-20000].

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

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

5. What is the land use in the surrounding area? Be specific.
   The land use in the surrounding territory is vacant to the north, south, east & west.

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

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

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

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

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

No

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

No

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

All of the owners of real properties within the territory proposed to be annexed have requested, in writing, that their properties be annexed to County Sanitation District No. 20 so that said district can provide off-site sewage disposal service to said properties.

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

   a. Adjacent areas:

      N/A

   b. Mutual social and economic interests:

      N/A

   c. The local government structure of the County:

      No effect.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

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

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

The wastewater generated by the proposed project will be treated at the Palmdale Water Reclamation Plant (PWRP). The PWRP has a design capacity of 15 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 9.4 mgd. The District's sewerage facilities have adequate capacity to collect, treat, and dispose of the wastewater to be generated by the subject territory.
2. Estimate the probable future need for government services (including public facilities) or controls in the area:

Although the present area is not currently serviced by the District, the area was included in the future service area that might be served by the District. The District’s future wastewater management needs were addressed in the Palmdale Water Reclamation Plant 2025 Facilities Plan.

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

N/A

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

The current permitted capacity of the PWRP is 15 mgd. On October 6, 2005, the Board of Directors of District No. 20 approved the Palmdale Water Reclamation Plan 2025 Facilities Plan and certified the associated EIR. The 2025 Plan addresses the sewerage needs of the PWRP service area through the year 2025 and the services planned to meet those needs. The 2025 plan allows the capacity of the PWRP to increase to 22.4 mgd by 2025.

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

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

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

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

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

   Yes ☒ Name of Agency: County Sanitation District No. 20 of Los Angeles County No ☐

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

   N/A

BONDED INDEBTNESS

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

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

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

   Because all of the District’s existing bonded indebtedness is in the form of revenue bonds, liability for payment of the debt is apportioned to and collected from every parcel pursuant to the terms of the District’s Service Charge Program and not as a separate property tax levy. The District’s Master Service Charge Ordinance provides that local governmental parcels are exempt as long as they continue to be used for local governmental purposes. Likewise, the Ordinance provides an exemption for parcels that are not connected to the sewerage system (e.g. open space) until such time as they connect to the sewerage system.
3. To what extent will landowners within the proposal area be liable or remain liable for any existing indebtedness of the city or district? Until revenue bond is paid in full.

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

NOTIFICATION

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

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

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

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

Distribution:
LA County Board of Supervisors (Fifth District)
LA County Library
LA County Public Works
LA County Fire Department
United States Department of the Interior-Bureau of Reclamation
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District
San Marino Unified for elementary and high school

LAFCO File: Annexation No. 29 to County Sanitation District No. 16

Notice is hereby given that an application for the proposed annexation listed above has been received by the Local Agency Formation Commission. The application proposes to annex 14.765± acres to the district. The subject territory is located on Gainsborough Drive at its intersection with El Campo Drive, all within the unincorporated Los Angeles County.

The proposal application and map are attached for your review. Please submit comments, if any, to the LAFCO office by Monday, August 13, 2012.

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

Date: July 11, 2012

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

LAFCO PROPOSAL DESIGNATION NO.: A-16-29

AFFECTED AGENCIES
(Cities and/or Special Districts)

1. County Sanitation District No. 16 of Los Angeles County

2._________________________________________________________

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

1. Annexation

2._________________________________________________________

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

APPLICANT: Grace Robinson Chan

TITLE: Chief Engineer and General Manager

CITY/DISTRICT/CHIEF PETITIONER: County Sanitation District No. 16 of Los Angeles County

ADDRESS: P.O. Box 4998

CITY: Whittier

STATE: CA

ZIP CODE: 90607-4998

DESIGNATED CONTACT PERSON: Donna Kitt

E-MAIL ADDRESS: dkit@lacsd.org

TELEPHONE: (562) 908-4288 ext. 2708

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

SIGNATURE: [Signature]  DATE: April 26, 2012

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL LOCATION:

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

Thomas Brothers Map Page 566, Grids F6, 7; G6, 7
Located on Gainsborough Drive at its intersection with El Campo Drive, all within unincorporated Los Angeles County.

TOTAL ACREAGE OR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY:

14.765 acres or 0.023 square miles

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

☐ Yes  ☒ No

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

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

   The subject territory consists of vacant land and is located within an industrial area.

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

   The topography is flat.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

4. Number of landowners within the proposed territory.
   1
5. What is the proximity of the subject territory to other populated areas?
   N/A

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

7. Number and type of existing dwelling units:
   0

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

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

LAND USE AND ZONING

1. What is the assessed land valuation of the subject territory (give source and date of information)?
   The assessed valuation per the Assessor’s current tax roll is $807,373.

2. What is the current land use and zoning designation within the subject area?
   The present land use is industrial. The current zoning is Single-Family Residential 13,000 sq. ft. min lot size [R-1-13,000].

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

No

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

No

GENERAL INFORMATION

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

All of the owners of real properties within the territory proposed to be annexed have requested, in writing, that their properties be annexed to County Sanitation District No. 16 so that said district can provide off-site sewage disposal service to said properties.

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

   a. Adjacent areas:

   N/A

   b. Mutual social and economic interests:

   N/A

   c. The local government structure of the County:

   No effect.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

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

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

The wastewater generated by the proposed project will be treated by the Joint Outfall System (JOS), which is comprised of 6 upstream water reclamation plants and the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant. The JOS has a design capacity of 592.7 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 411.53 mgd. The District's sewerage facilities have adequate capacity to collect, treat, and dispose of the wastewater to be generated by the subject territory.

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

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

N/A

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

The current permitted capacity of the JOS is 592.7 mgd. On July 12, 1995, the Board of Directors of District No. 2 approved the 2010 Master Facilities Plan and certified the associated EIR. The 2010 Plan addresses the sewerage needs of the JOS service area through the year 2010 and the services planned to meet those needs. The 2010 plan allows the capacity of the JOS to increase to 630.2 mgd by 2010.

5. List any assessments, fees, or other charges to be levied as part of this proposal and or that may be levied in the near future. The property owner will be paying a service charge for the Districts services.

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

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

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

   Yes ☒ Name of Agency: County Sanitation District No. 16 of Los Angeles County No ☐

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

   N/A

BONDED INDEBTNESS

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

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

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

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

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

   Until revenue bond is paid in full.

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

   N/A
NOTIFICATION

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donna J. Kitt</td>
<td>P.O. Box 4998, Whittier, CA 90607-4998</td>
<td>(562) 908-4288 ext. 2708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATIONAL PROPOSALS
Summary of Los Angeles Unified School District Reorganization Proposals

August 2012

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District (USD) that were at various stages in the school district organization process as of July 16, 2012.

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

Status: Final petition submission pending.

Status Date: June 26, 2007

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

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None

Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None

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

August 2012

The following is a summary of school district reorganization proposals (exclusive of those affecting the Los Angeles Unified School District [USD]) that were at various stages in the school district reorganization process as of July 16, 2012.

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

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

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

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

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

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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
On April 27, 2004, LACOE received a copy of the CDE’s final feasibility study. On April 29, 2004, LACOE received notice from the CDE that the petition hearing had been delayed indefinitely at the request of the Wiseburn SD. Subsequently, the Wiseburn SD requested that the SBE hear the petition, along with its request for two waivers. A hearing was scheduled for July 7, 2004. On July 7, 2004, staff was notified by the CDE that Centinela Valley UHSD requested a delay in review by the SBE. Wiseburn SD agreed to withdraw its petition for consideration before the SBE to accommodate additional review requested by Centinela Valley UHSD. Subsequently, the CDE rescheduled the petition to be heard before the SBE on September 9, 2004.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

On June 11, 2012, Senate Bill 477 was introduced by Senator Rod Wright. The bill language seeks to create a Wiseburn USD (pending approval by the voters who currently reside within the Wiseburn SD), along with the creation of two JPAs as described above. The Wiseburn SD informed staff that it is currently revising the language of the proposed legislation under the guidance of Senator Wright and district advisors. Staff requested that the districts keep them informed of their progress and to report back to the County Committee. The Wiseburn SD requested that the County Committee submit a letter to the SBE expressing support of the pending local solution and legislation. On June 29, 2012, the County Committee sent a letter to the SBE expressing support.

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

**Status Date:** July 16, 2012

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

On June 6, 2012, LACOE received a request for a petition pursuant to EC §5019 and §5020 to increase the number of trustees from five to seven, to establish trustee areas, and to require trustee area voting within the Pomona USD. The request was submitted by chief petitioner, Mr. John Mendoza. The petition was forwarded to County Counsel to determine the legal compliance of format and content. On June 19, 2012, County Counsel deemed the petition sufficient, staff returned the petition to the chief petitioner on June 20, 2012, for circulation.

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

**Status:** Petition in circulation.

**Status Date:** June 20, 2012

* 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.

On January 4, 2011, staff conferred with a representative from the Registrar-Recorder’s office, who informed us that no audit of petition signatures had been done yet, and they clarified the cost of signature verification. On February 15 and March 1, 2011, staff contacted the Registrar-Recorder and were informed that the signature audit had still not been done. On May 12, 2011, staff from the Registrar-Recorder’s office advised LACOE that an audit of the petition’s signatures was underway. On November 28, 2011, the chief petitioner Mr. Wasson notified LACOE of the death of one of the co-chief petitioners, Ms. Morse. Mr. Wasson stated that another chief petitioner would not be named.

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

Status Date: December 5, 2011

* Indicates update from previous summary.
PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TRUSTEES FROM FIVE TO SEVEN AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUSTEE AREAS WITHIN THE POMONA USD

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

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

Status: Petition in circulation.

Status Date: August 20, 2009

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* 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: October 2, 2006

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

OTHER INQUIRIES REGARDING REORGANIZATION (within the last six months)

Unification Proposals/Last Activity Date

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

* Indicates update from previous summary.
Transfer of Territory Proposals/Last Activity Date

- Temple City USD to Arcadia USD/March 2012

Formation Proposals/Last Activity Date

- None

Trustee Areas and Governing Board Size/Last Activity Date

- None

* Indicates update from previous summary.